

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

[Browse all Theses and Dissertations](#)

[Theses and Dissertations](#)

2013

The Little Brother Syndrome And Nuclear Proliferation, An Exploratory Analysis of Pakistan and North Korea's Risk Prone Policies

Richard Ellis Hebblethwaite
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Hebblethwaite, Richard Ellis, "The Little Brother Syndrome And Nuclear Proliferation, An Exploratory Analysis of Pakistan and North Korea's Risk Prone Policies" (2013). *Browse all Theses and Dissertations*. 1352.

https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all/1352

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Browse all Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

THE LITTLE BROTHER SYNDROME
AND
NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION,
AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF PAKISTAN AND NORTH KOREA'S RISK PRONE
POLICIES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

By

RICHARD E. HEBBLETHWAITE
B.S. (General), College of Social Science, Florida State University, 1987,
B.S. (Political Science), College of Social Science, Florida State University, 1987

2013
Wright State University

Wright State University

Graduate School

19 December 2013

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY Richard Hebblethwaite ENTITLED The Little Brother Syndrome And Nuclear Proliferation, An Exploratory Analysis of Pakistan and North Korea's Risk Prone Policies BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Arts.

Pramod Kantha, Ph.D.,
Thesis Director

Laura M. Luehrmann, Ph.D.
Director, Master of Arts Program in
International and Comparative
Politics

Committee on Final Examination:

Pramod Kantha, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science

Liam Anderson Ph.D.
Department of Political Science

Vaughn Shannon, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science

R. William Ayres, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Hebblethwaite, Richard . M.A., Department of Political Science, Wright State University, 2013.
The Little Brother Syndrome And Nuclear Proliferation, An Exploratory Analysis of Pakistan
and North Korea's Risk Prone Policies

The successful pursuit of nuclear weapons technology by Pakistani and North Korean leaders has fundamentally shifted the post war nuclear paradigm that established the monopoly of five nuclear powers over nuclear weapons and supplies of fissile materials under the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). How does one explain the daring nuclear pursuit of Pakistan and North Korea and their success in achieving this capability? Numerous theories have tried to explain both the rationale and the causal factor(s) for nuclear proliferation and specifically nuclear arms. While realism and neo-realism concentrate on the fear of the unknown; i.e., the international system and military power and rivalries, there has been scant, if any, efforts by scholars to researching the background psychological motivations of the state for those who make nuclear proliferation decisions, the political leaders. In this analysis, I have sought to understand nuclear proliferation through the prism of what I term "Little Brother Syndrome."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. <u>Introduction</u>	
a. Statement of the Problem	01
b. The Research Question and Subordinate Questions	02
c. Literature Review	
i. Major Social Science Theories and Nuclear Weapons	03
ii. Nuclear Non-Proliferation, Nuclear Policy, Historical South-Asia	05
iii. Refining My Analysis: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Psychology	07
iv. Psychology, Nuclear Family, and Behavioral Dynamics	09
d. Procedure	13
i. Methodology/Research Design	13
II. <u>Pakistan</u>	
a. Historical Background and the Establishment of Little Brother Syndrome	15
i. The Obstinate Fight and Poor Governance	18
ii. Little Brother and Moral Righteousness, the Fight for Jammu and Kashmir	23
b. International System Loopholes, Pakistan's Support of Terrorism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons	
i. From Diplomacy to State Supported Terrorism, Little Brother and the Use of Uncivil Behavior	29
c. Can Realism or Neorealism Fully Explain Pakistan's Actions	
i. Family Ties & Hegemonic International Politics	34
ii. Little Brother Versus Big Brother Militarily	36
III. <u>North Korea</u>	
a. Historical Background and the Establishment of Little Brother Syndrome	44
b. International System Loopholes, North Korea's Support of Terrorism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons	54
c. Can Realism or Neorealism Fully Explain North Korea's Actions	
i. The Great Leader	54
ii. Saving Face In the Land of Confucianism	
iii. The "Catch Me If You Can" Competitive Drive	
IV. <u>"Little Brother Snares the Sun"</u>	
a. LBS and the Drive for Nuclear Arms	65

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

V.	<u>Little Brother Syndrome</u>	
	a. LBS and the End of Hegemonic Alliances	87
	b. LBS and Management By Crisis	93
	c. LBS and the Use of Religion	96
	d. LBS and Universal Family Norms	98
VI.	<u>Conclusion</u>	
	a. Little Brother Syndrome Analysis	101
	b. Summation	105
	<u>End Notes</u>	
	a. Chapter One	114
	b. Chapter Two	116
	c. Chapter Three	123
	d. Chapter Four	126
	e. Chapter Five	132
	f. Chapter Six	137
	<u>Bibliography</u>	139

Chapter One

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The proliferation of nuclear technology information and hardware used for the creation of nuclear weapons has recalibrated the ranking of nations in the international community. No longer limited by economic power or global military standing, small non- and semi-democratic countries can attain the firepower and capabilities once maintained by only the largest world powers. This hegemonic effect of nuclear weapons gives minor nation-states the means to surpass international political boundaries imposed by the larger world system and thrust their own political policies and agendas onto the world stage.

The use of psychological insights data on how humans learn to perceive their surroundings may give us an additional reference points regarding states actions and national level nuclear decisions. How could this be? In a revolutionary 1964 film entitled “7-Up”, British director, Paul Almdorf, documented 14 school age children at age seven and conducted filmed interviews every seven years thereafter. Later taken over by Michael Apted, both directors provided a documented theory showing how these later adults all retained their psychological profile as exhibited in the very first film’s interviews.¹

Using the films as a foundation, I studied how children are influenced by their closest associates; fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, i.e. their nuclear family. As I continued my research on inter-organizational functions within the typical western or Asian nuclear family, my thoughts also turned to hierarchies and how each individual perceives his/her family ranking. I am the youngest sibling in a family of seven, and being a little brother helped me focus on the psychology of same.

The psychology of a little brother is what I term “Little Brother Syndrome”. Little brothers often have the feeling that a rivalry exists between them and their older siblings even though often, the older sibling is not even aware a rivalry exists. Little brother thinks his older siblings are seen as being far superior to the youngest family members. The older siblings do not see little brother as a threat but the reverse is not true. Little brother is extremely competitive and will fight to gain the status of his rival as well as the attention of those in charge, the parents. Righting this perceived wrong and forcing the rival to acknowledge the “win” so as to be seen as an equal is the purpose of his continuous fight.

In comparison, twentieth century social scientists have attempted to explain the variables and causal factors state leaders use in their political decision making processes. The most widely recognized and accepted social science theory came about as a result of nuclear weapons. Morgenthau’s 1948 Realism Theory stated social scientists should treat a nation as a single individual acting upon its own best interests.² While researching Pakistan and North Korean nuclear proliferation efforts; it struck me that the behaviors of the two countries’ leaders were very similar to those of little brothers. The question I seek to answer: Do the countries of Pakistan and North Korea have Little Brother Syndrome, and can it explain the motivations of these leaders when dealing with their more powerful siblings, India and South Korea as well as the International Community?

The Research Question

Can the “Little Brother Syndrome” help explain how certain states react with the international community and why a limited number of political leaders have chosen to engage in nuclear weapons proliferation?

Subordinate Questions

1. How did Little Brother Syndrome become established in Pakistan and North Korea?
2. Did LBS help Pakistan and North Korea exploit loopholes in the International System, particularly with their state support of terrorism and the pursuit of nuclear weapons?
3. Why Realism or Neorealism cannot fully explain Pakistan's, and North Korea's actions regarding state terrorism and their pursuit of nuclear weapons?

Literature Review

Major Social Science Theories and Nuclear Weapons:

Hans Morgenthau's "*Politics Among Nations*" came out in 1948 just before the beginning of the nuclear age. In 1949, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) detonated its first nuclear weapon. What began as a peaceful coexistence between the two remaining post World War II superpowers soon escalated into a series of confrontational actions without direct combat. Morgenthau's realism theory was not written to predict a state's nuclear behavior. The political and military actions of both the Soviet Union and the United States, however, demonstrated aspects of realism's "power politics". As the weapon that has the most destructive capabilities known to man, thermonuclear weapons represented both the absolute best and the absolute worst aspects of realism's "power", the threat of (nuclear) war. American nuclear weapons were used to threaten the Soviets from further global expansionism and military domination. Realism was not just a social theory but a strategic foreign policy practiced and used by the United States. The Cold War, realism based policies, and nuclear weapons soon became and have remained forever-after intertwined.

Focusing on military capabilities within the international relations system, neo-realists have written extensively on nuclear weapons issues. Authors such as Robert Jervis, John Mearsheimer, Stephen Walt, Kenneth Waltz and others have produced numerous articles and books on such matters as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), recent attempts by both members and non-members to obtain nuclear weapons capabilities, the use of nuclear weapons after the Cold War, and nuclear weapons deterrence and policies. In his 1984 book *The Illogic of American Nuclear Strategy* Robert Jervis defends the Mutual Assured Destruction or MAD theory and shuns the critics who were pushing for Ronald Reagan's nuclear superiority posture.³ Stephen Walt's 1987 book *Origins of Alliances* introduces a refinement of the realist balance of power theory with his own defensive neo-realist "Balance of Threat" theory.⁴

The one area where neo-realism reaches its zenith is with Kenneth Waltz's *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons – A Debate Renewed*.⁵ Waltz counters his chief opponent Scott D. Sagan in this single 2003 work by proclaiming the spread of nuclear weapons as a positive mechanism for states to pursue their interests and secure their international borders. His work supports the spread of weapons and uses the Indian-Pakistani military dispute over the Jammu-Kashmir provinces to demonstrate how nuclear weapons have successfully defused a territorial dispute. In response, Sagan supports organizational theory pessimists who fear preemptive strikes, an accidental launch, or how improper command and control of nuclear assets may actually set the stage for nuclear warfare within twenty-first century South Asia. Waltz counters by saying that the danger nuclear weapons poses forces a state's leaders to behave as rational actors and seek other ways or means to end a dispute. Sagan feels it is the human factor of irrationality that is the gravest concern and that in the heat of an argument, one side or the other will use their ultimate weapon as a means of obtaining their self-interests.⁶

Kenneth Waltz's pro-nuclear expansion belief is cited by academic authors to explain the reasoning why South Asian states are experimenting with nuclear armaments to secure territorial boundaries. Kanti Bajpai's "The BJP and the Bomb" (*Inside Nuclear South Asia*) cites Waltz's position that nation-states who face nuclear rivals have a strong incentive to seek their own nuclear weapons.⁷ As a social scientist advocating the expansion, proliferation and use of nuclear weapons for deterrence capabilities, Waltz's position has put neo-realism at the forefront of this twenty-first century nuclear debate.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation, Nuclear Policy, Historical South-Asia

There is a plethora of writing about nuclear proliferation in South Asia, and especially, historical accounts of the A.Q. Khan affair. S. Paul Kapur's *Dangerous Deterrent, Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia* was a central piece that took a critical look as to whether or not the Indian-Pakistan nuclear programs have brought security to their territorial border dispute.⁸ He writes about the Cold War stability/instability theory and South Asia's continuing conventional violence. He counters Waltz's theory by saying that nuclear weapons may actually "tempt countries to fight small wars" and maintains that India's and Pakistan's nuclear assets have increased instability.⁹ His 2008 MIT Press article "*Ten Years of Nuclear Instability in a Nuclear South Asia*" implies that Pakistan is willing to risk small scale incursions into India's Jammu and Kashmir provinces because both sides achieved their nuclear goals.¹⁰ "Allah's Bomb, The Islamic Quest for Nuclear Weapons" by Al J. Venter is a reporter's historical account of nuclear proliferation by South Asian, African, and the North Korean governments.¹¹ Venter is a military weapons and intelligence analyst writer for *Jane's Defense* who believes nuclear proliferation is still occurring. He has written that while world news

outlets are emphasizing the end of the A. Q. Khan nuclear proliferation network, the former middlemen used by Khan are still proliferating nuclear technology know how and the dual use hardware necessary to create weapons of mass destruction.¹² His book serves as a warning to Western nations, that Islamic countries are still seeking nuclear technology so as to equal the capability threats Western militaries possess. Another historical intelligence reference is journalists' Adrian Levy and Catherine Scott-Clark's *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*.¹³ These detailed works account for the illegal and clandestine schemes used by Pakistan to obtain nuclear material and technology. The Pakistani attempts to profit from the selling of this technology and the hardware to produce enriched uranium demonstrate the ease with which A.Q. Khan's activities succeeded in securing state interests.¹⁴ Devin Hagerty's *The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation, Lessons from South Asia* details how preemptive attacks against nuclear research facilities were planned by both India and Pakistan and how incidents like Brasstacks in 1987 and the 1999 Kargil Campaigns placed not just these two countries but the rest of the world at peril for a nuclear winter.¹⁵ Philip O'Neill, Jr.'s *Verification in an Age of Insecurity, The Future of Arms Control Compliance* is a review of current international laws regarding arms control and the need for reform to address rogue states.¹⁶ He questions current international nuclear policies and discusses possible solutions for new legislation and proposes new technical procedures. O'Neil believes North Korea could provide the test case to see if his proposed technical detection standards would accomplish their intended goals.¹⁷

Another detailed account on the extensive A.Q. Khan nuclear proliferation schemes is Gordon Corera's 2006 book *Shopping For Bombs*.¹⁸ Corera surprises the reader with his intelligence analyst style of writing about Khan's dealings with North Korea, China and Iran. Being closed

societies ruled by totalitarian regimes, Corera delivers evidence of their unmistakable cooperative efforts of nuclear weapons research and design. He alleges Chinese officials gave Pakistan nuclear weapon blueprints violating Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty protocols. In exchange for Uranium 235 enrichment processes, North Korea sent advanced No-Dong missiles to Pakistan while Khan was selling P-1 enrichment centrifuges to Iran. Confirming Corera's allegations is Mark Fitzpatrick's *The Iranian Nuclear Crisis, Avoiding Worst Case Outcomes*.¹⁹ Using International Atomic Energy Agency reports on their inspections of Iranian nuclear facilities, he verifies Corera's reports and updates the reader on Iranian attempts to by-pass United Nations sanctions and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty mandates.²⁰

Refining My Analysis: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Psychology

While researching nuclear weapons, I found an informational subset that examines the psychology of nuclear deterrence. I explored this subset to investigate if any of the authors used human psychology as a potential causal explanation for nuclear proliferation. This avenue of approach was explored very briefly in the early 1970's but was quickly abandoned. The search for an explanatory psychology theory soon switched to an emphasis on counseling families to ease their fears of potential nuclear war. The escalating Cold War locked down most attempts at nuclear proliferation and the interest topic was soon lost.

Psychology as an explanatory factor for nuclear proliferation appeared nearly 25 years later in author George Perkovich's book *India's Nuclear Bomb, The Impact On Global Proliferation*.²¹ He contends it is a country's political parties which seek nuclear weapons as a means to psychologically improve their party's popular consent. Sumit Ganguly in his *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions Since 1947* also asserts that it is the country's

governmental leaders and political elites that pursue acquisition of nuclear weapons as a psychological source of state nationalism to bolster their own individual popularity.²² Both these authors used group psychology as a factor for proliferation decision by political leaders, but none of these works attribute proliferation decisions to the psychological predispositions that existed in the countries.

In 2002, Saira Kahn's, *Nuclear Proliferation Dynamics In Protracted Conflict Regions* attempted to explain nuclear proliferation using protracted conflicts as a stressful psychological consideration for nuclear proliferation.²³ Through her detailed and precise examination of events and causes, she explains why the South Asian countries of India and Pakistan, and the Middle Eastern countries, Iran versus Iraq, Israel versus Egypt, and Israel versus Syria all sought nuclear arms. Her work found those countries with multiple conflicts or wars are more likely to conduct nuclear technology and/or nuclear weapons proliferation to enhance their countries' security. She explains if the protracted territorial border dispute is resolved, such as Egypt's and Israel's did in 1977 with the Camp David Accords, countries are less likely to seek nuclear weapons. Egypt ceased trying to acquire nuclear weapons following Camp David. States with unresolved disputes such as India and Pakistan continue until both sides have proven their nuclear weapons existence.²⁴ Overall, the stress of a protracted conflict is what, she says, causes a country's leaders to seek nuclear weapons in order to even their country's capabilities with that of their antagonist.

Jacques E.C. Hymans' *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation, Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy* categorizes individual leaders' psychology into four groupings: Sportsmanlike Nationalists, Sportsmanlike Subalterns, Oppositional Nationalists, and Oppositional Subalterns.²⁵ Sportsmanlike Nationalist politicians try to get along with their international peers and show

themselves as leaders while Sportsmanlike Subalterns seek to align their countries with a larger international leader or alliance. Opposition Nationalists blame international “others” as the source of their country’s troubles and they want to be the top leaders in the international community. Oppositional Subalterns do not have international leadership ambitions and so align themselves with the more powerful international community members. Divided into four groups, Hyman suggests it is how the individual in each group sees their National Identity Conceptions that influence their political decisions. Or in other words, how an individual perceives their country’s strengths (or lack thereof) also includes an emotional side when deciding to seek nuclear weapons. Hyman contends Oppositional Nationalists are the most likely leaders who push their countries to obtain nuclear weapons.²⁶ His book focuses on the leaders of four countries, France, India, Australia and Argentina and describes how the leaders of the first two made the decision to obtain nuclear weapons while the leaders of the last two decided against it. Using their public speeches, he ranks the remarks of Oppositional Nationalists leaders on their use of fear, a sense of urgency and emotional claims of nationalism in order to say the state needs nuclear weapons to be secure. He then uses those rankings to statistically prove how Oppositional Nationalist leaders are the proliferators of nuclear weapons both before and after the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was formally established.

Psychology, Nuclear Family, and Behavioral Dynamics

What my literature search found was that the individual human psychology of political leaders/elites as a motivational/causal factor for nuclear proliferation has largely been ignored. Exploring psychological motivations of national leaders and combining it with other determinants could provide a better understanding of why some nations pursue proliferation as

the cornerstone of their national security strategy. In two works referred above, Perkovich and Ganguly see the leader's motivation to win popular support by manipulating people's perception by pursuing nuclear weapons in their favor. One needs to understand why it is that people will positively react to proliferation decisions by their leaders. Threat perception from foreign countries (especially from perceived enemies) and increased sense of national security from nuclear capabilities obviously appear to be the prime explanation. However, one also needs to ask if the leaders themselves are immune from such psychological perception. For example, if people in India, in general, feel threatened by the military (both conventional and nuclear) might of China, are not the leaders equally insecure dealing with the Chinese leaders or worried about the Chinese threat. Could it then be said that the leaders' sense of inferiority vis-a-vis an adversary that has proven military superiority inculcate a lingering psychological inferiority into the minds of the leaders of the nation seen as inferior in this power equation? These challenged leaders, I argue, suffer from little brother syndrome, which turns them into oppositional nationalists who, as discussed above, have greater tendency to proliferate. If this is plausible, then the perception of and resentment towards the inherent weakness in relations to an adversary emerges as a key factor that propel the leaders of lesser powers to seek a greater balance; this could as, Hyman's typology posits, be done through alliances with greater powers or through proliferation. I found the need for further research of this possible explanation.

When I accidentally referenced "nuclear" and "family" during a library database search, the results prompted me to explore how individuals' learning techniques and decision making abilities are initially formed. Specifically, behavioral psychology has explored how personality and social traits are significantly influenced during a person's early childhood from six months to twelve years old by their nuclear families. (Note: Using behavioral science terms, "nuclear

families” consist of a father, mother, child, and any sibling(s).) *Children in Cooperation and Competition* author Emmy Pepitone details how it was not until the 1950’s that early childhood studies on sibling behavior and interaction were seriously investigated.²⁷ Authors Ann Minnett, Deborah Vandell, and John Santrock have written about the propensity of the youngest male child to act aggressively against the oldest sibling particularly when there is an age difference of two to three years. Their article “The Effects of Sibling Status on Sibling Interaction: Influence of Birth Order, Age Spacing, Sex of Child, and Sex of Sibling” details the observations made and the statistical analysis of the observed children.²⁸ Their study concluded that “the highest level of aggression occurred in boys with a brother”.²⁹ These interactions are what I call “the little brother syndrome”. The youngest brother feels he has to prove to himself, to his larger family, and particularly to the oldest male brother that he is an equal family member. As the youngest member of a multi-sibling family, or of a sibling dyad, the little brother’s competitive psychological drive is to prove that he is a person to be contended with and or be reckoned. Driven by this fierce competitiveness, he will fight and will continue intensifying all efforts for recognition as an equal despite having been repeatedly corrected or simultaneously defeated.

In comparison to Khan’s and Hymans’ writings, the actions described by Minnett, Vandell, and Santrock have a remarkable similarity to the actions of nation-state actors and political party leaders who are nuclear proliferators. Specifically, the “little brother syndrome” when compared to “Oppositional Nationalists” appeared to have some of the same psychological characteristics. The correlations of aggressiveness, competitiveness, and the intense desire to be at the same level or above seemed to be very real. The intent for Oppositional Nationalists is to be recognized as a leader by the international community. For little brothers, their intent is to be recognized and confirmed by their older brothers and the parent(s) as an equal family member.

In short, Hymans' work substantiates and validates the need for further psychological research as to the cause and/or establishment of Oppositional Nationalists.

The primary research question is to find out if "the little brother syndrome" can help explain how certain states react with the international community and why a limited number of political leaders have chosen to engage in nuclear weapons proliferation. The little brothers in my study are the countries of Pakistan and North Korea. Both Pakistan and North Korea were born amidst conflicts that resulted in the partition of the earlier nations. The leaders of both these countries had perception of isolation and weakness and had deep rooted perception of their national survival being at stake. They also found that they could not count on the international community as a credible reassurance for their security and hence the need to become more innovative and manipulative to overcome their insecurity.

The counterpoint, however, is that most of the information needed for the qualitative review of Pakistan's and North Korea's leaders is not easily obtainable. Using the countries' histories, including the records of their nuclear proliferation attempts, cultural family studies and recently declassified intelligence sources, I believe enough background information may be found to make a plausible case to support my analysis. Once only reserved for state intelligence analysts, recently written family histories and biographies of these two countries' major leaders may also provide the needed clues.

The second counterpoint that could be made is the actual leaders themselves and whether or not "the little brother syndrome" is applicable to the make-up of their own Asian nuclear families. A psychological review of the South Asia and Eastern Asia nuclear family may be just as important as birth order and the family's members. Individual psychological status may not be tied as a direct causal agent due to the fact people may change psychologically as they

progress through life. Can the same behavioral patterns attributed to a seven to twelve year old boy be the same when the boy is a young man or an older gentleman?

The third counterpoint is the relationship between government leaders' personalities and the "character" of the state. Is the state characterized by its leader(s)? In other words, does the state take on the same attributes as a person but expressing itself through its leaders? Are institutions instrumental in building the reputation and/or character of a state and can state institutions influence state leaders and their decisions?

The Constructionist school of approach asserts that the international community is explained in terms of "what your expectations are influences your perceptions".³⁰ In other words, if a country's political elites assume the international community to be always hostile, they would prepare for wars, expect wars, and will fight wars. If the political elites perceive the international community to be peaceful, then, they would expect peace, practice peace and embrace peaceful intentions. Constructionists believe the international community is about individual psychology as well as international community members' own psychology i.e. self-identity conception(s).³¹ Using this theory, could psychology and behavior sciences have explanatory powers of nation-state actions and nation-state actors? Is the "little brother syndrome" a causal factor for Pakistan and North Korea to seek nuclear weapons as a means to influence the international community?

Procedure

Methodology/Research Design

In order to answer the main question and the three subordinate research questions, I am planning to use open source histories of Pakistan and North Korea and their leaders to find out if

and how LBS could be applicable in these two countries. I am planning to research newly declassified archives from past U.S. presidential administrations and those of both European allies and foes. I am hoping to use this research to explore if the International Community has in existence an overarching ability that rules over other countries within the system. Using that information, did LBS help Pakistan and North Korea exploit any International Community weaknesses, particularly with their state support of terrorism and the pursuit of nuclear weapons? The last question is can Realism or Neorealism fully explain Pakistan's and North Korea's actions including those of state supported terrorism and their pursuit of nuclear weapons? By reexamining the usefulness of each realism/neorealism theory, I am hoping to prove they lack the cohesiveness that LBS has regarding international actions.

Chapter Two

Pakistan

Conceived in peace but born of fire, Pakistan's history does not project a country ready for an end to its sibling rivalry with India. Pakistan's political and military leaders have stoked the flames of religious animosity and existential threat from India in order to sow public discontent with its much larger neighbor.³² This redirection of its public focus has shifted Pakistani society's attention away from its own civil and military failings. In their place, the searing focus bears down on religion as a heated means of outward hostility and as a central cause for its massive spending on military preparedness.³³ By intermittently striking at its territorial neighbor politically and militarily, Pakistan's actions are contradictory to International Community expectations, standards and norms. Can the "Little Brother Syndrome" help explain how Pakistan reacts with the international community and why its political leaders chose to engage in nuclear weapons proliferation?

So how did Little Brother Syndrome become established in Pakistan? The roots of Pakistan's innate need for a sibling rivalry with India lie in how the nation emerged out of colonial India. Pakistan's existence is owed to the inability of colonial India's resistance movement to politically maintain the provincial ties the British originally established. When it became apparent in 1947 that British power was truly going to depart colonial India, both Hindu and Muslim sides of the Indian resistance movement agreed to a peaceful split of certain Indian provinces.³⁴ Under the India Independence Act of 1947, Vice-Roy Mountbatten was instructed by the Home Office to allow the 587 Princes to decide whether to remain with India or East and West Pakistan. The Princes were the deciders but consideration was meant to be given to the populations' religious and ethnic majorities. India's Muslims would have their own countries of

West Pakistan and East Pakistan with the rest of the majority Hindu provinces remaining as one India.

The problems between the Indian National Congress and the Indian Muslim League intensified when both sides began arguing over specific provinces. The Indian National Congress and the Indian Muslim League both agreed to establish the Bengal and Punjab Boundary Commissions. Each party would choose two members (2 Muslim and 2 Non-Muslim) with both commissions having a European chairman to make a decision if the commission was deadlocked. The United Kingdom State Department chose Sir Cyril Radcliffe, Vice-Chairman of the General Council of the English Bar who was suggested by the Secretary of State.³⁵ Lord Radcliffe was a noted barrister but he attempted to draw the boundary lines based on religious and ethnic orientations of the local populaces. For the Princely states that were being “dissected”, in theory the Princes’ decisions on which country to join were to be final decision as long as the ethnic majority agreed. While “other considerations” were also to be included, the four weeks the Commissions were given was simply not enough time.³⁶

Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the political leader of the Indian Muslim League, and Mahatma Gandhi, leader of the Indian National Congress, both thought they had an agreeable and peaceful solution. However, riots between these two religious groups, led by hardline agitators, left over one million dead in their destructive wakes.³⁷ Conceived as a means to maintain a peaceful coexistence, East and West Pakistan and its Indian counterpart emerged as blood-soaked lands whose people feared each other and the others’ religions.

Newly created West Pakistan and East Pakistan were not prepared for the massive onslaught of religious refugees.³⁸ East Pakistan was situated in proximity to Nepal (to the North) and Myanmar (near the South) but surrounded on three sides by India’s far North-Eastern provinces.

East Pakistan did not have the space needed for the huge numbers of people fleeing the violence. West Pakistan was ruled by an elitist landed class who kept the duo roles of both political and economic power. Vast numbers of refugees in West Pakistan were either placed or chose to stay primarily within the eastern cities which were close to the country's new border.³⁹ West Pakistan's northern and the western regions were the country's primary agricultural zones and remained sparsely populated. Mimicking the colonial British and reverting to past religious and social barriers, both East and West Pakistan maintained plutocratic governments despite the outward show of successful and mostly peaceful democratic revolutions.

From the beginning, Pakistan saw itself as having been dealt bad cards. The country was seen by the International Community as a Third World outcast with little to offer the industrialized free world. After their separation, India retained the vast majority of industrial capabilities with Pakistan barely having any at all.⁴⁰ Pakistan's government did not have the military means or equipment necessary to defend the country from any aggressor including India, China, or the USSR. Despite the prior agreements made by India's and Pakistan's government, India did not supply Pakistan with the promised military stores. Once East and West Pakistan split from India and after each side killed half a million of the other in religiously inspired riots, India refused shipment. Out of the 300,000 tons of promised munitions, equipment and supplies, only 6,000 tons of worthless and outdated military scrap items were sent from India by train.⁴¹ Pakistan desperately needed the military capabilities or it was feared the two countries would again be swallowed up into India or taken over by ambitious Chinese or Russian rulers.

The Obstinate Fight and Poor Governance

From the outset, Pakistan's political and socio-economic systems were bound to fail. Before the 1947 separation, neither Jinnah nor Gandhi could come up with an amenable political plan to save India as a whole nation. Their political alliance was based upon a common foe, the English and their aristocratic form of governance. With both their adversarial politics formed upon mainly religious lines, India's resistance movement began to unravel when members of the Muslim league led by Jinnah began demanding their own self-rule and ultimately their own country. Gandhi and his supporters in a very unexpected and unusual move simply acquiesced. His Congress Party leadership had been taken over by his supporters who marginalized him.⁴² The inability of India's rival political elites, the Congress Party and the India Muslim League, to be able to compromise with one another led to further estrangement of its populace and to the civil massacres that followed. This was the setting stage of a much larger Indian nation confronting Pakistan and the creation of Pakistan's Little Brother Syndrome.

The Indian provinces that became East and West Pakistan had a political history consisting of what was allowed by the British government. After World War One, the United Kingdom's powerful empire began to wane and the Indian call for self-rule increased. Local political control was enhanced by the 1919 Government of India Act.⁴³ As a result, what became Pakistan's wealthy landed class and political elites created small city dominions to compete politically. Pakistan's political parties wanted universal suffrage but were denied again when the 1935 Government of India Act did not grant it. The act only stated it would be granted in the future. The 1919 act and the 1935 act were legal decrees which allowed local communities to self-govern and included provisions for limited self-taxation. England's absolute monarchy retained its power over its colonial subjects by granting them restricted powers of their own. For what

was to become East and West Pakistan, local elections gave those ambitious enough to seek political office as well as political power the ability to do so.⁴⁴ Political parties and their machinery were established on the city level and voting on local matters became an established as well as an entrenched societal norm.

As a new nation, East and West Pakistan lacked the ability of more well defined nations in the cohesiveness of a national identity. The major tribal and religious based identity groups had no pull to self-identify as a Pakistan nation. The only cohesive nationalism was hatred of India. Muslim leaders of the India separation movement saw an opportunity to create a new Muslim state but had little to no plans of how to incorporate their ideas into a federal civil service, national army, federal controls, or government organizations to support a civil society. National leaders accepted what was known at the time i.e. British colonial practices based on hierarchal classes of wealth. This inability to create self-recognition as a national country has left Pakistan reeling from military coups and the inability of civil society to cohesively form strong formal democratic supporting infrastructures and ideals.

The leadership of this new democracy was formed around the Muslim leadership of the free India movement and it lacked the organizational support that Mahatma Gandhi and his protégés had. Jinnah did not have the momentum of thousands of supporters in the new country. Many Muslims decided to stay in India lacking the capability and financial wherewithal to travel to either Pakistan. Those Jinnah followers who did manage to make it to Pakistan did not find the welcome they had anticipated.⁴⁵ Most followers moved to West Pakistan's major cities along the Eastern border and had difficulty finding basic housing and necessities. Pakistan desperately needed massive foreign aid in order to provide for the one million plus Indian refugees.

In addition to the newly arrived refugees, Pakistan's civil government was based on previous political norms established during the British colonial period 1857 to 1947. British overseers made it a habit to disenfranchise local populaces by legal and socially acceptable class discrimination based on wealth. The second method of disenfranchising was the reinforcement of ethnic distinctions and mores. The typical British colonialism model was "Divide and Conquer".⁴⁶ Having local ethnicities or religious factions fight against each other so they don't all fight against you. This divide-and-conquer methodology worked exceedingly well within the confines of colonial India. Instead of basing society on acceptance of a complex social order consisting of different origins and means, democracy was in name only, and England's monarch ruled the empire.

After East and West Pakistan's independence was granted, Pakistan's national civil government embarked to switch political focus from the city level to the national level. Created akin to the Confederate States of America, the CSA national level was established as a weak counterpart to states' rights advocates who held onto political power. For Pakistan, the political elite saw that true political power lay within cities-states structures versus the national level. As long as they were left alone, these elite power structures run by the land owning upper class were content with the current configuration. Jinnah realized that in order for a national association to form between the national state and its peoples, these city structures and local political power needed to be tapped into or broken apart. To his dismay, the local aristocracy, i.e. the wealthy landed class, as well as the people, refused to join the national government focus this new nation so desperately needed.

The link-pin of Pakistan's Little Brother Syndrome based nationalism is to concentrate focus on the military as the hero and savior of the state's original territorial goal and later as its Islamic

defender. From the outset, political organizations were not given the high admiration that the military was. This was due to the fact Pakistan found itself at war within the first year of its creation. Throughout Pakistan's history, when political organizations banded together to confront national problems, the necessity of countering India's military capabilities took precedence as well as most of the available national budget. If a political party like the Pakistani Peoples Party which had national appeal takes hold, the military would step in and take control of the nation. Political corruption was and is rampant in Pakistan and the voting system is no stranger to it as well.⁴⁷ As the former President Pervez Musharraf says in his book *In the Line Of Fire*,

“Sadly, a functioning democracy is exactly what has eluded Pakistan since its birth on August 14, 1947.”⁴⁸

He credits,

“rule by a small elite – never democratic, often autocratic, usually plutocratic, and lately kleptocratic—all working with a tribal-feudal mindset”³⁹

In short, the Pakistani military, and specifically, the Pakistani army has often seized national control when a political power vacuum is created or a national protest occurs and turns violent.

The army replaces civilian rule with its own leadership. Co-editors Myron Weiner and Ali

Banuzaii researched why this keeps occurring in *The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics:*

Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan. They wrote:

“Of Pakistan's institutions, one, the military, has remained untouched. It was too powerful for civilians to tamper with and virtually ran itself without outside interference. Only when it was defeated by the Indian Army in 1971 were there attempts by Bhutto to restructure it, and some of these attempts may have only hastened his own downfall.”⁵⁰

The link-pin of Pakistan's Little Brother Syndrome relies upon the military to counter any potential threat to Pakistan. If that threat were diminished, then the Army would lose its status as

Pakistan's Islamic faith defender. Consequently, any new Indian weapons capability has to be matched by Pakistan's military establishment.

In its beginning, Pakistan was enduring its early consolidation efforts but barely a year had passed before war was declared in 1948. Despite gaining significant ground in the disputed Jammu and Kashmir territories, the war was seen as a defeat for Pakistan but not for its military. While the military was given broad public support after the war, the civilian government fared far worse. Even before partition, the Muslim League which was Pakistan's staunch supporter saw its popular support crumble into nothingness during the 1937 Indian elections.⁵¹ After partition and Pakistan's first conflict, it was the civil government that began losing public support. Like the Confederacy in the 1860's, the Muslim League nationalists were caught in a cauldron of states' rights (albeit for Pakistan city-state) advocates. Nationalists were overruled, overlooked, and disregarded by the voting supporters of their own political creationist, the Muslim League. Civil authorities were blamed for the failures of the war goal as well as the civil unrest created by the lack of adequate housing, the high cost of food and the scarcity of employment. As noted by author Mr. Keith Callard,

“There were floods, corruption, inefficiency and poverty, and there was no kingdom of heaven on earth. And Government, as always, was to blame.”⁵²

The inability of the Muslim League to connect with Pakistan's voters on national level issues was the foothold needed by Little Brother Syndrome to start its precedence.

In retrospect, the use of the military to bolster Pakistani nationalism was a huge mistake by Jinnah. Instead of tying the average citizen to his or her federal government, the political ties the populace felt for the country and its civilian government leaders became estranged. Like the American South who forever praised General Robert E. Lee while cursing President Jefferson Davis, Pakistani's praised their military generals and blamed the national government for its

inabilities to effectively operate. After the war, the popular support for the average soldier still remained high while civil government political leaders, both federal and local, support dropped considerably. Muhammad Ali Jinnah passed away 11 September 1948 before Pakistan's first war was officially over.

“But he was ageing, sick and tired, and soon he was dead. And the party that he had built began to disintegrate.”⁵³

The Little Brother Syndrome had its foundation firmly set within the first years of Pakistan's creation.

Little Brother and Moral Righteousness

The Fight for Jammu and Kashmir

After Partition, the Punjab Boundary Commission's unfinished work left the princely states of Jammu and Kashmir undecided and hotly disputed by Pakistan. With both provinces having Muslim majority populations, Pakistan's first attempt was to secure a favorable solution to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute through state diplomacy. As newly created “small” independent states, Pakistan originally sought the assistance of the international community in order to overcome the social, religious and territorial injustice(s) it believed Britain and India caused. Pakistan's civil government was hoping the United Nations would come to its aid and force India to recognize Pakistan's legitimate rights to the disputed regions. As a poor nation, Pakistan was unprepared for a major tactical war with India. Pakistan's government chose to pin its hopes on the never tested United Nations' ability to solve territorial conflicts. Growing tired and impatient with India continually blocking UN bureaucratic actions, however, Pakistan's government chose to use asymmetric warfare as its means of gaining what it considered as its legitimate territory. The competitive fight was on and Little Brother's moral cause and national goal to free its fellow Muslims from Indian rule was firmly and formally established.

The Pakistani people were primarily questioning British intentions and if Britain was not unfairly favoring India. The last British Viceroy of India was Lord Mountbatten the former W.W. II commander of England's South-East Asia command. "Although Mountbatten finally agreed on (establishing) Pakistan to please Jinnah, he still insisted that it made no sense at all."⁵⁴ Pakistanis also questioned why the boundary commissions split the Muslim Punjab and Bengal provinces with only half the territories declared part of Pakistan.⁵⁵ Pakistani leadership attributed the territorial advantages accruing to India at the time of partition to Hindu perfidy and what they called "the pernicious anti-Pakistani collusion between Lord Mountbatten and the first Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru".⁵⁶

The continual on and off use of limited military force by a smaller nation against a much larger nation has its roots in the Little Brother Syndrome. My analysis contains the idea that a little brother when opposed to the controlling force of a larger, older sibling will fight to achieve or at least defy the status of that "rival" sibling. The older sibling is "recognized" by the parent or parents as being more mature and of greater understanding than the younger or the youngest sibling of the nuclear family. The older sibling is given more responsibility and authority to watch over the younger regardless of the ages separating the children. The problem lies in the fact the larger and older children may not have the mental techniques necessary to "rule over" the younger siblings but are given that authority by the parents anyway. What may have started out as a *friendly* role of simple family adjustments often turns toward hostility to coerce the younger children *into line*.⁵⁷ This Little Brother Syndrome dynamic is what fuels the intense hatred and animosity between India and Pakistan.

In October 1947, this first major conflict between the two antagonists locked the combat method used into future conflicts and established a continuing 'Little Brother Syndrome rivalry'.

Pakistan, lacking competent arms and material for a traditional army, called upon religious fighters from the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of the North-West Frontier territories. Pakistan used these traditional tribal nomads as an operational and military deception “shield” for its first offensive movement in the disputed Jammu and Kashmir provinces. The five thousand combatants were given six weeks of army training and placed under army commanders for the operation.⁵⁸ “On 23 October 1947, some 5,000 Pashtun tribesmen – Afridi, Waziri, and Mahsud from the NWFP – crossed the border into Kashmir, carried by Pakistan army vehicles.”⁵⁹ The tribesmen covertly invaded Kashmir in an attempt to claim the non-aligned territory for Pakistan. The deception plan was to disguise these recruits as J&K citizens who started a voluntary civilian revolt against the Indian federal government. Pakistan’s religious militia however blundered into existence. The men resorted into mobs that began ransacking and looting the Indian towns they were sent into to start a popular uprising.⁶⁰ The J&K Maharaja fearing loss of his power requested Indian military support. He received India’s help but he also had to sign over his government’s ruling authority for defense, communications, and foreign affairs.⁶¹ Without the towns’ public support for Pakistan, India was able to rally its paramilitary and military forces to combat the irregular foreign militia.

On 1 January 1948, India’s state department formally filed its grievance with the United Nations.⁶² There were three United Nations resolutions. U.N. Resolution 39, passed in 20 January 1948 established a three panel commission to report to the U.N. Council on the best course of action to further peaceful relations. U.N. Resolution 47, passed in 21 April 1948, called on both parties to remove their military personnel and establish a plebiscite for the entire Jammu and Kashmir provinces. The third part of the resolution called for a general election so a deciding vote to join Pakistan or India could be taken. Neither side removed their military forces

entirely from the disputed regions. In January 1949, the United Nations called for a cease-fire and Pakistan eagerly agreed. The two sides stopped their warfare on January 1st, 1949 and later in July, the United Nations' cease-fire line was established.⁶³ In 1951, U.N. Resolution 91 sent in U.N. military observers to observe and report any violations of the ceasefire agreement along the established line of control. Pakistan's liberation effort resulted in obtaining little over a third of J&K territory but also the international community's condemnation of Pakistan's Machiavellian means.

For Pakistan, the war's outcome was seen by its population as a militarily strategic and tactical defeat. Originally, Pakistan's newspapers, radio stations and government television services all shared in the responsibility for the public support of its military forces. As with the South in the American Civil War, Pakistan's military forces were believed to possess great physical and mental attributes. Newspapers published articles saying how Pakistan's military members were better than their foes and how "one Pakistani *jawan* (soldier) was worth seven Indian *jawns*".⁶⁴ As with the Southern campaigns in the early part of the American Civil War, Pakistan's early battlefield successes were eventually stopped and the war became a stalemate.

To complicate matters, the commander-in-chief of the Pakistan Army was British General Gracy. On the Indian Army's intervention in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Quaid-e-Azam reacted swiftly and ordered General Gracy, (acting Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan Army) on 27/28 October 1947 to dispatch troops to the scene. The British General, however, failed to carry out the orders of the Governor General. It might be said that, in the circumstances, he blatantly defied the Quaid. Some people thought it was a case of high treason. At that time all the four provincial Governors, the Agent to the Governor General in Baluchistan and the three Services Chiefs of Pakistan were British. To help maintain order, British officers

were kept in charge of India's and Pakistan's militaries during and after partition. As the governor-general of Pakistan, Jinnah ordered the deployment of regular Pakistani troops in support of the tribal invaders.⁶⁵ Pakistan's British commander-in-chief refused the order and instructed his English officers not to assist. The native army elements responded but had been greatly delayed in trying to restart the eastern offensive. With critical time lost, the war ended with little territorial gains having been made. India's larger military was able to contain Pakistan's military actions. A little over a third of the Kashmir territory was seized but Pakistan's popular support for the imaginative capabilities of its forces as well as the war itself met the reality of India's pure numerical strength. While the U.N. agreement called for a civil referendum or plebiscite allowing the citizens of J&K provinces to vote and decide which nation to align themselves with, this vote has never taken place.

From the war, Pakistan's early leadership learned of the value of independent forces free of European constraints or restrictions and chose to keep these covert assets. Pakistan leadership saw no wrong in using whatever resources it had to take the Jammu and Kashmir provinces. The Federally Administrated Tribal Areas and North West Frontier Province (now called Khyber Pakhtunkhwa⁶⁶) irregular militia tribesmen had been sent into the Jammu and Kashmir provinces to start 'local insurgencies' in favor of the provinces joining Pakistan. On a grander scale, this was repeated in the 1965 India-Pakistan War. In 1965, India was taking the constitutional legal steps to declare the disputed J&K provinces as its own. Pakistan again tried to influence the international community for support but failed. Seeing no other recourse, Pakistan introduced both irregular/militia tribesmen it had trained in great numbers along with its professional soldiers who were wearing civilian clothing. During the 1999 siege of the Siachen Glacier called the Kargill Conflict, Pakistan claimed the original occupiers were not its soldiers, but again, local

tribesmen trying to reclaim land lost in the 1947 partition. Whenever an incident occurs inside India's Jammu and Kashmir provinces, Pakistan's leadership claims no government knowledge and implies the conflict is the result of Indian separatists.

Historically, the Federally Administrated Tribal Areas or FATA is a legally declared Pakistan land area watched over by a Political Agent who reports directly to Pakistan's President. The agent's job is to administer one of the seven areas using the 1901 Frontier Crimes Regulations established under British rule. The agent polices the local populaces by the use of regular Pakistan military troops and the Frontier Corps, a paramilitary force of irregular tribal members whose officers are Pakistan army officers.⁶⁷ The mountainous Pashtun tribal clans that inhabit these seven tribal areas and three frontier regions are granted limited Pakistani citizenship, they are rarely if ever given Pakistan passports, and live in an area where the rule of law is vastly different than those living outside FATA boundaries.⁶⁸ The tribal clans have no established civil court system and cannot file legal grievances against the federal system. Legal grievances can only be filed against the Agent who has sole responsibility for making the final ruling. The only recourse is the use of communal Sharia law in which the head of the tribal clan may decide what to do but only for internal clan disputes. Schools in the NWFP are limited, the teachers are under-educated themselves, and religious schools called Madrasa are the primary education providers.⁶⁹ This in an area with only a seven percent literacy rate.⁷⁰ The clans do have limited political representation in Pakistan's Senate and the National Assembly. Universal suffrage was finally granted in 1996 but political parties were not allowed to participate in the general elections until 2012.⁷¹ As a result, the FATA is a prime recruiting area among a closed disenfranchised populace and provides the best covert training grounds for Pakistani state supported terrorist efforts to reclaim the J&K provinces.

Despite multiple wars, the Jammu and Kashmir provinces remain largely Indian.⁷² Many in the International Community believed its Muslim population wanted to be part of West Pakistan. Despite continued efforts by Pakistan to have the United Nations resolutions regarding these two provinces fulfilled, the United Nations has refused to open the debates or carry out the resolutions either with force or negotiations. In the international debate on how India and Pakistan are to resolve this issue, Pakistan emerged as the little brother to the much larger and better established India.

From Diplomacy to State Supported Terrorism Little Brother and the Use of Uncivil Behavior

Pakistan's early civilian and later military governments sought asymmetrical warfare to bridge their initial capabilities gap with India. Superior in personnel numbers and military assets, India had no political or military reason to give up the Jammu and Kashmir provinces. What started as a political dispute soon rose to a military territorial challenge which has since transformed into a constant terrorist threat to the Indian towns that bordered the disputed areas. Pakistan's military leaders turned to long term terrorism to wear down India's armed services, its provincial and federal police directorates and later its paramilitary police forces. While denying their active support for terrorism, Pakistani leaders believed a terrorism based campaign would eventually cause India's territorial capitulation.⁷³ As the little brother in this sibling rivalry, Pakistan seeks and uses any method available to win the competitive fight.

Pakistan's use of terrorism as a state function is not unprecedented and neither is the International Community's response which was to overlook this state aspect in order to further its own goals. In his 1969 book *The Myth of Independence*, Zulfikar Bhutto described how the United States wanted Pakistan to forego its territorial dispute with India and accept Indian regional hegemony.⁷⁴ Instead of resolving Pakistan's territorial dispute, Pakistan's leadership

ignored the U.S. request. Any acceptance or public show of wanting to end this Little Brother Syndrome rivalry would be seen as a sign of weakness in the eyes of the polity. Settling the issue without achieving the country's religious goal to free Jammu and Kashmir would also end Pakistan's core reason for its existence. In the eyes of Little Brother Syndrome, accepting India's position would terminate Pakistan's own reason to exist.

After the 1971 separation of East Pakistan, the next major international crisis making Pakistan an important American ally again was the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The United States intervened in an attempt to turn Russia's invasion into "The Soviets' Vietnam".⁷⁵ As a result, the United States military and financial aid was indirectly supporting Pakistan's own Jammu and Kashmiri terrorist groups. The Soviet war began December 1979 and lasted to February 1989. In 1985 alone, the United States' Central Intelligence Agency spent \$250 million dollars to help defeat Communist Russian and Afghanistan forces.⁷⁶ When the Soviets pulled out in 1989, an internal civil war raged between the different sects and religious fighters who conducted the ground war. Pakistan, seeing an opportunity to create a state friendly to its Islamic principles supported the Taliban with ammunition, fuel, supplies, and training.⁷⁷

One of Pakistan's state support terrorist groups that was being monitored by the Central Intelligence Agency was the Kashmiri group Harakat ul-Ansar (HUA).⁷⁸ The group was founded by Abdelkader Mokhtari in 1993. The CIA found that HUA was being actively supported by Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) department along with numerous Taliban units. The HUA were also being instructed at Taliban training camps in both Pakistan and in Afghanistan.⁷⁹ When, Kabul, now Capitol of Afghanistan fell to the Taliban forces in late 1996, this freed up additional personnel to be used elsewhere such as Bosnia or Jammu and Kashmir. The CIA noted in a Top Secret National Intelligence Daily dated 30 September 1996

that “HUA contacts of Embassy New Delhi have hinted that “they might undertake terrorist actions against civilian airliners.”⁸⁰ Despite repeated U.S. demands for Pakistan to stop supporting the Taliban in the 1990’s, the strategic value of the Taliban and other groups like it such as the HUA was more than enough reason not to do so. The United States, a top leader of the International Community, was unable to get Pakistan’s cooperation. Under Little Brother Syndrome, the Pakistani government continued supporting terrorism and doing so by using United States’ funds to accomplish its goals.

Pakistan has an operational advantage keeping terrorists within its own borders and encouraging their illegal war against India. Pakistan’s civil authorities can claim they have no knowledge of terrorist activities while the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence as well as regular military instructors train and equip terrorist group members. The knowledge of these covert state activities can be kept to a very limited number of higher level government personnel. When terrorist actions do occur, leaders can provide plausible deniability; i.e., the appearance of innocence when city, regional, national, or even international press question them.

Since 1970, India has had six thousand, five hundred and forty two terrorist incidents. Of these, approximately 2,131 have occurred in the Jammu and Kashmir provinces.⁸¹ Authors Chris Demchak and Eric Werner’s *Exploring the Knowledge Nexus: India’s Path in Terrorism-Driven Institutional Growth* details how India was able to manage an explosion of terrorist organizational growth in the 1980’s.⁸² After a large increase in the number of deaths attributable to terrorist attacks, Indian state governments made the decision to band counter-terrorism units together and create their own separate agency called “Anti-Terrorist Squads”.⁸³ The paramilitary squads were somewhat successful, so in 1986 India’s federal government created a new federal counterpart called National Security Guards.

According to Demchak and Werner, until 1989 the number of terrorists caught who were not from Jammu and Kashmir region, was one in eight.⁸⁴ After 1989, which was the year the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, eight out of 10 terrorist members caught in Jammu and Kashmir were foreigner fighters. Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency covertly assisted mujahedeen members making their way into Kashmir. The mujahedeen fighters began a terror campaign to force out the minority Hindu population. The number of car bombings, political and ethnic assassinations, violent based intimidations, terror propaganda, and arsons all increased substantially. The Indian Muslim population that was native to the area also came under attack and contributed to the Kashmir emigration. In total, over 200,000 civilians left Kashmir to escape the religious and ethnic violence.⁸⁵

While India was partly successful, the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 caught the United States off-guard and the resulting American deaths rallied the nation to declare war on Afghanistan's Al-Qaeda faction and its use of terrorism. Pakistan's President Musharraf was called by Secretary of State Colin Powell and told he and Pakistan would join the war against terrorism and Al Qaeda, "You are either with us or against us".⁸⁶ The United States promised a robust economic assistance package that included finalizing the previous 1990 freeze on F-16 fighter aircraft and millions in humanitarian assistance.⁸⁷ Despite years of intelligence reporting stating that HUA and other Kashmiri groups were supporting and being supported by the Taliban, the United States sent massive funding to Pakistan.⁸⁸

A prime example of how LBS came into the next international crisis is the Frontier Corps. Central Intelligence Agency operatives described how Pakistani Frontier Corps elements were utilized in command and control; training, and when necessary combat right beside the Taliban in Afghanistan.⁸⁹ Comprised mostly of Pashtuns, the Frontier Corp members were "preferred

over the regular Pakistan army forces because the army is predominantly Punjabi who have different features as compared to the Pashtun and other Afghan tribes.”⁹⁰ Pakistan denied any connection and the Taliban denied they were sheltering HUA militants.⁹¹ The Frontier Corps were also responsible for providing combat training in Kandahar or Herat for the Pakistani madrassa students who were being sent to Afghanistan to fight with the Taliban.⁹² As Pakistan’s relationship with the United States soured over Taliban support, the U.S. Ambassador Thomas Simons confronted an Afghanistan “official” (name excised in the declassified cable) that what Pakistan provides is “wheat, POL (Petroleum, Oils, and Lubricants), and busses full of adolescent Mujahid crossing the frontier shouting ‘Allahu Akbar’ and going into the line with a day or two of weapons training.”⁹³ In September 2000, the U.S. Secretary of State urged the Government of Pakistan to cease all military and financial support to the Taliban. Internal State Department communications were claiming “Pakistani support for the Taliban has been long-standing, the magnitude of recent support is unprecedented.”⁹⁴

After September 11, 2001, Pakistan again received U.S. military and humanitarian support but this time to fight a common enemy; terrorism. Announced in an April 2009 press release, President O’Bama’s \$83.4 billion dollar war funding request included “\$400 million for the new Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund which would allow Central Command (author’s note U.S. Military) to provide training and equipment to build the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistan’s military, Frontier Corps, and irregular security forces.”⁹⁵ Associated with Pakistan’s formerly state supported Kashmir terrorist groups Lashkar-e Toiba (formed 1990), Harakat ul-Ansar (formed 1993), and Jaish-e Mohammed (formed 1994)⁹⁶, the Inter-Services Intelligence Division, the Frontier Corps, and its irregular security forces became Pakistan’s counterinsurgency forces. Little Brother Syndrome strikes again.

Family Ties & Hegemonic International Politics

Realizing the U.K. did not have its interest at heart and in order to protect its newly won international boundaries, Pakistan originally turned to the United States to guarantee its continued existence. Pakistan's elite realized from the beginning that in order to remain free, it needed a first tier and world recognized supporting ally. As the Cold War between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. developed, Pakistan's geographic location became its greatest asset. From the 1950's on, by allowing the United States military to establish bases and outfit them with short and medium range nuclear missiles within the country, both civil and military aid was generously given. This allowed Pakistan to build a worthy military with a capability to adequately defend against a larger neighbor. By having its supporter's military within the country, the enemy that risked crossing Pakistan's borders also risked having the United States intercede on Pakistan's behalf. Seeing these benefits, Pakistan's government willfully and successfully supported the United States in a variety of international government functions.

In 1954, Pakistan signed a Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement with the United States.⁹⁷ In the 1950's and 1960's, the United States used West Pakistan's military airfields to covertly launch secret U-2 reconnaissance flights which could photograph and monitor the Communist nuclear missile fields in the Soviets' western regions.⁹⁸ The United States also maintained classified intelligence gathering equipment at Peshawar Air Station.⁹⁹ (The 1979 Iranian Revolution later forced the U.S. to expand Pakistan's own electronic intercept capabilities.¹⁰⁰) From 1954 to 1965, as long as Pakistan's government leaders allowed the United States military to freely function within its borders, Pakistan received continuing and copious Western foreign aid.

This strategy of allowing the United States to place intelligence infrastructure within Pakistan was based on military necessity for a hegemonic alliance with a strong world super-power. In

1954, Pakistan joined the U.S. sponsored South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) that was created to stop Communist China's expansion.¹⁰¹ The 1955 Baghdad Pact (later renamed CENTO in 1958) was also signed by Pakistan. The agreement was designed to stop communist USSR expansionism into the Middle East. Seeing the help it could receive from allying itself with the United States, Pakistan signed a new bi-lateral Agreement of Cooperation. As Ahmad Faruqi writes in his *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan*, the country became the United States' "most allied ally in Asia".¹⁰²

From Fiscal Year 1950 until Fiscal Year 2001, Pakistan received a grand total of \$3.6 billion dollars (in 2006 U.S. currency values) of foreign military sales and military aid from the United States.¹⁰³ In 1954 the United States Congress authorized the joint Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement.¹⁰⁴ The treaty purpose was to train Pakistani military officers and enlisted on the warfare techniques and the advanced equipment used by American military units.¹⁰⁵ Pakistani officers were also taught how American Army war planners grouped joint operations together to ensure their plans' success. Pakistani military personnel received tactical and strategic training on the advanced American equipment including tanks and fighter aircraft. The United States helped East and West Pakistan while the larger and older India, as a former colony, was created and later continued to be supported by the United Kingdom. For South Asia, there was United States Dad, an English Mother, an older Indian brother, various brothers and sisters consisting of the former English colonies, and little brother Pakistan. The only fragile force holding this dysfunctional family together was its own hegemonic family ties.

Little Brother Versus Big Brother Militarily

Little Brothers' competitive drive makes them want what the older sibling's already enjoy from their parent(s), recognition and to be seen as equals. Forcing the older sibling for this recognition is within the Little Brother Syndrome competitive spirit. Younger siblings may well create or be having a feud the older sibling may not even identify or realize. For example, Pakistan and India have fought four major wars, countless skirmishes and undeclared terrorist actions mostly to the detriment of Pakistan. Can the Little Brother Syndrome explain why Pakistan continually uses its budget consuming military to achieve the perceived vindication of its goal when the risk is so high?

A historical perspective will help alleviate the question as to why Pakistan sees its military capabilities superior to much larger India. The provinces of Jammu, Kashmir, Punjab, and Sindh have an enduring historical legacy of supplying fierce and rugged individuals suited for Britain's Colonial India's military needs.¹⁰⁶ During World War One, from these provinces Great Britain actively recruited approximately 500 thousand men into its colonial armies. During World War II, two million Indian men served with over 650 thousand men coming from this area of India.¹⁰⁷ When East and West Pakistan were created in 1947, Pakistani Muslim and Sikh men already had a well-established historical fighting culture. Pakistan's government perceived this image as a tremendous advantage against their Indian foes.

The first Jammu and Kashmir clash may have been inconclusive but Pakistan did manage to take at least some of the territory it sought and did so without the military wherewithal needed for an extended fight. If former soldiers could succeed as well as they did this first time, what would happen if equipped with proper military arms and support? The line-of-control that was

established by U.N. negotiations gave Pakistan some recognition internationally despite its negative connotations.

India and Pakistan's second major military conflict occurred in 1965 and was a close repeat of the stalemated 1947 war but on a much larger scale. Pakistan's strategy was to again covertly send in tribal warriors and professional troops disguised as Kashmiri civilians to start local rebellions against the Indian provincial governments. Instead of a couple thousand, in August 1965, some 7,000 troops were sent across the border to take up positions for the planned uprisings.¹⁰⁸ India soon learned the presence of these troops and after securing her western positions drove armored columns into the high Pakistani held Kashmir Mountains and captured Haji Pir pass. Pakistan counterattacked with a numerically superior number of tanks and personnel. Using tactics similar to the 1962 Chinese military incursions against India, ground and armored units raced eastward and recaptured the pass. A second stalemate ensued until India reorganized, regrouped, and reinforced its front line forces with new supplies, equipment and men. On 6 September 1965, India crossed the international border further south in the Kashmir range with early success. The Indian southern offensive began driving towards Islamabad and Lahore. India had correctly assessed Pakistan may try the same tactics as the Chinese and responded quickly with numerous air assaults in the North and in the south with heavy tank battalions. When the United Nations quickly offered a cease fire agreement, both sides readily agreed.

The irony in this second major engagement of two professional militaries is the fact both sides again were equally equipped with primarily United States and United Kingdom military equipment. Pakistani forces were relying upon American Patton tanks and F-86 "Saber" aircraft purchased under U.S. Foreign Military Sales contracts. The Indians relied upon British

Centurion heavy tanks and aircraft and also utilized Soviet heavy artillery. Why Pakistan generals believed the same military deception tactic would work a second time (as well as in future conflicts¹⁰⁹) is unknown. Could it be they felt what is termed the “Cinderella” effect? I.E. winning an unachievable goal when everyone including the other team doubts your abilities? With both sides using roughly the same military hardware, India’s numeric advantage again played a decisive role. The total number of military personnel engaged in combat was greater but the same premise(s) led to the same and familiar conclusion. While Pakistan’s Air Force could claim a better air combat performance than India’s, the international community including the United States condemned Pakistani political leaders for causing the war.

While the number of Pakistani troop losses was greater than India’s, Pakistan’s Air Force could claim victory by the number of Indian aircraft that were downed. Pakistani pilots asserted superior tactics and procedures were used to destroy India’s fighter aircraft. In an interview with a British reporter, a Pakistan Air Force pilot credited better equipment and skills for the reprieve of the 5 to 1 advantage India had.¹¹⁰ This *bravado* statement is a method US Air Force and Navy training squadron instructors’ use when teaching new fighter pilots. The Pakistani F-86 squadron pilots received similar training as part of Pakistan’s purchase of these American fighters.¹¹¹ This American training reinforced Pakistan’s Little Brother Syndrome. USAF training instructors emphasize the need for extremely aggressive competitiveness and always striving for the combat pilot to overcome whatever situation he is in and win the engagement. This was nothing new for training military pilots. However, the problem it created was the favored prominence given to Pakistan’s military. Ayub Khan’s dictatorial reign was seen as being the only legitimate solution for Pakistan’s internal struggles. The U.S. training buttressed

military competitiveness and mutually strengthened Pakistan's Little Brother Syndrome embodied in the psyche of its military as well as its political leaders.

Again, the international community condemned Pakistani actions and the United States formally declared no foreign military sales would be allowed for either combatant country. This dramatic U.S. foreign policy shift was seen by Pakistan society as an additional reason to end their hegemonic reliance upon the United States. China's perceived win in the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict¹¹² and its nuclear weapon explosion in 1964¹¹³ opened Pakistani eyes to the possibility of another ally against India. As a result, Pakistan began building mutual ties with Communist China.¹¹⁴ Chinese tanks began appearing in Pakistani Army tank companies right beside their American Patton tank counterparts. Pakistan also purchased Chinese artillery and began officer exchange programs with China to make up for the loss of American equipment, supplies and training.¹¹⁵ During this period, the tactic worked and the military services were fortified. The problem was Pakistan's military had non-interchangeable parts and stores that were not uniformly standardized. As political tensions between East and West Pakistan began intensifying, Pakistan's military competitiveness was about to be tested not initially from India but internally instead.

Pakistan's obsession with Little Brother Syndrome also led to the neglect of accountability and governance which created greater fissure between military dominated Pakistan's federal government and its Eastern wing. The creation of split East and West Pakistan had immediately placed the country at peril with India. The two states of Pakistan were more than 1,000 miles/1,600 km apart and any military or commercial flight had to fly over either China to avoid Indian airspace or India itself. East Pakistan was also surrounded by India on three sides with the Southern border facing the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean. Militarily, East Pakistan

had to counter a much larger sized Indian army stationed near the borders which could attack from any side. East Pakistan could not rely upon West Pakistan to fly in troops and supplies or use ground maneuvers for resupply if war against India was declared.

East Pakistanis also resented the minimal support received from the federal parliament for civil and economic improvements projects. East Pakistanis believed the federal government was far too narrowly focused on claiming Jammu and Kashmir. Ali Banuazizi and Myron Weiner, co-editors of, "The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan" states Bengalis were, "underrepresented in the military and complained bitterly that their own relatively underdeveloped economy was being exploited by West Pakistani firms."¹¹⁶ The combined country's federal budgets given to civil governance and economic improvements were much smaller than the military's. The civil infrastructure budgets were primarily spent on West Pakistan and rarely within East Pakistan.¹¹⁷

The following months brought a series of cataclysmic events which resulted in East Pakistan gaining its independence. Facing ill health, mounting internal political dissatisfaction with riots, and losing support of long-time military backers, on 25 March 1969, Ayub Khan turned over his dictatorial presidency to Army Chief General Mohammed Yahya Khan.¹¹⁸ Knowing of Pakistan's connections with China, on 25 October 1970, President Richard Nixon offered a one-time exception to the United States FMS ban on military equipment for Pakistan. Included in the offer was permission for "Pakistan to procure about \$50 million worth of replacement aircraft and some three hundred armored personnel carriers."¹¹⁹ Yahya Khan agreed but before delivery could be received, Pakistan's 7 December 1970 elections began a showdown between East and West Pakistan.

Neglected politically and treated with indifference, civil politics had created the Awami Movement for greater East Pakistan autonomy.¹²⁰ Supported by both Hindu and Muslim voters, the Awami League movement gained widespread grass-roots based popular political support. In the December 1970 elections, the Awami League won a staggering 160 of the possible 162 seats based on their total population. These 160 seats out of Parliament's 300 seat total gave them a clear Parliamentary majority. West Pakistan's 'divide and rule' mantra had failed. The Awami League's leader, Mujib-ur-Rahman was demanding greater say for East Pakistan.¹²¹ Hardliners of the Awami League credited their sweeping victory as a call for complete independence. The Pakistan People's Party of West Pakistan won 81 Parliamentary seats and its leader, Zulfikar Bhutto, the then Prime Minister wanted a joint co-leadership position with the new Awami League's Mujib-ur-Rahman to keep the country whole. To force Awami League's agreement, Prime Minister Bhutto refused to allow party members to take their parliamentary seats. President Yahya Khan began sending additional army ground troops with the idea of suppressing a rebellion.¹²² With neither side willing to budge, President Yahya Khan held meetings in Dacca, East Pakistan starting 15 March 1971 to resolve this constitutional issue.¹²³

Two outside factors worsened the relations between East and West Pakistan. The first was the tsunami and its tidal wave that hit East Pakistan the previous December. Killing over 200,000 East Pakistanis, West Pakistan did not send any aid until the International Community responded.¹²⁴ The second event occurred during "Pakistan Day" held 23 March each year. Instead of flying the Pakistani flag, the Awami League members as a mass political protest displayed Bangladesh's provincial flags throughout Dacca. Two days later, Yahya Khan left East Pakistan and the following day, the Army began a viciously brutal crackdown.¹²⁵

The sharp but short India-Pakistan 1971 war demonstrated the International Community's Realist beliefs. Amidst escalating civil war and tensions with India, Pakistan believed the United States would come to its aid joining the battle. They also believed China would assist them if India and Russia expanded their operations. Unlike previous encounters, the United States and the Soviets had interceded both politically and militarily. From the beginning of hostilities, the Soviets were helping India. In August 1971, India and the Soviet Union signed the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation stating each side would consult with the other if attacked by a third party.¹²⁶ Russia, seeing an ally who could intercede on their behalf if China invaded the U.S.S.R. sent military advisors. The Russians also helped man the advanced radar and other equipment India had purchased after the 1965 American arms embargo. Russia also sent several large naval vessels that were ready to monitor the American carrier task force Nixon had ordered into the Indian Ocean. The Russian fleet began shadow operations raising Cold War anxieties.¹²⁷ Diplomatic efforts increased significantly as foreign political tensions were turning this regional conflict into a certified International crisis. Neither the United States nor China chose to assist Pakistan. With no International Community support and feeling betrayed, Pakistan formally surrendered East Pakistan and the nation of Bangladesh was created on 16 December 1971.¹²⁸

The Shimla Agreement between Pakistan and India was reached in July 1972.¹²⁹ Both sides agreed to exchange their prisoners as well as to withdraw their troops to the international boundaries in Punjab and Sindh. Previous contestations regarding where the line of control actually resided in Kashmir were also settled.¹³⁰ The defeat of Pakistani forces was a huge embarrassment. The Simla Agreement held Pakistan to resolving not just the war's end but any future inter-state dispute was to be settled by direct negotiations, bilaterally. In addition, under

the agreement, all the outstanding disputes Little Brother had with India were ended with Prime Minister Zulfikar Bhutto's signature.¹³¹

India's conviction that Little Brother would be deterred from any future military actions was badly ill advised. India's leaders turned their attention towards China and its nuclear capabilities demonstrated in their 1964 atomic blast. Pakistan's leaders refuted their military loss and began their quest to counter India's nuclear ambitions. As demonstrated by both the United States and by its close ally China, Pakistan could not rely upon any of the major world powers to guarantee its existence. Pakistan would have to build its own nuclear capabilities if it was ever going to be able to counter India's atomic threats. Little Brother was unwilling to accept the status quo and aimed to be recognized by the International Community for his abilities despite what anyone else said.

The next military interaction with India occurred only after Pakistan had demonstrated its own atomic warheads. Pakistan's 1999 Kargil conflict was a return to previous standard operating procedures but with the added threat of nuclear weapons. Covert religious fighters and Pakistan army commandos seized Kargil Heights before Indian troops reoccupied the positions in the spring. The twist in this scenario was the fact each combatant possessed nuclear weapons. In 1974 India exploded a nuclear device claiming not a weapon but a test.¹³² In 1998, India exploded more nuclear weapons and Pakistan reciprocated using multiple warheads.¹³³ With both sides having nuclear deterrents, Pakistan did not stop its use of terrorism nor limited military engagements. President Musharraf, claiming them as religious fighters and not professional troops, declared the action was the result of independent actors. Indian troops were rushed to the area and began retaking the heights by force. When the presence of Pakistani commandos became known, Musharraf sent limited troop numbers to support the effort. India's

Air Force commenced air operations but shied away from entering Pakistan air space. After taking severe losses, Pakistan ordered the remaining forces to retreat.¹³⁴

The four wars are a testament to Pakistan's Little Brother Syndrome. This highly intense competitive drive causes government leaders, high ranking senior military officers and the populace to believe its military can defeat a larger foe. Pakistan's arrogance defies standardized military numerical logic. Knowing your country should have the capacity to defend itself is a real world condition. Believing your military can defeat a country twenty times larger than your own is a Little Brother Syndrome indicator.

Chapter Three North Korea

Seen as an Asian outpost for American ideals, Korea was divided into two separate parts in the final days of World War Two. This American effort to free Korea from its Japanese overlords was quickly seen by the other remaining superpower, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the USSR, as an intrusion into Asian affairs within their sphere of influence. Having overrun the last remaining Japanese forces in Manchuria, the USSR agreed to a temporary solution to split the country. Both the USSR and the United States agreed to oversee free elections after the war so that Koreans themselves could decide upon their own form of government consensually. Despite United Nations' military action between 1950-1953, numerous cross-border military incidents, occasional North Korean terrorist assaults and now northern held nuclear weapons, this "temporary solution" has survived sixty-five years to this day without a political or military resolution.

As a peninsular state divided in half, Korea was viewed as a very young nation in 1945 and was deemed by both the USSR and the US as not being prepared to rule itself.¹³⁵ Having survived the political decision to divide the country, North Koreans were still being treated by the USSR as underlings. While the Japanese over-seers were gone, they were simply replaced by communist Russians who controlled all aspects of North Korean government activities.¹³⁶ Needing a leader the USSR could trust, the Soviets chose a former Korean Manchuria guerilla fighter who had been heavily indoctrinated in communist ideology.¹³⁷ Kim-il Sung, a sickly former major in the Soviet Army's Eighty-eighth Brigade, which never saw actual combat was chosen by the Soviets to represent the Korean people and be their communist leader.

Kim assumed control of the northern branch of the Korean Communist Party in December 1945. In February 1946, with the help of his Russian backers, he was chosen as the chairman of the Interim People's Committee. Kim began to raise ties with communist cells already located in South Korea before the proposed 1948 United Nations sponsored "vote" to decide reunification. Although accepted by the communist cells already operating in the South, Kim was unable to exercise or expand communist influence in the South. The heavy handed election held on May 10, 1948 gave the political victory to Syngman Rhee, a strong anti-communist, supported by the United States. His party for the "elected delegates" formed the "National Assembly of South Korea" under the U.N. plan for reunification. On 20 July, Rhee was appointed president and a month later, 15 August 1948, the association declared itself the "Republic of Korea".¹³⁸ United States Military control of Korea was turned over to the civilian Republic to govern itself.

As a response, Kim-il Sung called for the Conference of the Leaders of Political Parties and Social Organizations of North and South Korea and held the meeting in Pyongyang, 29 June 1948. The conference called for an open and general election to be held for deciding how all of

Korea, both North and South, could be reunified as a single government. Ignored in the South, the 25 August 1948 vote created the Democratic People's Republic of Korea or DPRK, on September 9th 1948. While South Korea was recognized by the United States, North Korea was recognized by the USSR on 13 September 1948. What started off as a simple demarcation line for joint military operations during World War II was now the beginning of a cold war between the two super powers.

Sung's first major military decision which included his private obsession, was to try and overtake South Korea and combine the two Koreas into one singular state.¹³⁹ With Kremlin's backing, he launched a surprise artillery attack that met with quick success. His military propaganda department instantly began broadcasting saying that the South had attacked the North. He then launched a full blown invasion plan that had been written by his Soviet military advisors.¹⁴⁰ North Korean forces easily pushed back their adversaries to the point their own supply lines were stretched exceedingly and dangerously thin.¹⁴¹ President Truman who had recently authorized pulling American troops out of Korea found his remaining military inadequately prepared for such an assault. Had it not been for American air-power, the North's attack on the last South Korean strongholds in the southern part of the country would have succeeded.¹⁴²

President Truman called upon the newly created United Nations to intervene with troops, military hardware and supplies. While American forces landed at Inchon harbor behind enemy lines, the combined U.N. force was able to move the Northern troops back to the international border and beyond. What appeared to be an easy victory for the North soon became a rout with many North Koreans leaving their farms and villages in order to escape to South Korea.¹⁴³

Kim-il Sung pleaded for Russian and Chinese intervention in order to prevent North Korea's collapse. Russia, sensing the United States was not going to back down, refused any direct assistance other than covert aircraft, pilots and aircraft support personnel. Stalin's advisor Khrushchev did not want the war to turn into a global conflict with possible nuclear ramifications. He convinced Stalin not to send ground forces despite the fact the U.S.S.R. military had drawn the war plans. On the other hand, Communist China sent thousands of ground troops to combat the U.N. forces. The charges of entire Chinese divisions, bad weather conditions, and inhospitable terrain complicated U.S. led efforts. The Chinese entry into the war finally pushed the Americans back to the recognized 1945 international border when a truce was signed in 1953 ending three years of conflict.¹⁴⁴

An important consideration of the war's outcome was the fact Kim-il Sung remained in power in North Korea. He was able to convince both Chinese and Russian government elites that his leadership was needed to reconstruct North Korea. The war had proved disastrous for the North's agricultural system, its civil production facilities, and even far worse for its citizens. North Korea lay in ruins. Sung, however, began implementing the same public relation techniques that his Russian handlers had used during his first rise to power. He convinced the remaining North Korean population that it was he who had saved North Korea from South Korea's, United States' and United Nation's combined treachery. His use of mass media to obscure the facts into his favor, simply worked.

From his introduction to power in 1945 till his death in 1994, Kim-il Sung used state mass media to bolster his public image and his public standing with the North Korean population. Sung was originally portrayed by his USSR handlers as a former guerilla fighter against the evil Japanese forces during WWII. His later personification as a Korean defender against United

States aggression and deceit during the Korean War was plastered, broadcasted, and written about extensively.¹⁴⁵ This was done despite the fact that Sung concocted the whole war idea and had agreed to let the Soviets conduct the planning if Stalin would grant his permission. Time and again, whenever North Korea was involved in an international incident, the person who saved the day was always the great leader, Kim-il Sung.¹⁴⁶

This propaganda technique is not new but its effect for North Korea's Kim-il Sung and his heirs proved to be extremely successful. The method has its basis in Gustave LeBon and his 1913 work "The Psychology of Revolution". In section three of *The Role of the Leader in Revolutionary Movements*, LeBon writes:

"...the unconscious collective mind of the crowd seems bound up with the mind of the leader. The latter gives it a single will and imposes absolute obedience."

"The leader acts especially through suggestion. His success depends on his fashion of provoking this suggestion."¹⁴⁷

"...According to the suggestions of the leaders, the multitude will be calm, furious, criminal, or heroic. These various suggestions may sometimes appear to present a rational aspect, but they will only appear to be reasonable. A crowd is in reality inaccessible to reason; the only ideas capable of influencing it will always be sentiments evoked in the form of images."¹⁴⁸

The irony that exists in the North Korean use of LeBon's philosophy is that Germany's Nazi Party of the 1930's and 1940's extensively used the same revolutionary techniques as well.¹⁴⁹

LeBon's and Otto Weininger's early 20th Century works were incorporated as the foundation for the Nazi Party. Included was the idea of a singularity of genius or a timeless man (aka Adolph Hitler) who could see the meaning of (historical) events due to his significant memories. This central theme was adopted by Hitler, and more importantly, by his supporters who eventually created Hitler's supremacy displacing Germany's weakly held democratic rule. There were

other European political and state leaders who integrated this image method including Italy's Fascist Party leader Mussolini and the USSR's Generalissimo Joseph Stalin.

After the Korean War, Sung used the singularity of genius technique in order to retain his control over North Korea. He faced very long odds against retaining his leadership role of Communist North Korea. With the March 1953 death of Joseph Stalin, however, Sung managed to convince Khrushchev and China's Mao Ze Dong that he could revitalize North Korea and shape it into a shining example of a communist workers' paradise/utopia. Using the communist indoctrination training he received in Soviet Manchuria during World War II, Sung replicated Stalin's, and other European leaders' method of convincing his own people what a great leader he was. Sung manipulated the country's people and resources via each level of the communist Korean Workers' Party ensuring he was portrayed as the single great leader who was above all in his abilities.¹⁵⁰

For the financial backing needed for this new Korean Communist revolution, Sung relied heavily upon both China and the USSR. Between 1945 till 1970, it is estimated the total U.S. dollar amount North Korea received in foreign aid from communist China was \$541 million; they received \$1.146 billion from the USSR.¹⁵¹ The foreign aid was first used primarily to rebuild North Korea's shattered military forces. Once secured, the construction of housing and heavy factories necessary for the production of steel and other civil construction components were quickly built. In the later 1950's and 1960's, North Korea was seen as an emerging nation despite its communist government. Subsequently, North Korea's governmental leaders tried to entice those that had fled south during the war as well as the large Korean communities positioned outside the country to return. The largest external Korean community was located in Japan where hundreds were recruited to return to the north. The Gross Domestic Product index

for North Korea during this time period surpassed that of South Korea. Many in South Korea and its worldwide Korean communities saw the South as being under the dictatorship of a former criminal with U.S. ties. Until April 1960, South Korean President Rhee Syngman was seen as using the same Japanese imperialism tactics along with the political elites who came from the former Japanese land owners controlling the country just like they had before World War II. After Syngman's resignation, the South Korean Major General Park Chung-hee seized power in a military coup. For some, the prospect of returning to their native country proved to be too difficult to decide while others returned to the North seeing better opportunities and a country with more promising recovery in the form of its GDP. Using its new found standing within the Western world, North Korea continued to request favorable trade and economic development efforts with the USSR and China. From the 1950's to the mid 1970's, using North Korea as a model of worldwide communist achievements, both countries eagerly and continuously agreed.

During Kim-il Sung's reign over North Korea, his mimicking style of an occult communist leader also had a darker side geared toward the state support of terrorism as a tool of international relations. From 1953 to 1994, North Korea was a bastion of state supported terrorism and used it as a means to destabilize South Korea's government, military, and civil society. The fact that no peace treaty was ever signed ending the Korean War gave Kim the ability to deny any or all "terrorism" acts. Sung would often simply deny any incident had even occurred or have it placed in the international columns of a military option.¹⁵² Since there was not an official or internationally recognized peace treaty, what could South Korea do except expect more warfare versus terrorism or a combination of the two?

To this day, North Korea's government is routinely accused of the state sponsorship of terrorism and appears to use terrorism as a means to influence South Korea, Japan, and other

regional East Asian countries. The University of Maryland sponsors the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and the Response to Terrorism's "Global Terrorism Database".¹⁵³ Based primarily on newspaper, magazine, and media reports of significant new stories from around the world, the GTD verifies the incidents as acts of terrorism before logging them into the database. The University of Maryland's Global Terrorism Database does have a specific time or date restriction since the dataset was established in 1970 and does not have any previously dated information. A search result conducted on 16 January 2010, however, shows 53 separate acts of terrorism within South Korea or against South Korean owned government (including federal and defense), business, and/or civil organizations' buildings, vehicles, and/or personnel (START-GTD). The dataset was searched from 1970 to 2010. Of these incidents recorded, nine were directed against South Korea's recent assistance to the U.S. military for medical support operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Forty-four terrorist incidents were mostly aimed at the country's military establishment and in a few cases at local and/or federal police. Of those forty-four suspected terrorist acts, nineteen episodes were attributed to internal leftist radical student organizations. That leaves approximately twenty-five, which are of an unknown origin, i.e. there is no known perpetrator. This could be linked to Terrorism's definition as the weapon of the weak and hence also related to little brother syndrome and would equally apply to Pakistan

These terrorist incidents can be directly traced to North Korea and their use by Kim-il Sung to influence regional and international relations and opinions. These include attempted assassinations, such as the 1968 Blue House raid (South Korea's presidential palace), the December 1969 hijacking of a Korean Airlines flight YS-11, and the 1974 attempt to kill South Korea's President Park Chung-hee by a presumed North Korean agent Mun Se-gwant. Each major action was a direct attempt to cause the South Korean government to fail or lose face.

The 17 January 1968 Blue House raid was conducted by 31 North Korean special operations trained commandos.¹⁵⁴ The team infiltrated the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and made their way to Seoul in two and three man squads. Seeing heightened security, they changed their original plan and changed into local South Korean Twenty-First Infantry army uniforms. They marched to the Blue House but were stopped by local police outside the Blue House perimeter. A firefight ensued and the commandos fled toward the DMZ. Twenty-nine were killed by South Korean police and/or army units as well as American army troops. Only one North Korean commando was captured alive and two are suspected to have made it back to North Korea.

This brazen attack by North Korean commandos demonstrated the North's resolve and did not result in South Korean retaliation. The psychological effect on public opinion towards fighting the north was pitted against the South Korean government's effort to dampen expectations for a renewal of hostilities. This is particularly true with the United States wanting to ease tensions and backing away from any indication that it would respond to or reciprocate the North's aggression. Public opinion called for decisive action(s) against the northern communists but no direct military action was ever taken.

This lack of resolve/action was dramatically evident when two days after the Blue House affair, North Korea seized an American communications interception ship, the USS Pueblo. The ship was taken in international waters and the crew was forced to spend twelve months within a North Korean prison while negotiations yielded no concessions except from the Americans. This act of war was tolerated. American public opinion decried the lack of aggressive military action and the United States lost face in the international arena.¹⁵⁵

One of the more dramatic terrorist acts North Korea committed was the hijacking of Korean Air's YS-11 turboprop passenger aircraft, 11 December 1969. Cho Ch'ang-hŭi, a North Korean

agent boarded the flight from Gangneung Airbase, a joint military-civilian use airport in Gangneung, Gangwon-do province. The aircraft was flying to Seoul's Gimpo International Airport. The aircraft was taken to Wonson Airfield in North Korea where both the crew and passengers were indoctrinated by North Korean agents using communist ideology. North and South Korea governments held talks in January 1970 which resulted in most of the passengers being released but not all. The four crew members and seven passengers who represented the educated upper class were permanently detained.¹⁵⁶ To date; neither the aircraft nor the remaining eleven South Korean hostages have ever been released.

Five years later, Kim'il Sung ordered an assassination attempt against South Korea's president Park Chung-hee. The South Korean president was known as a far right conservative whose continued political career was favored by the United States. The public was growing disenchanted with Chung-hee's conservative policies including supporting the U.S. Viet-Nam war effort. Between 1965 and 1973, over 300,000 South Korean troops had been stationed in South Viet-Nam. President Chung-hee had recently won the 1972 election without opposition. In essence, he had created a self-styled dictatorship based on the very controversial Yusin Constitution enacted by the South Korean legislature. At the time of his attempted assassination which caused his wife's death, South Korea's tight-knit ties to the United States was unquestionable. If North Korea could cause a situation that would bring down the South's government, Kim-il Sung was willing to try. The expected response to the North's provocation was absolutely nothing except maybe more diplomacy and diplomatic talk.

The psychological leadership strategy used by Kim-il Sung was to keep the disputed United Nations' declaration of a recognized sovereign southern country as a protracted conflict. His use of state sponsored terrorism was initiated to inflame political unrest in the south while

consolidating financial and military support from China and Russia. The use of South Korea as a protracted conflict is necessary for the continuation of his own regime and allows for three basic paradigms:

- A) The Great Leader
- B) Saving Face In the land of Confucianism
- C) The “Catch Me If You Can” Competitive Drive

As stated, the image of the infallible great leader as one who guides the state to greater good was not new when adopted by Kim-il Sung. His continued use of this psychological technique did empower him to have absolute control over the government as well as the country’s resources and its people. Sung had to find a way however to keep popular sentiment from changing its focus from he being the great leader to the people demanding his departure. Using North Korea’s protracted conflict with the South, state media was able to homogenize the idea that all persons in the state had a hand in making North Korea the great state that it is. As long as the masses follow the ideas, beliefs, and recommendations of the great leader, North Korea will be a worker’s paradise.

The substantial flaw in the operational aspect is knowledge. State achievements would have nothing to be compared against without demonizing South Korea and its United States support. With limited to no outside information sources available to the population, the drive to have North Korea's and especially it’s leader’s virtues excel all others is paramount. In contrast, the only acceptable terminology when describing outside North Korea is all negative. Any demonstration of individual or popular dissent is quickly subverted and dealt with by the Communist Workers Party, the political police called the “Bowibu”,¹⁵⁷ and/or government law enforcement agencies. All persons are indoctrinated on how if only they follow the virtues of the Great Leader true happiness can be obtained.

Kim-II Sung also used Confucian religious teachings as a way to influence regional and international politics towards his favor. As a whole country, Korea experienced four dynamic time periods under Chinese or Japanese rule. The four major periods are the Unified Silla Kingdom, the Koryo Dynasty, the Choson Dynasty, and the Japanese Occupation Period ending with the presently divided North Korea and South Korea.¹⁵⁸ Japanese colonial rule was the harshest for Koreans. In an attempt to eradicate Chinese cultural influences, Japanese government policy towards the Koreans centered on the removal of lifelong Chinese cultural ties with a redirection of educational, government policy, religious edicts, and an emphasis of having a Japanese focused national identity. Japanese political and industrial colonial leaders emphasized the importance of being Japanese centering in on all forms of business practices and common economic activities.¹⁵⁹

Religion was the one steadfast area where the Korean people held onto their belief structures and refused to allow Japanese land owners to have cultural influence. Since the Koryo period, the majority of religious worshipers were followers of Confucian or for the time period, what is called Neo-Confucianism. The tenants of Confucius are respect for authority especially elders, and watching out for your nuclear family's reputation so as not to damage it with your own actions. Korean piety was placed at the front of societal norms and those who conformed were welcomed while violating civil norms was to "lose face".

In practice, Kim-il Sung ironically used these Confucian norms as a way to continually embarrass South Korean government, civil society, and culture. The term ironic applies in this situation since Sung was raised by Protestant missionaries when he was growing up. This did not stop him however from causing international incidents and pointing out how if the South Koreans were better followers of Confucian principles, their government would not have lost

face in the latest debacle.

Examples of Kim-il Sung using this technique include the U.S.S. Pueblo incident, the 1969 shooting down of an American EC-121 aircraft, and the kidnapping of foreigners. The 1954 international incident involving the communications listening station on the U.S.S. Pueblo was the first large scale international crisis the North Koreans staged and controlled. The occurrence was first reported by the international free press as an American Navy vessel operating in international waters that was illegally seized by North Korea's Navy. North Korea claimed the vessel was off course and was residing in its declared coastal boundary conducting espionage. Taking place only three days after the Blue House assassination attempt, North Korea sought and received United States agreement on negotiations to end the affair. What the U.S. Secretary of State Foster Dulles had not counted on was the tenacity of the North Korean denial and its extremely aggressive and accusatory tone demanding a U.S. apology. Much akin to the negotiations ending the Korean War, North Korea would not release the ship or the crew until a full formal U.S. apology was made. After twelve months of negotiations, the U.S. did issue a formal apology but the U.S.S. Pueblo ship itself was never returned. Rather, the ship is still in North Korea and being used as a museum piece as an example of aggressive U.S. military behavior. The Great Leader once again saved the day and vanquished the foes of communism by making them lose their honor in front of the international community.

Another military incident occurred 15 April 1969 when the North Korean Air Force shot down a U.S. Navy EC-121 during its signals intelligence (SIGINT) mission. Military strategists saw the shoot down as a test of the new American president Richard Nixon in the very beginnings of his presidency. Nixon ordered the pentagon to prepare a list of military options including recommendations. More than two dozen plans were presented to the president and his

advisors.¹⁶⁰ President Nixon and National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger could not find additional ways to punish North Korea militarily without considering possible nuclear ramifications. National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Earle Wheeler and he finally decided upon fleet maneuvers as a way to forewarn North Korea. The following week, an identical “Beggar Shadow” SIGINT mission using different aircraft was conducted to show North Korea the American government would not be deterred. The United States Navy presented a demonstration of force off North Korea’s coast; but again, no responsive military action was conducted. The loss of thirty-one American service members would not be answered with a military response. Due to the inability of conducting operations without a nuclear response, America was seen once again, losing face in the international arena.

Once thought of as only a conspiracy theory, the kidnapping of North Korean ex-patriots and other foreign nationals has proven to be a dangerous but confirmed North Korean government action.¹⁶¹ Between 1977 and 1981, North Korea kidnapped both Korean ex-patriots and Japanese citizens. In addition, nearly five hundred South Koreans consisting mostly of young girls were forcibly taken to North Korea against their will. Citizens from a total of twelve countries were abducted and taken to North Korea to be used as language instructors for military Special Forces and spy training centers.^{162, 163}

These human rights violations committed by North Korea also defy the Confucian norm of familial piety. The protection of family members is a cornerstone of familial piety and North Korea’s illegal activity forcibly removed relatives including children from secure settings. Hundreds of South Korea’s young women and girls were being abducted without a trace. Until Kim Jong-Il 2002 announcement, North Korea denied any involvement.¹⁶⁴

The third paradigm used by Kim-il Sung's government is the "catch me if you can" competitive drive. There are a series of events that belie Sung's efforts to get away with whatever is possible. Between 1953 and 1994 there were numerous North Korean caused international crises and forty-four plus terrorist incidents in South Korea.¹⁶⁵ South Korean military units and American infantrymen also encountered brutal and continuing skirmishes in the DMZ from 1966 – 1970.¹⁶⁶ One of the most egregious experiences for South Korea and the international community was the wholesale kidnapping of prominent South Koreans and expatriates in East Asian countries. All of these acts depict a leader who continually skirts the edge of international norms in order to prove that both he and his country are more than worthy adversaries who must be contended with.

This "catch me if you can" paradigm proved advantageous to North Korean propaganda efforts. It demonstrated that a small nation like North Korea could continually agitate western international relations without much fear of retaliation. Propaganda directed at the U.S. and South Korea showed the inability of a large super-power who was powerless against the North despite the United States' greater military capabilities. The only direct threat to the United States was in the matters of foreign policy or foreign relations; i.e. saving face in front of the world. The incidents were never enough to force the U.S. to commit the necessary military resources or personnel or convince its allies of the need for decisive action. Neither the United States nor South Korea could commit itself militarily without the risk of having China and/or Russia intercede on North Korea's behalf.

Kim-il Sung did not let age affect his policy making nor interfere with North Korea's international relations; in fact, he continued to take fantastic risks and drastic actions. From 1974 to 1994, in the last twenty years of his life, there is the appearance of him using his son,

Kim Jong-il as a tool to implement both his policies and practices. While most international observers figured there would be a massive power struggle over who would eventually replace the aging communist dictator, Kim was secretly training his son to take over what amounted to a communist hermit kingdom.

Kim Jong-il is the first son and later only surviving son of Kim-il Sung and his first wife Kim Jong-suk. Born in April 1943 during World War II, little is known of this future leader's history. As a closed society, unless a close ally defects to South Korea or to the free world, the personal lives of most state leaders is kept a state secret. Other than what is propagated by the state, researchers, reporters and intelligence analysts have little chance to uncover the truth about a person's personal interactions and/or deeds. Kim Jong-il's past is strictly and very tightly controlled and protected.

One event that helps to define Kim Jong-il's life and future actions as a state leader that has managed to escape North Korea censorship involves Kim's action as a little boy. As told by author Bradley K. Martin in his detailed account of North Korea, *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Kim and his younger brother Shura were playing in a pond (later claimed by North Korea to be a cement swimming pool). Kim Jong-il was only six years old but he was rough-housing his four year old little brother by repeatedly shoving him back into the pond/pool. Kim did not like the attention his younger brother received and terribly resented him. While bullying his perceived sibling rival, Kim Jong-il killed his younger brother by drowning him.

Kim's mother was in the house during the murder and later claimed she walked out to the pond finding Kim either pushing his little brother into the water or forcibly holding him down underneath. She immediately called Kim-il Sung who rushed home to find Kim still in the pond

and his other son floating in the water. Kim-il supposedly screamed at Kim, "What did you do?! What did you do!!?" Despite taking his youngest son out of the water and driving him to the best available doctor, Kim's murderous attempt succeeded.

When Kim Jong-il came into prominence, it was in his later life when his father "The Great Leader" began training and using him to implement his plans. Kim Jong-il was serving in the DPRK's Communist Workers' Party and working his way up the bureaucratic chain. His influence as the Great Leader's son did not stop him from trying to build a coalition of his own supporters. If anything, his father's appeal was to be used by Kim Jong-il to further his own societal, political, and monetary gains.

Kim-il Sung did take notice of his son's later political efforts despite the obvious history of mental illness. Sung also used his son as a close ally to carry out various military actions as well as terrorist incidents. While Kim was never physically involved in any of the engagements, he was known to be both the planner and financier of several notable events that brought North Korea international condemnation.

The first of many happenings was the 1983 bombing in Rangoon, Burma that was intended to kill South Korea's president Chun Doo-hwan. While the bombing missed its intended target, the blast ended up killing twenty-one individuals including four cabinet ministers of South Korea's government, the Presidential Chief of Staff, the South Korean Ambassador to Burma, press reporters and four Burmese nationals in the crowd.

The second international incident was the 1987 downing of Korean Air Flight 858. The mid-air bombing destroyed the aircraft and caused the deaths of eleven crew members and all one hundred and four passengers. An agent of North Korea's covert military operations team was caught by the Bahrain police. Agent Kim Hyon Hui told the investigators that the overall leader

who ordered the operation was none other than Kim Jong-il. The objective he said was to disrupt the 1988 Summer Olympics being held in Seoul, South Korea. The attack was conducted to shame South Korea and show the international community South Korea could not prevent the attack. The secondary mission of the attack was to scare away international tourists from attending the Olympic Games and events. The horrible deaths of innocents did not succeed as intended by Kim. The games continued unabated. The desperate North Korean actions do demonstrate however the extreme level of dangerous risks these instigators were willing to take.

An analogy can be drawn from the failings of North Korea's economy and the health of its leader Kim-il Sung.¹⁶⁷ At age 60 in 1972, Kim's birthday was a national celebration for the leader who was showing signs of his age. In comparison, civil infrastructure projects including those necessary for agricultural production were not hitting their targets either by the due dates or the production goals that were set by the central government.¹⁶⁸ Despite new rhetoric and a new five year plan from 1972-1976 that called for increased food production, the government set goals were not being met.¹⁶⁹ At the same time, the North Korean military was being vastly expanded. By 1974, over seven hundred thousand men were in the armed forces. Instead of utilizing manpower capabilities in agricultural improvement programs, North Korea's government placed huge numbers of the population into active duty status.¹⁷⁰ There was much speculation as to why this was occurring. Analysts debated the causes including the 1969 Nixon Doctrine that called for Asian allies to bolster their own military numbers and America's slow withdrawal from Viet-Nam. One theory was that Kim-il Sung was considering one last military attempt to unify Korea under the communist flag. Park, South Korea's president began to bolster the South's military forces as a precaution. As the North continued to increase its military well into the 1980's, the more it intensified the economic ruin and starvation of the rest of the

population.

Kim-il Sung died 8 July 1994 and his son Kim Jong-il succeeded his father just as Kim-il Sung announced in a 1980 speech during a formal dedication.¹⁷¹ As Kim-il Sung's health began to wane in the 1980's, Kim Jong-il used the KWP's and state's propaganda departments to bolster his own image and achieve the political power base he desired. Kim Jong-il had not been building his political entourage and power base solely from the Korean Workers' Party alone but primarily with North Korean military officers and the North's powerful military community. Jong-il ensured his power by cultivating close friendships and personal alliances with the ever burgeoning military establishment.¹⁷² His father had him appointed as leader of all North Korean military forces just three years before his 1994 death. Kim Jong-il was given the title "The General" despite never having served a single day of military active duty. After his father's death, Jong-il attempted elevated his own standing with the population, claiming the title "Dear Leader", then "Great Leader" and later "Supreme Leader".¹⁷³

Kim Jong-il had a sordid past controlling state terrorism and his new leadership role of a country known to be developing nuclear weapons had the international community alarmed. Right before his father's death, the Agreed Framework limiting North Korea's plutonium based nuclear research had been negotiated with ex-president Carter.¹⁷⁴ The agreement halted operating the Yongbyon nuclear reactor originally built by the Russian government. The United States deal included the construction of two light-water reactors as replacements for lost energy production. In addition, the United States was to supply heavy fuel-oil as a substitute until the reactors could be built. With Kim-il Sung's death, the international community was worried the new state leader would not honor the non-binding, non-legal agreement.¹⁷⁵

North Korea has a long history of trying to obtain nuclear capabilities, both civil and military

technologies. In 1964, the Fatherly Leader attempted to purchase or barter nuclear weapons from China's Mao Zedong. To Kim-il Sung's dismay, the Chinese leader flatly turned him down. He formally asked again in 1974 but achieved the same results.¹⁷⁶ During the 1980's modernization period, North Korean officials solicited the Soviets who agreed to sell North Korea four light-water nuclear reactors. The deal was never formalized due to the Soviets requiring hard currency which North Korea did not have. Instead, an economic, scientific, and technical agreement was signed which included a provision for the four reactors.

North Korea was not totally devoid of nuclear power plants but the limited Russian technology dated their efforts with a 1970's 5-megawatt research reactor located in Yongbyon. The site was monitored by United States intelligence satellites which could identify the reactor cooling ponds and plutonium processing center. To a nation that preferred covert operations and hiding strategic civil and military sites from the United States and South Korean militaries, Yongbyon was a known target that could easily be observed and just as easily be hit.

Kim Jong-il's knowledge or understanding of his father's nuclear plans is unknown but his own plans have caused political consternation among the world's nuclear powers. Jong-il has used his country's nuclear research program to threaten Western powers and forced them to grant concessions. He has kept the United Nation's International Atomic Energy Agency from completing their inspection work at the Yongbyon nuclear site. Though his father signed the Agreed Framework on his nation's behalf, Jong-il has not agreed to reinstate the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Kim Jong-il has mastered the ability to get what he wants by drawing assistance from the free world all the while continuing his nuclear weapons program(s).

One of the major aspects of Little Brother Syndrome is the ability of the state and/or leader using the technique to achieve their desired results without interference from the International

Community (I.C.). How could “catch me if you can” be tolerated by the I.C., particularly by a small and militarily insignificant state? If behaving badly as a little brother, should he not expect to be corrected by a parent or older mature sibling? Would not the same be expected by smaller states’ leadership which is constantly agitating the International Community?

North Korea’s rise began during the end of World War II and amid the beginnings of the 20th Century’s Cold War. Kim-il Sung’s mastery use of Little Brother Syndrome included playing his major communist supporters against one another. This allowed him flexibility when dealing with the world’s two largest communist states, China and the Soviet Union, and also allowed him to obtain greater resources from each. If he angered the Soviets, he could always pay homage to the Chinese as the Asian leader of communism and praise them as having a better communist system. He made them prove to him which country was the better communist within the International Community by helping to support communist North Korea in its time of need. In short, this little brother was playing communist Mom against communist Dad.

North Korean leadership used the Little Brother Syndrome techniques to their fullest advantage. Knowing the United States would never risk full scale military intervention for fear of escalation and possible nuclear war, North Korea was perfectly suited to small scale combat incursions, the state support of terrorism, and the willful kidnapping of South Korean and Japanese citizens. From the country’s very beginnings, North Korean unpredictability was underscored by the uncertainties, unwillingness, and inability of the International Community to respond to these actions. With the United States, the International Community’s lack of political support and foreign policy ambiguity left its leadership having to deal with North Korea on its own. The only firm foreign policy the United States leadership could attempt was verbal containment and North Korea, the little brother in this nuclear family was not listening.

Chapter Four

“Little Brother Snares the Sun”

LBS and the Drive for Nuclear Arms:

“Though brave Dormouse had freed the sun, everybody realized that Little Brother, who had snared the sun, was the wisest being in the world, and the one with great power. Since that time the humans have been the chiefs over the animals, the hunters instead of the hunted.”¹⁷⁷

North Korea and Pakistan are on opposite sides of China geographically but when it came to creating nuclear weapons these two nations on opposing sides of the political spectrum came together to create new world threats. North Korea’s “Hermit Kingdom,” a dictatorship with little regards for human rights, paired up with Pakistan, a semi-democratic state whose political leaders have struggled to wrest power from a dominant military. Since their creation, each state has fought to retain their international identity as well as to use their international supporters for their protection. Both nations have been defeated by a larger military force and have failed to gain the full territory they sought. Both use state supported international terrorism to force their enemies to withdraw territorially, yet each has failed. Pakistan and North Korea have also lost their initial International Community standings as well as the image they sought to create. From their sheer Little Brother Syndrome stubbornness, both countries sought nuclear weapons as the means to solve these problems and now they have them.

Pakistan’s quest for nuclear weapons began with the third major Indian defeat of its military forces. The 1971 loss of East Pakistan was a devastating blow to a people who prided themselves as a nation with a professional military capable of defeating India¹⁷⁸ What started the 1971 war dates back to the previous 1947 partition which left two princely Muslim majority provinces in India’s declared national sovereignty. West Pakistan’s continued emphasis on incorporating both Jammu and Kashmir eventually caused an internal rift with East Pakistan’s populace who felt they were being overlooked on major budgetary and other joint country

decisions.¹⁷⁹ This internal civil squabble began as a political protest but turned into a West Pakistan crackdown using rape, extrajudicial killings and other human rights violations against the civilian population. In the eyes of the International Community, Pakistan became a draconian pariah state. In contrast, India was seen as a champion and savior for international human rights.¹⁸⁰ Three years later, on 8 May 1974, India exploded a “peaceful nuclear device” calling it “Smiling Buddah”.¹⁸¹ Faced with a territorial dispute with a now nuclear armed enemy combatant, Pakistan’s civilian and military leaders chose nuclear weapons to keep the status quo.

Before deciding to pursue nuclear weapons technology, Pakistan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the government’s original defense against India seeking nuclear weapons. The efforts put forth by Foreign Affairs consisted of pushing United Nations negotiations to outlaw the creation and use of weapons of mass destruction by South Asian governments. On 2 August 1963, China’s Premier of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China, Chou en-Lai sent a letter to world leaders requesting a world summit on nuclear weapons.¹⁸² His letter outlined China’s proposal to outlaw research and development as well as the complete prohibition and destruction of all nuclear warheads. Pakistan’s General/President Ayub Khan responded favorably.¹⁸³ His action was seen by both British and American governments as a Pakistani rebuff to the Western powers and an unwelcome warming of relations between a so called second world democracy and the Communist Bloc.¹⁸⁴ President Ayub began serious negotiations by inviting both Chou en-Lai and China’s Foreign Minister Marshal Chen Yi to Islamabad. On 3 October 1963, the British embassy in Karachi warned of the following:

“There is no doubt that whatever private explanations are made such a visit would exacerbate U.S./Pakistan relations very seriously and lend colour to Indian suspicions that it is only a matter of time before Pakistan sides completely with China.... There have been suggestions that Mr. Bhutto himself has got the bit between his teeth in promoting

Pakistan's relations with China and the {Communist} block and that he may be going further than the President and other more conservative members of the administration here would like. I do not know how much substance there is in this rumor but it is persistent. If it is true, there is a pretty urgent need to educate him."¹⁸⁵

Despite the private International Community condemnations, Pakistan's leaders saw the Chinese response as a means to further Pakistan's own Little Brother Syndrome goals.

Pakistan's diplomatic actions began in earnest in 1972 with Pakistan's attempts to create a United Nation's "Nuclear Weapons Free Zone" in South Asia and the Indian Ocean.¹⁸⁶ After their 1971 East Pakistan defeat, Pakistan was desperately trying to avoid a nuclear armed India. To complicate matters, India, which had been defeated by China in the 1962 Sino-Indian border war, found itself facing a much tougher Chinese foe two years later in 1964 when China detonated a nuclear warhead.¹⁸⁷ India would not discuss Pakistan's nuclear proposals. As a result, Pakistan turned to the International Community and the United Nations as a means to improve the International Community's image of Pakistan and regain the United Nations' trust.

As quoted in *South East Asia In Search of an Asean Community*:

"For twenty-three years, from 1974 to 1997, the United Nations General Assembly, every single year, called for a nuclear weapons free South Asia in resolutions sponsored mainly by Pakistan, supported by overwhelming majorities, and opposed principally by India. The resolutions went unheeded until, in 1998, both India and Pakistan conducted nuclear test explosions, definitively dooming the proposal."¹⁸⁸

Even after India's nuclear explosion, the federal government of Pakistan tried to sway the International Community to help stop this nuclear proliferation. In an attempt to bridge the bipolar U.S. and U.S.S.R. world to dissuade a nuclear armed India, Prime Minister Bhutto flew to Moscow in October 1974. Bhutto negotiated with the Kremlin's leaders and spoke to the Duma

requesting its assistance in creating a South Asia nuclear free zone. This was not an unusual tactic for international politics considering the U.S.S.R. had encouraged and championed the same for both South America and the Mediterranean. He also requested the U.S.S.R.'S help in stabilizing Afghanistan and use its influence with India to intercede on Pakistan's behalf. Prime Minister Bhutto received additional U.S.S.R. aid but the communist government leaders were not interested in stopping India's nuclear proliferation.¹⁸⁹

Pakistan's territorial security as a nation was also in jeopardy from not just India but a new adversary from the North, Afghanistan. In July 1973, Sardar Muhammad Daoud overthrew Afghanistan's king, his cousin.¹⁹⁰ General Daoud began clandestine operations against Pakistan by arming dissident groups located in Balochistan, and the tribal clans in Southern Afghanistan/Northern Pakistan as well as the North-West Frontier Provinces. The use of these armed groups made it appear Afghanistan, seeing Pakistan society's loss of confidence in the military was taking a cue from India and was trying to use Pakistan's own methods against them. A string of terrorist bombings occurred in several Pakistan cities.¹⁹¹ Pakistan's internal police forces began intercepting huge arm shipments to the groups who wanted to overthrow the current federal government. In Balochistan and elsewhere, the National Awami Party was banned by President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who saw them as ethnic terrorists versus Pakistani citizens unhappy with political disenfranchisement.¹⁹² The Pakistan military forces were called in to route the insurgents in what became a four year Balochistan civil war, 1973-1977. The internal dissidents drove an unsettled national populace further into the Little Brother Syndrome's paranoid consciousness that all sides including internally, were readily against them as a nation state.

Another national issue that was helping to drive the Little Brother Syndrome was the return of Pakistan's soldiers, civil authorities, and refugees from India after the 1971 war. Hasan-Askari Rizvi author of *Military, State and Society in Pakistan* states that "91,634 Pakistani military and para-military personnel and civilians were taken as POWs and moved to the camps in India."¹⁹³ The Simla Agreement which ended the war was signed July 1972.¹⁹⁴ What the agreement did not settle was the repatriation of these prisoners of war and other refugees. India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was holding them hostage so she could force the Pakistan government to formally acknowledge East Pakistan as the new country of Bangladesh. In August 1973, both countries negotiated the P.O.W. and refugees' return rights for those who wanted to return to Pakistan or India. The agreement called for resettlement to occur between 19 September 1973 and 30 April 1974. Bangladesh, however, wanted to bring charges against 195 of Pakistan's soldiers for international war crimes. The Bangladesh government, supported by India, gave up this action when a deal was brokered by the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) whereby Pakistan formally recognized Bangladesh.¹⁹⁵

The International Community felt all the issues raised by the 1971 war had been resolved. Pakistani people however felt betrayed by the military's poor performance and resented the International Community's lack of direct support for the war particularly the United States and to a lesser degree, even against China. The resulting political upheaval caused Pakistan's Supreme Court to officially review the military and its war operations.¹⁹⁶ Never released publicly, the report placed the blame on Pakistani officers who were in charge of East Pakistan's military and federal forces. With this additional political unrest growing, Bhutto decided to crack down even harder on any and all internal dissention.

Having lost both East Pakistan and the International Community's positive image for its human rights abuses in the 1971 war, having apparently lost the hegemonic support of the United States' military training, equipment and supplies, and having India explode a "peaceful nuclear device" in 1974, Pakistani leaders were under inordinate amounts of political stress. Despite the popular political reforms being undertaken including a new Pakistan constitution in 1973, there was considerable turmoil in trying to find Pakistan's right course of action.¹⁹⁷ The Little Brother Syndrome's competitive drive took over. Prime Minister Bhutto, and later the leader of the his military coup against Bhutto, General Zia ul-Haq, opted for the pursuit of nuclear weapon as a nationalistic unifier of Pakistan and its Muslim citizenry.¹⁹⁸

Prime Minister Bhutto was one of the first national leaders to publicly call for Pakistan to have nuclear weapons. The world first took notice when on March 11, 1965 he told a Manchester Guardian newspaper reporter that Pakistanis "would eat grass" if necessary to match any nuclear capability that India develops.¹⁹⁹ In his 1969 book *The Myth of Independence*, he wrote how it was necessary for Pakistan to be able to build its own nuclear weapons in order not to fall militarily behind India.²⁰⁰

As Prime Minister, Bhutto had tried to arrange a deal with France to build a nuclear fuel rods reprocessing facility. Pakistan's nuclear weapon efforts were originally all plutonium based. The idea was to use the spent fuel rods from a Canadian built nuclear power-plant located in Karachi. The spent rods contain plutonium which could be extracted and processed into nuclear weapons grade material. At the same time, the Prime Minister was also attempting to get West Germany to build a heavy-water production facility. Germany eventually turned down the request. France, however, was not easily swayed by the United States' pressure to do the same and tell Pakistan's government "no". What stopped both the deal from going through and later

Prime Minister Bhutto's political ambitions was Pakistan's 1977 national election.²⁰¹ After the vote count, Prime Minister Bhutto claimed victory but charges of election rigging and voter fraud were rampant.²⁰² To keep protests down, the Prime Minister declared martial law in the major cities. The opposition party, the PNA kept up political opinion against the Prime Minister's own Pakistani Peoples Party. Saudi Arabia's King Falid intervened and held negotiations between the two political parties so they could work out a possible solution and keep the civil peace. For six months, both sides negotiated in good faith and were just about to settle the issue when Pakistan's military forces launched "Operation Fair Play" yet another military coup to oust Pakistan's civilian rule. The coup took place on 4 July 1977 and Prime Minister Bhutto was arrested on corruption and a single murder charge based on allegations he ordered the murder of a political opponent. By mistake, the assassination attempt killed the opponent's father. Bhutto was tried, convicted and later hung that very year.²⁰³

After his death, one of the more shocking revelations about Bhutto's nuclear ambitions was that he was the government leader who had actively started Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. At the initial meeting, he had told,

"a gathering of Pakistani scientists in the Punjabi city of Multan in May 1972, that he wanted them to start work on developing a nuclear weapons capability, which he declared, the country needed to ensure its security against India."²⁰⁴

That meeting was held just two years before India detonated a "peaceful atomic explosion" on 8 May 1974. Bhutto's purpose was to organize Pakistani nuclear scientists and engineers and begin the process to create and manufacture nuclear weapons. Bhutto asked those gathered in Multan if they could create a nuclear weapon in three years?²⁰⁵ Men who would later be running an elaborate international conspiracy for twenty plus years agreed they could do it.²⁰⁶ After

India's atomic test two years later, Pakistan had no choice if it wanted to keep pace with India's military capabilities. Still trying for a diplomatic solution however, Bhutto sent Pakistan's Ambassador to the United States, Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, to ask if America's nuclear umbrella would or could be extended to include Pakistan if India attacked with nuclear weapons. The response from Secretary of State Kissinger was cold and harsh. The answer was "No".

Kissinger told Yaqub Khan that India's bomb test was "a fait accompli and that Pakistan would have to learn to live with it."²⁰⁷ In addition, after the coup, the Multan meeting which started as a small effort, as the military and finance departments were originally opposed, soon had the military's backing. "According to (later) Pakistani Atomic Energy Commission chairman, Munir Ahmed Khan, the nuclear program, did not, in fact, get under way in earnest until after the Indian 1974 test."²⁰⁸

The United States, using diplomatic and financial compensation, was the first and primary member of the International Community to try stopping Pakistan's nuclear ambitions. President Gerald Ford, trying to reestablish the United States as Pakistan's ally, sent Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to both India and Pakistan. Kissinger was in Pakistan to shore up relations and invite Prime Minister Bhutto to the White House for a visit.²⁰⁹ Bhutto was eager to meet with the newly "unelected" President Ford. His wish was to have the United States lift its 1965 arms embargo against Pakistan. The ban on foreign military sales had been put into place right after the 1965 Pakistan-Indian war, and strategically and militarily, had hurt primarily Pakistan. In an effort to politically manipulate a world super-power, Prime Minister Bhutto had stated during an October 10th 1974 interview with the New York Times:

"If security interests are satisfied, if people feel secure and if they feel they will not be subject to aggression, they [will] not want to squander away limited resources in

[the nuclear] direction.”²¹⁰

Whether the statement was one to manipulate the United States Congress or whether the Prime Minister was practicing Operations Security to direct questions away from nuclear development is unknown. What is now known is that on January 20th, 1971 Prime Minister Bhutto had already given green light to Pakistani scientists working on developing nuclear weapons.²¹¹

When Prime Minister Bhutto met with Secretary of State Kissinger a third time in August 1976, President Ford had written a letter to Bhutto requesting Pakistan forgo the German heavy water plant and the French (plutonium) reprocessing plant. The American administration decided to enhance the deal by offering 110 A-7 ground attack aircraft if the Pakistani government would not build the nuclear fuel rod reprocessing plant the U.S. knew was for plutonium based nuclear weapons development.²¹² Kissinger hinted the U.S. could close the deal now but if the Democratic Party won the 1976 presidential election, the next administration might block the deal. To the surprise of the Americans, Bhutto turned down the offer based on the advice of his cabinet members and his Pakistan Air Force Chief of Staff Zulfikar Ali Khan. The strength and forcefulness of both sides’ arguments that were displayed during the formal meeting demonstrated to each party that Pakistan was fully committed to its nuclear decision.²¹³

One of the reasons the representatives of the Pakistani government may have turned down the United States’ offer was Doctor A.Q. Khan. Born in Bhopal, India, he was the youngest son of parents in their 40’s.²¹⁴ His father, Dr. Abdul Ghafoor Khan had come to Pakistan during the 1947 Partition of India and Pakistan. A. Q. Khan grew up in India and later traveled to Pakistan to be with his parents. He had received his university graduate degrees at Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands and his doctorate at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium 1972. While in Europe, Khan had married a local woman, Hendrina Donkers who originated

from South Africa and had moved to the Netherlands.²¹⁵ Khan yearned for returning to Pakistan but he could not find a suitable high level job within the country. He had tried writing factory owners and had even gone to the extent of writing the Minister of Economics but his letters were all in vain. The one letter he wrote that made it to the Prime Minister's office was the one in which he described a new European process for making highly enriched uranium.²¹⁶ Khan's letter reached the Prime Minister during the time the Germans backed out of the heavy water construction contract which was needed for plutonium reprocessing. Khan's letter informed the Prime Minister about another method being used by the European company he worked for to create weapons grade nuclear material from highly enriched uranium. Kauser Niazi, Pakistan's information minister would later recall how Prime Minister Bhutto "toyed with the idea of transforming the Pakistani correspondent from Holland into a super-spy."²¹⁷ So in the Spring of 1976 when President Ford was offering new A-7 fighter/bomber aircraft to forgo the French reprocessing plant, Pakistan was already investigating two separate ways to make the critical mass of a nuclear weapon.²¹⁸

A.Q. Khan held degrees in metallurgy but it was his work as a subcontractor at the URENCO Group, a uranium research facility that led to his nuclear career in Pakistan. The URENCO Group was established in 1970 by the governments of the Netherlands, West Germany, and the United Kingdom to ensure their civilian nuclear power reactors had a constant source of 5% enriched uranium rods needed by civilian based nuclear power reactors.²¹⁹ The company was located in the Netherlands but Khan was fluent in French, German, as well as English and he had his former doctoral professor's endorsement for this highly advanced scientific and engineering work.²²⁰ Khan's metallurgical skills were very useful to the company since the new uranium enrichment process consisted of alloyed metal centrifuges spinning at extremely high rotation

rates. The high speed centrifuges spun while enriched uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) gas was injected. The lighter uranium gas stayed in the middle while the heavier gas was pushed to the side. Combined in tens of multiple rows and all working at the same time, the lighter enriched U_2 gas was sent to the next series of centrifuges multiple times until the uranium reached 95 percent enrichment which makes it a viable nuclear weapons grade material.²²¹ While the uranium centrifuge process is cumbersome and dangerous when the centrifuges rotate at speeds of 100,000 rotations per minute, the process is less dangerous than recovering enriched plutonium from spent plutonium nuclear fuel rods.²²² Despite not having a high level security clearance needed for the advanced Top Secret technologies, Khan was given access to multiple sets of mechanical and engineering drawings so he could translate them for other engineering staffs.²²³ Those mechanical drawings are what he was illegally taking home and copying while later offering them to the Prime Minister of his home country.

In 1974, Pakistan's Prime Minister decided to use A.Q. Khan and had him investigated by the Inter-Services Intelligence agency or ISI. The ISI profile report cited references that Khan "had not yet grown up"²²⁴ and that Khan felt rather highly of himself.²²⁵ Samples of Khan's past letters to factory owners and government officials were included in the report and showed those Little Brother Syndrome traits that he possessed. One, he claimed to be a descendent of a former notable Islamic military commander from the 1100's. Two, he felt he would be a great asset to Pakistan which would one day remember his name. Three, he was quite taken with himself and wanted to prove to his future employer what a great leader he would become if only given the chance. Four, Khan believed he could solve Pakistan's military threats to its existence by creating a nuclear weapon and having it used as a deterrent against an abhorrent India. Included in the ISI report were excerpts of editorials Khan had written and submitted to various European

newspapers. He had written these opinion letters to the newspapers' editors defending Pakistan and downgrading England, America, India, and anyone else who did not believe Pakistan was sincere in its goal of creating an Islamic state other nations should follow.²²⁶ Khan is not just a little brother. He is a Little Brother Syndrome's classic example with strong combative competitiveness. He is out to prove to his detractors no matter their size or their capabilities, that not just his country, but that *he, is right*.

The first order of business for A.Q. Khan was getting authorization to build the facilities needed for his classified effort entitled "Project 706". Demonstrating his tenacious and combative personality, Khan demanded to see Prime Minister Bhutto. Instead of Khan being in charge, Khan had been placed under Pakistan's Atomic Energy Commission director, Mr. Munir Ahmed Khan. Dr. A.Q. Khan became incredibly angry and belligerent about his purchase orders that were being ignored. Bhutto called in the Secretary General of Defense Ghulam Ishaq Khan and Foreign Secretary Agha Shahi. All agreed A.Q. Khan would be responsible for a planned uranium enrichment laboratory. Army Brigadier General Zahid Ali Akbar Khan of the Army Corp of Engineers was given command of the construction project.²²⁷ General Khan, his assistants Colonel Sajawal Khan and Colonel Mahmood, and Dr. Khan decided upon Kahuta, a city 40 miles from Islamabad known for its remoteness yet still close to Pakistan's political and capital city, Islamabad.²²⁸ Construction was started and kept at an extremely quick pace. So much so, that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency's regional office in Tehran, Iran received a report stating,

"Something strange is happening at Kahuta. Construction work is going on at a pace quite uncharacteristic of Pakistan. One can see day-to-day progress."²²⁹

In 1978, the United States received a similar warning from the French government. The French had finally stopped construction of a plutonium reprocessing facility at Chasma, Pakistan.²³⁰

The official reason France decided to stop construction of the reprocessing plant was “Pakistan aims to get the bomb.” In a classified cable from Washington D.C. and sent to the U.S. embassy in Islamabad, the Deputy Secretary of State identifies Pakistan’s nuclear ambitions.

“4. YOU MAY ALSO TELL GOP {Government Of Pakistan} THAT WE ARE PREPARED TO CONSIDER THEIR REQUESTS FOR MILITARY PURCHASES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF OUR GLOBAL AND REGIONAL ARMS POLICIES. YOU MAY TELL THEM THAT THIS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDES CONSIDERATION OF F-5E’S (Fighter Aircraft) IN LIMITED NUMBERS.

5. IN MAKING THE PRESENTATION TO THE GOP, YOU SHOULD STRESS THAT OUR SUPPORT FOR PAKISTAN IS BASED ON ASSUMPTION THAT PAKISTAN WILL NOT ACQUIRE A NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVE CAPABILITY. IN THIS CONNECTION YOU SHOULD ARRANGE TO REVIEW WITH THE GOP US NON-PROLIFERATION POLICY AND ALL PERTINENT LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS.

8. FOR PARIS – PLEASE ADVISE GOF {Government Of France} OF FOREGOING. YOU SHOULD TELL GOP THAT IN OUR CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS WE HAVE MERELY STATED THAT WE ARE SATISFIED THAT THE CONTRACT IS NOT GOING FORWARD AND HAVE NOT MENTIONED ANY GOF ASSURANCES.”²³¹

The 4 October 1978 cable was sent to Islamabad and Paris immediately and with priority to London and other destinations proving that the International Community was fully aware of Pakistan’s nuclear ambitions.²³²

Dr. Khan’s plan was to obtain the ability to create nuclear weapons but it was not without peril. There is no doubt Khan had simply copied the plans for URENCO’s uranium centrifuges.

He had even taken the drawings home with him giving himself the ability to copy all the minute details of the technical orders and specifications needed for centrifuge construction and how they were arranged in series. When Khan left URENCO for Pakistan, he had already turned over vast amounts of mechanical and electrical drawings of the new centrifuges to Pakistani intelligence and Foreign Service officers who were located at Pakistan's Netherland embassy. What he brought with him in his suitcases he carried on his last return trip to Pakistan was even more important. Khan had copied down the entire suppliers list of companies URENCO used for the construction and upkeep of the nuclear equipment and facilities. The list detailed the products each company made for the URENCO centrifuges as well as the other support equipment needed for uranium enrichment. It also contained the supplier companies' points of contact for sales.

What helped Kahn and his staff's efforts were the economic crises that were facing Europe and the United States. In the 1970's, European economies were beginning to show signs of a very serious recession. Oil Producing and Export Council (OPEC)'s ban on oil sells to the United States and Europe were the result of the U.S. sending arms and supplies to Israel during the 1973 Arab-Israeli War. These economic crises helped draw attention away from Pakistan and its efforts to purchase the needed nuclear equipment. In addition, instead of buying complete centrifuge units, Dr. Kahn and his crew simply began by purchasing the subcomponents instead. Dr. Kahn's network included suppliers who were pushing for sales of parts and subassemblies that made nuclear components. This loop-hole effect showed the weakness of international security and economic systems when trying to prevent nuclear proliferation. By 1972, the international Zangger Committee had reached a consensus on what defined the equipment and material for the use or production of special fissionable material. The second memoranda listed the conditions and procedures for exports that would meet the Non-

Proliferation Treaty.²³³ Kahn's technical orders however would have allowed his team to break down complete systems into their smallest components. If the team could not purchase the parts, Kahn then turned to the Pakistani armaments industries to help reverse engineer the parts. How Pakistan's internal defense base was able to accomplish this task dates back to the late 1960's. The American military export ban after the 1965 India-Pakistan war had forced the federal government to seek international help. China, seeing an opportunity to build external foreign relations had supplied Pakistan with the needed industrial equipment. China also trained Pakistan workers on advanced machine shop skills necessary to build a self-reliant armaments industrial base. These industrial machine shops could then create the parts Pakistan needed for its nuclear research and production capabilities. The parts that could not be reversed engineered were alternatively imported from European and North American manufacturers with the help of Kahn's previous contacts and relations who were still residing in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and other countries. Kahn's goal was to build a suppliers network that could obtain these advanced technologies while claiming their intended uses were for other dual-use capabilities unrelated to nuclear research. Project 706 soon earned the code name "butter factory" as the real ones also contained spinning centrifuges. In a Top Secret report written by the Central Intelligence Agency's "Interagency Intelligence Working Group on Nuclear Proliferation", the National Intelligence Officer for Nuclear Proliferation Mr. John Despres wrote in a report dated 18 January 1979:

"The Community continues to be concerned that Pakistan, if it has not already done so, may soon acquire all the essential components for the plant that could ultimately produce the fissile material for several nuclear weapons a year. Indeed, Pakistan may already have succeeded in acquiring the main missing components for a gas centrifuge plant and ancillary facilities that are probably being built to produce highly enriched uranium for

weapons, perhaps even by 1982.Pakistan has probably already acquired all the technology—designs, plans and technical expertise—that is critical for the eventual operation of this plant.”²³⁴

As Dr. Kahn and his team began to assemble their infrastructure, North Korea’s Kim Sung-il was also trying to obtain nuclear weapons. Kim had originally tried to convince both Communist Russia and later Communist China to either sell or give North Korea operational control of nuclear weapons for their defense. Whether or not he succeeded is unknown. While the United States had put its own nuclear capable military assets in South Korea, there is little intelligence information as to how China and Russia reciprocated. U.S. intelligence now declassified shows China and Russia deployed military assets in large numbers in support of North Korea but only Russian deployments showed air force squadrons near South Korea with nuclear weapons. In contrast, the United States’ nuclear “Matador” missile program was initiated by the U.S. Air Force in 1951.²³⁵ Air Force units consisted of 1 to 3 missiles shaped like a fighter aircraft and powered by jet engines. Takeoffs were assisted by jettisoned rockets. Once fired, the B-61 “unmanned bomber” used radio frequencies for guidance until overhead the target and detonating the nuclear warhead. The records show U.S. Air Force Matador nuclear missile units were first sent to South Korea in 1958.²³⁶ The U.S. Army also deployed nuclear assets in the form of “Long Tom” nuclear artillery units and missile units equipped with the NIKE short range nuclear tipped missiles. By the end of President Eisenhower’s second term, U.S. military forces in South Korea alone had 600 nuclear weapons.²³⁷ If North Korea’s leader was to keep pace militarily with South Korea and its United States supporter, Kim Il-Song of North Korea needed nuclear weapons under its own control and not through the support of either China or the U.S.S.R. which could sacrifice North Korea at any time they chose.

The International Community took notice of North Korea's nuclear ambitions in 1993 when North Korea announced its intended withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This announcement was somewhat expected by the United States and by South Korea since North Korea had long been suspected of having a plutonium based nuclear weapons program. In a July 1991 meeting between President George Bush and South Korea's President Roh Tae Woo, the formerly Top Secret, now declassified meeting minutes address North Korea's nuclear and chemical weapon ambitions. South Korea's President Roh stated,

“The North Korea nuclear threat is a big problem- not just for two of us but the whole world. North Korea is asking for UN membership and says it wants to join IAEA. But they are trying to link inspections to a nuclear free zone on the peninsula. We are respecting the U.S. policy of NCND (No Confirm No Denial) but we will enter into negotiations with the North based on three conditions: 1) That the U.S. maintains its nuclear guarantee; 2) That the North accept full inspections; 3) That North Korea give up reprocessing. If they agree, we will enter into negotiations with North Korea. But North Korea would like to negotiate directly with you, over our head.”²³⁸

Elected into office in 1992, President Clinton's response to North Korea's 1993 NPT withdrawal announcement was to engage the North Koreans and work a peaceful diplomatic solution. On 21 October 1994, North Korea and the United States signed the “Agreed Framework”.²³⁹ The terms called for North Korea to stop all nuclear proliferation and its nuclear weapons programs. Part of the Agreed Framework also called for North Korea to stop operation of the 5-megawatt reactor and plutonium-reprocessing plant at Yongbyon. North Korea was also required to stop the construction of the 50-megawatt nuclear reactor also at Yongbyon and the construction of a 200-megawatt plant located in Taechon.²⁴⁰ In return, an international consortium called the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) would build two light-water nuclear reactors to supplement North Korea's domestic energy needs. The firm would

implement other parts of the agreement including supplying fuel oil for North Korea's other energy plants until the light-water reactors were producing electricity. KEDO would begin building the first light-water reactor but all the North Korean facilities had to be dismantled prior to the completion of the second.²⁴¹ In typical Little Brother Syndrome fashion, North Korea's leader readily agreed but the plan soon fell apart. Kim Song-Il signed the Agreed Framework 21 October 1994. Like Pakistan, he agreed to stop his country's plutonium research since he already had Dr. A.Q. Khan's method of turning Uranium into nuclear weapons.

Between 1994 and the final actual signing by all parties of the Agreed Framework in December 1999, North Korea's Little Brother Syndrome competitive spirit kept the United States and the International Community at bay while building the uranium centrifuges. Whenever negotiations to curb North Korea's proliferation activities occurred, North Korea would simply deny the accusations. In turn the North would accuse the International Community, KEDO, South Korea, Japan, and in particular the United States that these countries were not bargaining or acting in good faith. In an act of provocation, on 31 August 1998, North Korea fired a missile over Japan which landed in the Pacific Ocean.²⁴² On 17 November 1998, in the first high level talks at Pyongyang the United States accused North Korea of building a secret underground facility for nuclear weapons production.²⁴³ Between February 27 and 16 March 1999, additional senior level negotiations were held. In the midst of a horrendous famine, North Korea accepted the terms of the facility's inspection but also demanded international food aid. The North Korean facility was inspected in May and found to be clean of nuclear materials but the food aid became a disputed issue. There were accusations that instead of sending the international aid to starving communities, Kim Sung-il fed the North Korean military.²⁴⁴ To keep the negotiations in flux, he then accused the United States of supplying heavy fuel oil that

was contaminated and in turn, had fouled the burners of the North's electric plants.²⁴⁵ At the end of May 1999, former Defense Secretary William Perry attended another round of talks. He outlined an American proposal to dismantle North Korea's nuclear weapons program. On September 13th, North Korea suspended all missile flights during the continuance of negotiations. Four days later, President Clinton announced the very first relaxation or easing of economic restrictions and sanctions that had been placed on North Korea after the 1953 ending of the war. By December 1999, KEDO signed the official contract to begin construction of the two light-water nuclear reactors in North Korea.

Using an analogy, the North practiced "nuclear" negotiations like two little kids arguing in the back seat of the car while Mom and Dad were arguing with each other until reaching the family destination. "She/He touched me!" repeatedly being announced time and time again complaining to the parents, i.e. the authority figures. The shouts equate as scored points in a constant game of tit-for-tat. This is the same technique used by North Korean leaders ever since the end of the 1950-1953 war. Whenever an inter-state or international agreement is about to be signed or even if it is signed, there are other reasons why the North cannot be held accountable for its actions and so negotiations must continue if the International Community wants what North Korea considers to be a concession. No sooner had the IC hailed the negotiations as a win-win situation for all parties when North Korea demanded to be compensated for the loss of electrical power due to the plants not being built on time along with a threat they would start up their nuclear facilities. Kim il-Sung waited until Clinton left office and the newly elected President Bush was besieged by North Korea demanding and threatening the United States all over again.²⁴⁶

While North Korean diplomats were busily engaged in playing Mom against Dad among the International Community members, it's scientific and research centers had secretly been working with Pakistani scientists on nuclear weapons and also on missile technologies. The exchange of missile technology had begun much earlier during the 1980-1988 Iran versus Iraq war. Pakistan and North Korea worked together to supply Iran with missile armaments. Each side had kept its missile ties with the other ever since. The formal collusion began with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, daughter of the late Zulfikar Bhutto, who was beginning to build her own political core of power brokers. Not willing to contest the military's dominance of National Security politics, Bhutto was asked by A.Q. Khan in December 1993 to include North Korea in her schedule for an upcoming trip to China.²⁴⁷ She agreed and to her surprise, Kim il-Sung threw a world class reception for the newly elected Prime Minister.²⁴⁸ Bhutto's side-trip was a diplomatic mission to see if North Korea would be willing to sell or trade its long-range missiles and/or associated technology to Pakistan. As she later recalled in an interview with the authors of "Nuclear Deception" Adrian Levy and Catherine Scott-Clark, on the very first evening of the formal state dinner, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto leaned over to Kim il-Sung and said,

"Give my country No-Dong blueprints, please." I stated straight out. He looked shocked. I said, "We need those missiles." He stared at me in amazement. I was not sure if he understood and repeated my request. I could see the translator was trying to find the right way to express it. Suddenly Kim nodded his head and said: 'Yes. Let's set up technical teams and they can discuss the details.' And we continued our dinner."²⁴⁹

The two countries' technical teams talked the next day and when the Prime Minister was ready to leave, she was presented with a bag of materials. Included in the bag were computer disks (cd's) that had the blue-prints of the No-Dong missile and its technical drawings. Bhutto later stated

that the arrangements were for a cash deal only and that General Khawaja Ziauddin who now worked closely with Khan on all the arrangements was in charge.²⁵⁰

The North Korean and Pakistan partnership was the essential element that allowed each side to get what it wanted; Pakistan received advanced missile technology and North Korea was given a Uranium based process for creating weapons grade Uranium.²⁵¹ Working covertly, Pakistan used an American supplied C-130 cargo aircraft to conduct multiple flights between the two countries. American and British intelligence agencies began tracking the flights and took satellite reconnaissance photos of the C-130 trips between the two capitols.²⁵² The diplomatic ties between these nuclear proliferators dated back to the 1971 East Pakistan War in which North Korea helped West Pakistan. Pakistan has had an embassy in North Korea ever since. Both nations also helped Iran during the Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988 supplying primarily missiles. After Benazir Bhutto became Prime Minister in 1988, this on and off again diplomatic relationship was revitalized once again.

The International Community openly criticized North Korea's nuclear actions during the 1990's but individual countries were also conducting their own nuclear activities. North Korea's nuclear weapons program came under intense political scrutiny particularly from the United States, South Korea, and Japan who were most threatened. Despite having no nation conduct nuclear weapons testing for over a year, in October 1993, China conducted its 39th nuclear weapons test.²⁵³ China's test occurred during the time nuclear weapons states were unable to agree on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to permanently end all nuclear testing. In May 1994, the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference was held. All parties to the conference agreed to extend the Treaty indefinitely along with a new set of principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. However, just a few days after the

conference, China repeated its 1964 Chou En-Lai experience and exploded a nuclear bomb “in the 40-150 kiloton range, despite its pledge at the conference to ‘exercise utmost restraint’ regarding future nuclear testing.”²⁵⁴

In December 1994, mixed messages further complicated the Nuclear Weapon States’ message to stop proliferation and more importantly stop testing their nuclear arsenals. The governments of the United States, Russia, China, and Israel, objected to a United Nations legal review on the use, or the threat of use of nuclear weapons by one state against another. The International Court of Justice issued its “Legality Of The Threat Or Use Of Nuclear Weapons” Advisory Opinion of 8 July 1996.²⁵⁵ The International Court of Justice, in a majority opinion, stated that nuclear weapons have unprecedented warfare capabilities. The fact that civilian populations are targeted makes their deterrence use contrary under Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations.²⁵⁶ China however did not stop its testing and in August 1995, exploded its 43rd nuclear test this time at its Lop Nor test site.²⁵⁷ France complicated the international dynamics when on 5 September 1995 it broke its own three year moratorium with a 20 kiloton detonation at its Moruroa atoll located in the South Pacific.²⁵⁸ Even the United States tested a new nuclear device in July 1997. Operation “Rebound” was an underground sub-critical nuclear test that was conducted at the Nevada Test Site.²⁵⁹ This test broke a five year moratorium that the United States government self- imposed as a demonstration to the world it would eventually stop the use of nuclear weapons. So while the nuclear war threat from the former United Soviet Socialist Republics was significantly diminishing, the United States provided evidence of the value of nuclear weapons in a competition based world.

1998 was the pivotal year in which India and Pakistan, in a nuclear show of force to the other, both exploded five nuclear warheads. This was confirmation of the fact Pakistan had sought and

achieved nuclear equivocation with India. The International Community questioned how a third world country as poor as Pakistan could achieve such an expensive and technically difficult endeavor? Newspapers around the world asked their leaders what the International Community what they could do and why actions were not taken to prevent the spread of nuclear proliferation? The fact is the United States intelligence agencies had notified past Presidents who were fully aware of Pakistan's actions and who in turn, informed other world leaders and their governments as well. Four years later in 2002, North Korea's first nuclear explosion supposedly also shocked the world but then America's nuclear intelligence teams were not surprised by this action either. From 1972 forward, American Presidents had been briefed on how close the two countries were to producing enough fissile nuclear material to create nuclear weapons of mass destruction and how many viable nuclear weapons each country could annually produce. What these declassified documents show is the complete failure of the Non-Proliferation regime with the complicity of the leading nuclear powers. Little Brother had captured the Sun and the world took notice.

Chapter Five LBS & The End of Hegemonic Alliances

Pakistan and North Korea were formally created as countries and militarily defeated within their first five years. After the formal separation of North and South Korea in 1948, Kim il-Sung sought permission and received the backing of the former U.S.S.R.. In 1950, Kim launched his military attack to reclaim the whole of Korea. He was defeated primarily by United States troops with the military support of other United Nations member forces. Pakistan also sought to reclaim territory its government proclaimed was wrongly acceded to India by the Majadrod Maharaja (prince) who signed an accession agreement with India for the princely states of

Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan launched a botched popular uprising (insurgency/infiltration) using asymmetric warfare to force India to abandon the two states. The goal of Pakistan's government was to force India to allow the Jammu-Kashmir people with their larger Muslim population to vote what they believed would be their "Islamic allegiance" to Pakistan. India, with the help and know-how of seasoned veteran British officers, launched its own military operation and defeated the smaller forces Pakistan could muster. After Pakistan's and North Korea's defeats, both countries' requested and received help from one of the bipolar world's superpowers. Both countries signed hegemonic alliances that benefitted them economically and militarily. Their extreme assiduous focus was not just the territory they never gained but their goal was to free the population who lived there and still inhabited these disputed regions. The countries leaders claimed they had been wronged by their enemies which had at their disposal much larger military forces that could easily defeat them at any time. North Korean and Pakistani leaders used wide spread fear to spend the vast majority of their government budgets on military preparedness and to strengthen their countries against an attack that could come at any moment. While Pakistan and North Korea believed their hegemonic alliances would help protect their countries; when needed, their alliances turned out to be much less than what they expected.

After the India 1947 Partition, Pakistan quickly allied itself with the United States to safeguard its national security. Pakistan feared India would attack and assimilate Pakistan into a single Indian nation. Lacking modern equipment, Pakistan's leaders signed multiple pro-Western allegiances including the 1955 Baghdad Pact which later became Central Eastern Treaty Organization and the South East Asia Treaty Organization.²⁶⁰ The two treaties were created to stop the Russian and/or Chinese communists from further expansion. Pakistan joined believing

the United States would not let another nation attack them including China, Russia, and their worst fear, India.

The strong belief of an assured international defense that was placed in the hegemonic policies practiced by Pakistan's government leaders was quickly shattered. Within ten years of their signing, no Western help came when in 1965, India crossed West Pakistan's internationally recognized Eastern boundary. After a series of military skirmishes at the Rann of Kutch and other border positions, Pakistan launched Operation Gibraltar to seize Jammu and Kashmir using Kashmiri separatists, regular army, and army paratroopers all wearing civilian clothes. India, needing to relieve the offensive pressure of Pakistan victories in the Northern sectors, sent armored columns across West Pakistan's eastern boundary. Pakistan's capital city Lahore was targeted but instead of sending help, the United States and other western countries sent in planes to evacuate their citizenry.²⁶¹ Classified cables between the American and British embassies and consulates in Pakistan were rushed back to Washington D.C. and London in hasty fashion. Cables only hours apart were sent trying to find and push solutions that would alleviate the situation and help stop the fighting. These cables show that neither England nor America had any intention of coming to Pakistan's defense.

Instead of supporting Pakistan, England and the United States were more concerned how the international balance of power could be shifted by the various possible outcomes of the war. On 6 September 1965, the British Minister of State met with Agha Hilaly, the High Commissioner for Pakistan to discuss a ceasefire and ending the war.

“The Minister of State said that the British Government regarded the fighting as a major tragedy, particularly since it was a struggle between two Commonwealth countries. This development was not only a disaster for the subcontinent, but one which could lead to a serious escalation of war outside it.”²⁶²

Although he had not been advised by his home government, Commissioner Hilaly replied with the following:

“...he said he thought they would consider a mere cease-fire insufficient, since the problem would remain unsolved and fighting could only recur, and that the only reasonable basis for a cessation of hostilities would be the re-opening of the whole Kashmir question..... (Perhaps Kashmir could be evacuated and placed under a United Nations Mandate or similar international form of control). Without this condition Pakistan, though conscious of its inability to resist a country with military and economic resources four times greater than those of their own, would have to fight it out.”²⁶³

The United Kingdom, cabling its consulate in Washington D.C. was also trying to find the American position. Sir P. Dean was able to meet and see Mr. Dean Rusk, the head of the American State Department to discuss the India-Pakistan war.

“As regards Auyb’s request invoking the 1959 American Assurance, the United States Government did not accept Pakistani denials of infiltration across the cease-fire line and indeed had plenty of evidence both from UNMOGIP and American intelligence sources that infiltration had taken place. The clear implication in Mr. Rusk’s remarks was that there was no basis for Pakistan to invoke the 1959 Assurance.”²⁶⁴

Secretary of State Rusk was also concerned with the external considerations:

“The State Department were watching Chinese moves very closely and there seemed to be no major development so far. If there were any secret agreement between Pakistan and China, the Indian move against Lahore should bring it into the open. Ayub must have been getting some very bad advice, and if there were Chinese-Pakistan collusion, the Chinese were taking big risks. The Russians seemed so far to be adopting much the same attitude as the United States although Mr. Rusk had seen a report that they have given a private assurance to Shastri (note: India’s Prime Minister) over Kashmir.”²⁶⁵

The worlds’ bi-polar leaders, Russia and the United States saw no gain for either side to win the conflict. Both sides of the bi-polar world used their international political influence to pressure their member states via the United Nations and the two combatants to settle the dispute least the war expand. In a cable to its United Kingdom mission in Washington D.C., on 16 September 1965 an unidentified author (possibly Britain’s Foreign Secretary Robert Stewart?) talks about meeting the U.N. Secretary General U-Thant at the London airport.

“The reason for U Thant’s comparative optimism was his assessment that in the last resort both parties would accept a joint view of the Four Great Powers. He therefore intended to propose at the Security Council Meeting to be held on 17 September that a Committee be formed of United States, Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. to offer their good offices.”²⁶⁶

The U.S.S.R. proved instrumental negotiating a cease-fire and peace between India and Pakistan. Mr. Aleksey Kosygin, chairman of the Council of Ministers proposed a meeting in Uzbekistan and after both sides agreed, they met the U.S.S.R. delegation but not each other. The Tashkent Declaration was signed by Prime Minister Shastri of India and Pakistan President Ayub Khan on 10 January 1966. For Pakistan, the reason for going to war with India, aka the Kashmir issue, was not even mentioned.²⁶⁷

The 1971 East Pakistan war was also a major hegemonic alliance disappointment to Pakistan. India, leader of the Non-alignment Movement to counter the bi-polar international politics countries were facing, actually relied upon the U.S.S.R. for significant military support. President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger saw India’s Russian support as a dangerous ‘real politics’ move to disrupt a static bi-polar world. President Nixon broke federal policies and possibly multiple U.S. federal laws in an effort to send fighter aircraft and supplies to the Pakistan Air Force.²⁶⁸ He illegally diverted aircraft from other U.S. Air Force foreign military sales, had the manufacturer paint on PAF markings and then had the fighter aircraft flown first to Turkey, Jordan, and other friendly nations such as Iran where PAF pilots flew them back to Pakistan.²⁶⁹ Nixon also called upon other Middle Eastern nations such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia to support their Islamic neighbor by sending supplies and their own combat aircraft as well.²⁷⁰ Even though the U.S. president ordered the U.S. Navy Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean as a show of support for Pakistan, the effort was too little too late. When the Russian navy countered the U.S. naval task force by shadowing its ships, neither the U.S. nor the

Russians were willing to risk combat operations which might have started a much larger war and possible trigger a world-wide nuclear exchange.

Pakistan was also hoping China would side with them but the Chinese were unwilling in either the 1965 or 1971 wars to intervene militarily.²⁷¹ The People's Republic of China Communist leader Mao Zedong was confronting Russia and its threat to the Northern border. Relations between the two communist nations were beginning to develop into an open conflict. Combat operations against each other had commenced on 2 March 1969. These military operations focused on an island in the Ussuri river which was claimed by both countries.²⁷² Large scale tank maneuvers, artillery barrage exchanges, and massed troop movements led to a stalemate with the Russians threatening their nuclear missiles were aimed at China's northern industrial cities.²⁷³ China's foreign relations with the U.S.S.R. began seriously deteriorating on all levels and communist Russia was seen as a threat.²⁷⁴ The Russians and the Chinese were both fearful of the United States being in collusion with the other side.²⁷⁵ China was unwilling to aid Pakistan with anything more than sharp criticism of U.S. and U.S.S.R. actions at United Nation meetings. In 1971, Pakistan had asked for open Chinese support and President Kahn had hoped their new hegemonic world leader would be willing to send its forces on their behalf.

Pakistan's answer from China was the same as the United States'; i.e., a disappointment with little to no actual help. In July 1971, Pakistan's President Yahya Khan was misled by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Upon returning from his first Secret trip to China, he told President Khan that Chinese premier Chou En-Lai had informed him China would aid Pakistan with military forces if India invaded East Pakistan.²⁷⁶ China's Ambassador to Pakistan later informed Pakistan's Foreign Secretary Sultan Khan the translation was misunderstood but China would help with more than just rhetoric and political backing.²⁷⁷ When Pakistan's military

ammunition supplies were near depletion, President Khan begged the Chinese for help. The British and American ambassadors warned him that Chinese intervention might result in a much broader and possibly a nuclear war.²⁷⁸ Their guidance forced him to change his mind and he requested China rescind their ultimatum. In the end, China was fierce on the international public affairs front attacking both the Soviet Union and the United States at the United Nations for supporting India but military support never arrived. For all intents and purposes during the war, Pakistan was on its own.

LBS & Management By Crises

The Tashkent Agreement and Russia aiming nuclear weapons at China not only signaled an end to the India-Pakistan war of 1971 it also sounded the death knell of Pakistan's and North Korea's reliance upon first world leaders. For Pakistan, the collapse of these hegemonic U.S. military alliances led to a collapse of major military equipment support from the western side of the International Community. For North Korea, the China-Russia border dispute and Nixon meeting Mao meant an opportunity to play the International Community's two major communist states against each other for even more aid. The leaders of both countries had to find ways to keep the public's psychology based on the competitive fight while forgoing internal domestic needs. Amazingly, both North Korea and Pakistan with different political systems found the way to psychologically manipulate public opinion and that of the International Community.

How the two countries' leaders, whether under civilian or military dictatorship, managed to manipulate the general public? It was by using spate of crisis as the mode of governance or management. Using family structure that is recognized worldwide, the analogy here is to compare a declared and recognized state/country to that of a nuclear family. In conjunction, the "Bowen theory" is a modern psychological method to treat the entire family's behavioral

interactions and not just the individual.²⁷⁹ The theory states that stressors in the interdependent multigenerational family influences variation(s) in nuclear family functioning.²⁸⁰ In essence, measured family units show statistically that family sets have stressors or traits that have a tendency to continue through the whole family set even influencing the next generation. The Bowen theory did not limit stressor types. Alcoholism, drug use, physical harm, sexual deviance, criminal misconduct and other dysfunctional traits by parental units and/or older sibling(s) greatly affects all the family including its younger family members.²⁸¹ As a learned behavior, victims and younger family members believe these traits are a family norm that all families share. If confronted by an outsider who shows that such behavior is not normal, the younger family members are either shamed into silence or may end up defending those committing the acts in a Stockholm syndrome manner.²⁸² Family cohesion suffers and as a result; parental guidance is based on managing crisis after crisis and not dealing with the true foundational troubles that beseech the family. Every problem, no matter its actual size, is treated as a major crisis. Anything that can draw attention away from the abnormal behavior becomes the focal point of attention. Family members pick at each other, they form alliances within the family, and they break them when needed or required by the crisis at hand. The competition levels of the efforts of the competing family are intensified for all its members. Rivalries within the family are increased as competition for the parent(s)' attention and the demand for the parent(s) engagement to resolve disputes becomes more intense. Parents can help resolve these inner family disputes but they can also use the disputes to formulate resentment between the parties and see and reward those who follow their ideas and plans for the family. Setting family culture and establishing the moral norm of the family, the parent(s)' is/are attempting to rule via crisis management in a family in which crises have become the norm.

Taking this analogy to the state level, Pakistan and North Korea have both used management by crises as their style of civil governance. Bloodied by 1947 Partition, Pakistan's initial government lacked a strong central civil voting base and had to rely upon its city-state political organizations to help run the country. Soon after Jinnah died, the central government saw these city-states as a threat and tried to dismantle their strong political power and their civil voter bases. The city-states recognized the government's intent and belittled its legislative attempts to create a strong national level front. Before true national consolidation could occur, Pakistan's badly conceived 1947 war with India interrupted the federal government and its attempted plans for full Pakistani nationalism. Instead, Pakistan's military became the central focus of a nation that likened its military as the only true keeper; i.e. the savior of the country and its populace. So how does the military keep in power? By creating a threat that only it can deal with in order to save Pakistan. If the Indian threat is not perceived as grave or life threatening, then continually harass them using asymmetric warfare, periodic state supported terrorism, and/or guerilla tactics so they feel compelled to deploy their military forces on your borders. Management by crises is very effective if you are the state creating the crises.

North Korea is also using crisis management as a tool for civil governance. For North Korea, the ominous threat has been and continues to be the United States forces stationed in the South. Between 1958 and until their withdrawal in December 1991, the United States kept hundreds of nuclear armaments in South Korea.²⁸³ North Korea, totally lacking nuclear weapons was at the mercy of its international partners, the U.S.S.R. and communist China to provide a credible nuclear deterrent. In the 1980's, the U.S.S.R. demanded North Korea start paying its debts for projects the U.S.S.R. had financed.²⁸⁴ With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, North Korea relies primarily upon China for its nuclear deterrence but had started the processes needed

to create its own nuclear arms. The costs of building nuclear capabilities were borne by its allies and by its population.

In order to maintain control, North Korea used crisis after crisis as a management technique to show its populace the country was under constant threats by outsiders. By creating those crises; i.e. acts of terrorism and using asymmetric warfare against the South, the negative international publicity this generated was used to the North's advantage. The leadership could demonstrate to the country how the United States and its western allies wrongly blamed North Korea and labeled their country a "pariah" state or as an "axis of evil".²⁸⁵ Using Gustave Le Bon's repetition technique, these self-caused incidents were used by North Korea to motivate the populace's competitive drive that the leadership thought would help to eventually defeat the enemies of the state.²⁸⁶

LBS & The Use of Religion

A major significant variable both Pakistan and North Korean leaders use in their control of the state is religion. On 4 July 1977, General Zia ul-Haq came to power via military coup against Zulfikar Bhutto.²⁸⁷ The opposition party, Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) had called Bhutto the anti-thesis of Islam and had urged his ouster. General Haq had PNA supporters placed in his cabinet and attempted to use the Islamic faith as a national unifier. He did so by declaring Pakistan an Islamic religious state and by institutionalizing Islamic practices within the military first and later within government departments and agencies.²⁸⁸ Shariah law, which had many civil supporters became Pakistan's foundation of its legal system. Through the years, this concentration on Islam has intensified and has lead religious political parties to call for a stricter interpretation and practice of Islam by all members of society.²⁸⁹

Pakistan as a nation uses Islam as a way to bolster its military members and as a religious intensifier for its goal to reunify Jammu and Kashmir.²⁹⁰ These two provinces have been used as a religious goal and seen and/or treated as Pakistan's Islamic holy grail. The goal to gain this 'forbidden' territory taken away by Hindu India is a high moral cause for Pakistan's military, its government leaders and its civil populace. By creating a higher moral cause, Pakistan is allowed to be a country full of corrupt government officials, of weak and failing political, educational, and state institutions, of having an ineffective legal system with rampant police corruption, and where religious intolerance is allowed.²⁹¹ The moral and righteous cause is to reclaim Jammu and Kashmir and it is this cause that is the country's concentrated focus. Not the cries for fair elections, not for better school funding and state infrastructure repairs, not the calling for justice in the Taliban shooting of 14 year old Malala Yousufzai advocating for girls education in the Swat Valley of Pakistan.²⁹² These are simply crises to be used by power brokers and to be dealt with internally. As a nation, Pakistan may be dysfunctional but it is still a working national government and maintains armed forces capable and willing to defend the country and if necessary, with nuclear weapons. The idea to use the Islamic religion as a means to unify the country and unite its people, "...can be interpreted as a state project gone awry."²⁹³

North Korea's leaders also use the techniques of a religious cult in order to remain in power while focusing on its moral goal of reuniting the country. The use of cult tactics began with North Korea's first leader, Kim il-Sung:

"He has shown that obsession by his own actions, by those of functionaries representing him, and by his acceptance of the officially inspired adulation as it intensified during the 1950s. Since the establishment of the DPRK in 1948, he has made no single, genuine gesture (as Lenin did),²⁵ or shown the mask of modesty (as Mao did),²⁶ to discourage his growing personality cult. Besides, his *chuch'e* ideology, especially with respect to the individual superman-like leadership, by itself serves as a ready-made rationalization for encouraging and sustaining the Kim cult. Seen in this context, it is not farfetched to say that Kim Il-song has been the master builder of his own cult."²⁹⁴

In order to keep state power within the family, Kim il-Sung's lineage has had to do the same.

Even communist countries that were friendly to North Korea such as the East "German Democratic Republic" embassy in Pyongyang would describe its leader unflatteringly:

"The economic situation in the DPRK is indeed extremely difficult and complicated. The main reasons for this are the cult of personality [surrounding Kim IL Sung] and the subjectivism deriving from it."²⁹⁵

New York Times writer Nicholas Kristoff, while reporting in 1989 wrote about the North Koreans Juche policy to revitalize the country:

"In the 1980s Juche has become the symbolic self-portrait of North Korea at the primary stage of Kim dynastic succession. North Korea today is "not so much a nation as a religion," writes an American journalist, where Kim Il Sung ("the Great Leader" or the father), Kim Jong IL ("the Dear Leader" or the son) and the holy spirit of Juche all blend and blur into the holy trinity of national worship."^{31, 296}

In order to keep control, North Korea's leadership has had to ensure there is no organized religion other than that for the nation's leader. For example:

"Since the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the complete persecution of all religion by a state seems limited to exotic places such as North Korea."²⁹⁷

As a foundation to control its civil population, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will surely continue the cult worship of its national leader into the unforeseen future.

LBS & Universal Family Norms

Considering the unusual political systems in both countries, my first questions I researched was whether or not nuclear families in South Asia as well as the Far East, in this case Korea, are similar enough to be considered together as a group. In one of the very first family Asian studies conducted in Korea, authors Julie Lee, Charles Super and Sara Harkness studied 750 South Korean children living in Seoul. The children's ages ranged from kindergarten through the

seventh grade. The authors studied the self-perception of competence in children using age, sex and home influences using Harter's scales for children.²⁹⁸ In the first of its kind, their experiment included Korean culture as a variable for children's self-perceived competence.²⁹⁹ Their results found remarkable similarities to European and American family standards used to predict higher self-perceived competence.

“Traditional parental discipline and guidance are found to be significant for the development of self-perceived competence in Korean collectivist social skills, but not in peer acceptance, which is, instead, promoted by a nuclear family structure and high parental education.”³⁰⁰

At the end of the study, the authors found the families' nuclear structure and members' self-perceptions were the same standards found to be the most consistent for Asian as well as Euro-American families.

The second question I researched was how important culture is to a family and its impact on specifically Asian nuclear families. For East Asia, Confucianism and filial piety, the virtue of showing respect for one's parents and ancestors, were researched. My concern was how well the modern Asian nuclear family structure supports these traditional cultural family beliefs. While researching 'Life Satisfaction Among Korean Children', Nansook Park found that Korean culture emphasizes filial piety, parental control, harmony, family obligations and respect for older siblings.³⁰¹ In the results of her study, the nuclear family plays a key role:

“Across all ages, satisfaction with the family domain was an important predictor of global LS (Life Satisfaction). These results demonstrate the crucial effect of satisfaction with the family relationship on Korean children and youth' overall well-being, even at a time when peer relationships might seem to be more important.”³⁰²

Park goes on to say:

“...the relationship between self domain and global LS necessarily become stronger with age. This finding is counter to the assumption that people from collectivistic culture like Korea place a higher value on group norms and needs and a lesser value on an independent self (Kitayama and Markus, 1995). Even for youth from a collectivistic

culture like Korea, satisfaction with the self takes on increasing importance for their global well-being. The importance of the 'self' for adolescents seems more ubiquitous than a strict application of the individualistic versus collectivistic paradigm would imply."³⁰³

In short, Asian families share a remarkable similarity with European and American families concerning their children. In all three groups, the developmental well-being of persons, particularly at an early age, has an impact that will last throughout their lives. As Helen Sung suggests, "As people become more aware and understand the need for early promotion for emotional intelligence, it could have a profound impact on the quality of human interactions across the globe."³⁰⁴

In South Asia including Pakistan, the family is also the fundamental unit of society.³⁰⁵ For Pakistan, 95% of the population follow the Islamic religion though there are different Islamic religious sects throughout the country.³⁰⁶ As a religion, "... the family unit is central to Islam, and relations between the sexes are defined exclusively in terms of that unit."³⁰⁷ When describing societal norms in Pakistani families, medical practitioner and author Farhat Moazam, states the following:

"In contrast to the pluralistic society of the United States, Pakistan offers a fairly homogenous milieu insofar as values and socio-cultural norms are concerned. Religious belief plays a central role in the life of men and women from all social strata and is a major influence on all public and private activities."³⁰⁸

He goes on to say that the oldest son is given special authorities when describing family norms such as medical decisions for the older family members:

"As families are both hierarchical and patrilineal, the oldest male member plays a pivotal role in major decisions, with a varying degree of input from the patient and other family members."³⁰⁹

Like Western families, older siblings are also supposed to help younger family members.

"In Pakistan, according to Zaman, help is usually sought from an authority figure within the family, usually a parent or older sibling, who is expected to be not only supportive

and facilitative, but also directive in the advice given.[18] This is construed as a sign of caring rather than as an intrusive act.”³¹⁰

But intrusive acts do occur in families and the inaction of older siblings trying to make decisions without any in-puts from the younger family members does have an impact on them. The youngest siblings are given proof that they have no impact on major family decisions and do not warrant being consulted. The fear of not mattering at all can be a serious detriment psychologically and it can also be used to drive the need to be extra competitive in dealing with other human beings.

Chapter Six Conclusion

Morgenthau’s “Realism Theory” was written at the beginning of the Cold War era and helped define how Social Science and Political Science explained world trends.³¹¹ A counter argument is that the world adapted to the intricacies of Realism and governments and their leaders used Realism as a framework of reference for making key leadership and state decisions. Either way, Morgenthau’s realism theory contains the premise that states are defined as single individuals who act rationally and for their own best interests. Quoting Martin Griffiths,

“In Morgenthau’s view, ‘the relations between nations are not essentially different from the relations between individuals; they are only relations between individuals on a wider scale’.¹² Thus in order to understand the behavior of states it is necessary to begin with individual behavior as the explanation.”³¹²

Looking back historically during the time when nuclear weapons and Morgenthau’s theory were first being developed, Morgenthau’s theory is also based on the premise and belief that every state; i.e., every individual has an adversary.

While Morgenthau's ideas of the politics of man still ring true, what happens to his theory if the state or individual is not acting rationally? Morgenthau's politics has been challenged throughout the years but his argument has withstood the test of time for most of his audiences. Realism combined with Keynesian economics gave the Western nations opposing the bipolar world's Communists armed with nuclear weapons the ample monies, scientific methods, and military capabilities to oppose the adversary. The United States and its allies were victorious in their Horatio Alger struggle. Was the Cold War rational? If you're the winner it certainly was and it also reinforces your belief in your 'winning' theories.

The best Devil's Advocate argument against Morgenthau was actually written before Morgenthau ever penned his theory. In *All Quiet On The Western Front*, the hero's mentor asks the question,

“So.... A German mountain insulted a French mountain? A French field called the German field ugly names? No. War is sought by man and fought by men. To that I am certain.”³¹³

Hence, if a state is not geographical territory but a collective agreement of men and women, are they rational if they go to kill other men and women who do not hold the same beliefs? The realism theory premise of adversarial relationships most certainly holds true but the rationality premise is questionable. The Little Brother Syndrome helps fill this gap.

The Little Brother Syndrome does not contest the Realism Theory's premise of adversarial relationships but it does contest **rationality**. What the Little Brother Syndrome theory states is that competitiveness is a major factor that enhances or sometimes overrules rationality of individuals *and* states. If states are to be reduced into a single entity or individual, the best method to handle the relationships of the state is to look at how the state developed in the same manner as how individuals are raised in families. Despite what family counselors, social

psychologists and statisticians may want to believe, the families of the world are not the “nuclear” mom and dad with a single son and a single daughter. Psychologically, families can be loving and supportive of each member’s role(s). Families can also be mean, cruel, heartless and downright despicable. More often than not, families are a soft mixture of the two while mostly driving down the middle of the psychological road between the extremities.

Little Brother sees the sites differently from his perspective than the other family members do in theirs’. Each member of the nuclear family has their roles and responsibilities as ordained by the parents, society, and cultural norms. As the decision makers, parents use their authority to rule over the household as well as sustain the family with food, clothing, medicine and shelter / housing. The older to oldest sibling(s) are also given responsibilities in large families to help take care of and watch over their younger siblings. The youngest members of the family are given few if any responsibilities to help provide for the family and as the last person in line, receives the most corrections both physically and psychologically from the whole of the family from the parents on down. Youngest brothers and sisters, other than themselves, have the least amount of control for their situations they face internally within the family. This is what helps starts Little Brother Syndrome’s competitive nature. Little Brother wants to be seen and treated as an equal within the family organizational structure. Being seen as an equal member may never occur but it never stops little brother from trying to meet an almost impossible goal.

The second aspect of Little Brother’s perceptions is the strive to right a wrong that he feels has occurred against him usually by a much older brother or by a single or both parental authority figures. Many sociologists refer to this as a simple case of sibling rivalry.³¹⁴ The term however is used exclusively as a condition of discontent or worse between the children of the family and does not include either parent. Family psychologists often limit their research to only

the family member that is having problems adjusting to their family roles and responsibilities. Often diagnosed as a problem child or dysfunctional sibling, it is the treatment of the younger sibling only and not the older sibling that reinforces his own beliefs that an injustice is further enhanced and nothing will be done about the true cause of the problem; i.e. in little brother's mind, his older brother. In reverse, the older brother often does not even realize there is a problem. He is simply correcting the behavior of an unruly little brother who needs to learn what his family and his society expects of this new member. To the older brother's perception, there is no wrong that has been committed on his part and since he too needed to be corrected by his parents this is a normal life occurrence. In this case, he is simply substituting as a parental unit and is meeting the goals as set by the parent(s). Though he may not even know it, a simmering feud has been started and unless little brother is allowed to right the wrong no matter what minor circumstance may have caused it; little brother's competitive overdrive has been started. Until corrected, little brother will continue to use, in his mind, whatever method he thinks is appropriate to right the wrong, to put a stop to the injustice and force the parent(s) to realize he is an equal member and he does not have to tolerate their inaction(s) any further.

The third major component of Little Brother Syndrome is the presence of fear. Fear is the engine that sets Little Brother Syndrome's compelling competitive overdrive into action and in turn focuses the psychological drive to right the moral wrong. In bridging the gap between psychology and physiology, Dr. Walter Cannon first proposed the original "fight or flight" response in both animals and humans.³¹⁵ When little brother thinks he is faced with an extreme life or death situation; the body is forced into a psychological fight or flight condition. The brain may tell the body to prepare for battle against the attacker and try to overcome this known threat; or, the brain may tell the body to flee in order to preserve itself. The fight or flight response is as

basic a human psychological characteristic as the physiological parts that make up the human body. For Little Brother Syndrome the obvious choice is to use and turn his fear into strength and accomplish the impossible. Whether it is the Jammu and Kashmir provinces or the reunification of North and South Korea, little brother wants to do battle and overcome the injustice, the inaction of those in authority, and to right the moral wrongs that have been perpetuated against the country by a larger force that may militarily conquer it at any time. By doing so, little brother will then gain their respect and be accepted as an equal in their international realm once and for all.

Little Brother Syndrome Theory Summation

The Little Brother Syndrome analysis is, and will be, controversial due its downward focus on the family and its younger members' life experiences. LBS runs against the ideological groups and institutions of current liberal and realist social science thoughts, policies and theories. LBS will be interpreted as being too narrowly focused, too concentrated on the early lives of leaders in which undoubtedly leaders continue to learn throughout their lives to make much ado regarding their childhood experiences. In explicit terms, adults run and rule states and nations, not children. Like the term 'sibling rivalry', critics will accuse LBS as being used for a good analogy but as a possible theory it lacks the credibility and predictability of forecasting a state's actions for future events yet unforeseen. The primary international comparative politics question is "Would LBS qualify as a theory as defined by PhD Robert Keohane of Harvard University?"

"Even if one could eradicate theory from one's mind, it would be self- defeating to try. No one can cope with the complexities of world politics without the aid either of a theory or of implicit assumptions and propositions that substitute, however poorly, for theory. Reality has to be ordered into categories, and relationships drawn between events. To

prefer a theoretical activity over theoretically informed practice would be to seek to be guided by an unexamined jumble of prejudices, yielding conclusions that may not logically follow from the assumptions, rather than by beliefs based on systematic attempts to specify one's assumptions and to derive and test propositions."³¹⁶

Little Brother Syndrome is not envisioned as the single end all social science theory that explains all actions within the international relations realm. LBS is meant to be an explanatory theory which returns the academic focus back to the original international comparative politics' concept: Individual nations have their own set of lenses in which they see the world.³¹⁷ The LBS goal is to help explain certain states' actions while nations act and react within the international community. The LBS analysis states the best way to understand a state's or states' actions is to use the first institution that all mankind is exposed to in their very beginning; the family. By studying the interactions between family members, LBS proposes the advancement of international comparative politics by using family norms as a basis of ICP analysis. Like Amartya Sen's "Development As Freedom" in which his proposal is to look at the end result as the true variable to the cause, LBS proposes the same methodology.³¹⁸ To understand a nation and its leaders, LBS says to look at how the nation was initially created and to also look and see how its major political and military leaders were raised in their families. The LBS theory states comparative results will lead to a better understanding of how certain states behave in the international community and LBS will also assist both the social scientist and the layman by showing how the world works.

The Western world currently has three or four major schools of thought within the social sciences realm; realism, pluralism (also called liberalism), Globalism and the English School of International Relations dealing with human rights. The quintessential leader of realism is Hans Morgenthau and his original theory's four pillars that explain international relations. He theorized one) the international system is anarchic, two) states / nations are the greatest

important actors, three) all states are rational actors, and four) their main concern is survival of the state/nation. By naming his theory “realism”, he psychologically hit the bull’s eye supporting his theory with the name itself. Realism was just that; it was real and used to represent the real world. One cannot argue the world does not operate in real fashion, in real time, and real men work, struggle, and make war on each other in the real world.

In 1947 when Morgenthau enunciated his realism theory, he gave credit to the newly created nuclear weapon as a catalyst that would change the history of warfare and the history of man, his nation, and even the world.³¹⁹ His critics claimed Morgenthau left out important segments or elements that make up a state. States, his critics argued, are not a single actor, but consist of multiple internal actors who try to use or guide the state in a manner that will help it continue into the future. Ironically, Morgenthau could have just have easily been interpreted as a college professor teaching basic biology 101 and how lower biological life forms such as cells survive, grow, multiply and/or create higher complex life forms. The beauty of Morgenthau’s theory is that he uses clearly identifiable works such as those by Thucydides, Otto Von Bismarck and Clausewitz, to build his case. Morgenthau used the building blocks educational theory of the day to describe the international system. By using this teaching method, ordinary people could easily associate their own lives and actions within a simplistic yet plausible international relations theory called realism.

The other three main schools of thought, Liberalism, Globalism and the English School all reject realism’s unitary state actor basis while differentiating which actors should be considered major state players.³²⁰ Critics such as Imre Lakatos in the 1970’s refuted realism stating it did not meet his standards that theories ought to be progressive and be able to generate new ideas while reinforcing the core ideal.³²¹ Pluralism states other actors such as multinational

corporations, military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other legislative or judicial power players can help or hurt the state in its foreign relations. Globalism is more focused on the economies of countries but it is also focused on how capitalism is now being seen as the new world order. That economic world order is what creates interdependencies and leads to nations being dependent on Western Europe and the United States' world trade. The English School believes in the whole world concept but writers such as Hedley Bull believe states that make up the international community set the standards for realism's anarchy. English school theorizes that a country's ideas are more important than realism's material gains when explaining a state's actions. While English School was seen as an attempt to use both realism and liberalism's strong points, its critics call for an end to this theory since its writers are not primarily from England nor provides a strong enough case based on history to merge the two theories together.³²²

The strongest two theories to compare Little Brother Syndrome against are Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism. Neo-Realism's champion, Kenneth Waltz has written about how the international system is anarchic due to the fact there is no overseeing government. His *Theory of International Politics* is not predictive of the system nor does it focus on any particular state.³²³ Waltz has written extensively on the proliferation of nuclear weapons and he theorizes it will bring peace to the international community.³²⁴ Nuclear weapons forces states to normalize their relations lest the states initiate nuclear war which would be far too costly for both sides.

Debating Waltz's Neo-Realism with that of Neo-Liberalism, Robert Keohane a liberal Constructivist wrote *Neorealism and Its Critics*. In chapter one, the book states:

“Keohane suggests the need for a revised theory that incorporates Waltz's notion of structure but that takes seriously, as explanatory factors, elements of the international system not included in Waltz's limited conception of structure.³²⁵

Ironically, Keohane then goes on to dismiss alternative theories that are based on human behavior(s) of political leaders and/or the state as a singular actor. When discussing the use of human behavior theory on the causalities of conflicts, i.e. war, he states:

"Explanations of international conflict as resulting from human nature are vulnerable to severe criticism. As Waltz (1959:39) argues, they blame a small number of behavior traits for conflict, ignoring more benign aspects of human nature that point in the opposite direction. Furthermore, such theories fail to explain variations in warfare over time and space: if human nature is constant, why shouldn't warfare be constant as well?"³²⁶

Robert Keohane the Constructivist and Kenneth Waltz the Realist debated about which theory was more inclusive and could be used to help predict actions in the realm of international relations, but neither side greatly expounded outside the boundaries of their own theories. Neither Keohane nor Waltz tried to bridge the gap between the two theories. Each regarded his as the true solution. Other noted neoliberals such as Harvard's John Ruggie and formerly Princeton's Friedrich Kratochwil were arguing that it was not just the sole state actor that should be the focus of international relations theories.³²⁷ Liberalism's institutionalists argued the other major actors that comprised a state were the institutions founded by economists, by judicial bodies, by legislative assemblies, or by the military used to defend the state or used in offensive modes to seize power, peoples, territory or valuable material assets. Institutionalists believe the multiple actors that comprise a state's structure use their power internally to guide the state's actions.

In one of his latest works "*Institutions, Law and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*", Keohane's writing reflects how both neo-liberals and structural neo-realists have agreed to the importance of institutions:

“The purpose of this introduction is, first of all, to elucidate this conception of how the world works. It is both individualist and institutionalist, regarding institutions both as created by human action and as structuring that action. The principal motor of action in this view is self-interest, guided by rationality, which translates structural and institutional conditions into payoffs and probabilities, and therefore incentives. But my conceptions of self-interest and rationality are broad ones. Self-interest is not simply material; on the contrary, it encompasses one's interest in being thought well of, and in thinking well of oneself. One's self-interest is not divorced from one's principled ideas or identity but closely connected with them.”³²⁸

So while in his earlier career he dismissed human behavior based international relation theories, Keohane has broadened his neo-liberalism viewpoints to include singular self-interest and a person's self-identity.³²⁹

The Little Brother Syndrome theory fits among the other major social and political science theories by bridging realism and liberalism together. As a theory, Little Brother Syndrome uses the foundational work of realism and its anarchy in intrastate relations pillar. The use of force, whether economically, politically or militarily by a state which has the capability and flexibility to choose which method to use and the time and place to do so remains the critical factor. The end of the bi-polar world did not eliminate this fact nor did it end Pakistan's or North Korea's quest for the single largest destructive force known in the world; thermonuclear weapons.

The second realism pillar used by LBS is the state as a single actor. In the case of both North Korea and in Pakistan, the lure of power has kept the same family in power for North Korea and the overall number of Pakistan's leaders has remained relatively small. Since its 1947 creation, there have only been 10 or more separate rulers of Pakistan. Of the ten leaders, four or 40% were military officers seizing power via a military coup.³³⁰ As a semi-democratic country, the military seized control of the government due to the lack of political infrastructure, political parties with national callings, and with the inability of its first civil rulers to consolidate the political power of Pakistan's original strong willed city-state political entities. Pakistan's

troubles as a military state arose from the lack of nationalistic parties incorporating the different social and religious groups the country contained. The lack of resolve among its political leaders to transcend social classes as well as the dominant and minor Islamic religions into a single group of united supporters has had devastating effects on the country's stability as well as its civil infrastructure and political culture.

LBS however sides with the liberal academia when it comes to realism's rationality. Little Brother Syndrome came about as a result of a film I first saw in college called "21 Up" of the "Seven Up" movie series.³³¹ The film's producers wanted to know if character traits developed in a person's early years stayed with them throughout their lives. As the film demonstrated with its subjects, the theory stands true. One of my friends while I was in college at Florida State University was a Viet-Nam combat veteran. His thought about the movie was one of his life lessons learned. "You can keep running," he said, "but no matter what happens, you will always show up." I translated this thought into not just the people who take up the leadership roles of a state but I also included the state itself within my LBS theory. The characteristics of the state for both North Korea and for Pakistan have remained the same since their beginnings. Is it rational for states and their leaders to never change or improve? Certainly not, but as my theory shows it does help keep those who want to control a state to stay in power. Pakistani leaders, both military and civilian stay in power as a result of the population not connecting with the state in a nationalistic manner but as a religious connection as defined by the state. For North Korea, the dictatorial family of Kim il-Sung picked none other than Kim Jong-il and now Kim Jong-un to rule North Korea. If you want to keep the state's LBS characteristics continuing into the future, pick the youngest member of the family. Both of them were literally the youngest little brothers of their families. LBS strikes again.

LBS theory also uses the neo-liberal belief of constructivism's institutions but with a realist's perspective they are allowed to remain but as a tool to control the civil populations. Both countries, the leaders and the populace, view dissent as treasonous and use religion as a means of enforcing state control. Pakistan relies upon Islam as a national unifier but has found itself caught in a hail-storm of religious intolerance by different Islamic sects all claiming to be the true source for Islam.^{332, 333} The use of Islam was a tragic misstep by ul-Haq but Pakistan's national government lacks the resolve to correct its mistake. Pakistan's nuclear weapons are now the new unifier but at what cost if a national strategic mistake is made? The same is true for North Korea and its cult worship of its national leader(s). North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons was to counteract the military capabilities of its primary foes on its own. The trouble lies not in Pakistan's or North Korea's nuclear capabilities, the trouble is the characteristics of both states as well as the characteristics of their leaders. Little Brother does not like to be ignored by its parental units, the international community, and will continue to cause crisis after crisis until Little Brother gets what he wants.

The LBS irony is that while Neo-Liberalists and Neo-Realists appear to be agreeing on institutions, they have forgotten or overlooked the most basic human institution of all; the nuclear family. A family is the very first institution that every human being is born into yet social scientists have ignored or refused to use the family in meaningful theories. A family may consist of many actors or it may only be the mother and child. Regardless of the size or the number of actors, its conception is a world-wide occurrence that almost every single human being experiences. As a theory, Little Brother Syndrome uses the origins of realism and liberalism and acts as a bridge between the two major divisions. By using family structures and how its youngest male members act and react within it, Little Brother Syndrome has its origins

from and may be applicable to the greatest majority of this single largest institution here on planet Earth.

As what Kenneth Waltz called an explanatory system, Little Brother Syndrome may help explain why the processes of international relations occur as they do.³³⁴ As with the Seven Up series, human characteristics are learned responses that are ingrained in each of us and we do not lose the original thoughts, responses, and decisions that help make up who we each are. Little Brother Syndrome is simply how little brothers are self-taught by their surroundings to be competitive, demanding of themselves and others, to fight what they believe is the good fight and be recognized as an equal by the world. Little Brother has his own set of lenses to look through when he sees the world. With luck and by putting on *his* lenses, Little Brother Syndrome may even help predict why those nations who are now free of a bi-polar world and whose peoples have risen during this Arab Spring to create free nations and new governments do the things that *they* do.

Chapter One – End Notes

¹Almond, Paul and Michael Apted, directors, *The UP Series*, films from 1964 to present, Granada Television, British Broadcasting Corporation, United Kingdom.

²Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York, New York, Knopf, 1960, pgs. 59-61.

³Jervis, Robert, *The Illogic of American Nuclear Strategy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984, pgs. 11-13.

⁴Walt, Stephen M., *The Origins of Alliances*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY 1987, chapters 1, 2, and 5.

⁵Sagan, Scott D., Kenneth Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons, A Debate Renewed*, W.W. Norton and Company, New York, 2003, chapter 1 and 4.

⁶Ibid, pg. 109.

⁷Sagan, Scott D., editor, Bajpai, Kanti, “The BJP and the Bomb”, *Inside Nuclear South Asia*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2009, pgs. 25-67.

⁸Kapur, S. Paul, *Dangerous Deterrent, Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2007, pg. 45.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Kapur, S. Paul, “Ten Years of Nuclear Instability in a Nuclear South Asia”, *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 2, Fall, 2008, pgs. 71-94.

¹¹Venter, Al J., *Allah’s Bomb, The Islamic Quest for Nuclear Weapons*, The Lyons Press, Guilford, CT, 2007, pgs. 51-53.

¹²Ibid, pgs. 51-53.

¹³Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2008, pgs. 335-345.

¹⁴Corera, Gordon, *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York 2006, pg. 123.

¹⁵Hagerty, Devin T., *The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation, Lessons from South Asia*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA 1998, pgs. 3, 182-183.

¹⁶O'Neill, Philip, Jr., *Verification in an Age of Insecurity, The Future of Arms Control Compliance*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010, pgs. 74-77.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Corera, Gordon, *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York 2006, pgs. 44-45.

¹⁹Fitzpatrick, Mark, *The Iranian Nuclear Crisis, Avoiding Worst-Case Outcomes*, Routledge, New York, New York, 2008, pg. 44.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Perkovich, George, Gizewski, Peter, *India's Nuclear Bomb, The Impact of Global Proliferation*, International Journal, University of California Press, 2002, pgs. 404-418.

²²Ganguly, Sumit, *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions Since 1947*, Columbia University Press, 2002, pgs. 127-138.

²³Khan, Saira, *Nuclear Proliferation Dynamics In Protracted Conflict Regions, A Comparative Study of South Asia and the Middle East*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Hants, England, 2002, pgs. 139-146, 250, 285, 270-290.

²⁴Ibid, pgs 139-146.

²⁵Hymans, Jacques, E. C., *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation, Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy*, Cambridge University Press, New York, New York, 2006, pgs. 35-39.

²⁶Ibid, pg. 35.

²⁷Pepitone, Emmy A., *Children In Cooperation and Competition*, Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA 1980, pgs. 25-87.

²⁸Minnett, Ann M., Deborah Lowe Vandell, John W. Santrock, "The Effects of Sibling Status on Sibling Interaction: Influence of Birth Order, Age Spacing, Sex of Child, and Sex of Sibling", *Child Development*, Vol. 54, No. 4, August 1983, pgs. 1064-1072.

²⁹Ibid, pg. 1071.

³⁰Schneider, Ann, Mara Sidney, "What Is Next for Policy Design & Social Construction Theory?", *The Policy Studies Journal*, Volume 37, Number 1, 23 Feb 2009, pg. 4.

³¹Bastelson, Jens, "The Social Construction of Globality", *International Political Sociology*, Volume 4, Issue 3, 1 September 2010, pgs. 219-235.

Chapter Two – End Notes

- ³² Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institutional Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 15.
- ³³ Jalal, Ayesha, *The State of Martial Rule, The Origins of Pakistan's Political Economy of Defence*, Cambridge University Press, 1990, pgs. 44-48.
- ³⁴ Jackson, Roy, *Mawlana Mawdudi & Political Islam, Authority and the Islamic State*, Routledge, New York, New York, 2011, pg. 70.
- ³⁵ Tan, Tai Yong, Gyanesh Kudaisya, *The Aftermath of Partition in South Asia*, Routledge, New York, 2000, pg. 84.
- ³⁶ Ibid, pg. 85.
- ³⁷ Metcalf, Barbara; Metcalf, Thomas R., *A Concise History of Modern India (Cambridge Concise Histories)*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 2006, pg. xxxiii, 372.
- ³⁸ Ali, Tariq, *The Duel, Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*, Simon and Schuster, Incorporated, New York, New York 2008, pgs. 29-31.
- ³⁹ Nazeer, Mian M., *Urban Growth in Pakistan*, in “Asian Survey”, University of California Press, Volume 6, Number 6, pp 310-318, pg. 314.
- ⁴⁰ Rosen, George, *Western Economists and Eastern Societies: Agents of Change in South Asia, 1950-1970*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1985, pg. 43.
- ⁴¹ Faruqui, Ahmad, *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan*, Ashgate Publishing Company, Burlington, VT, 2003, pg. 41.
- ⁴² Bhargava, Rajeev, “India”, *Dissent*, Vol. 56, Issue 1, Winter 2009, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA, pgs. 40-43, pg. 41.
- ⁴³ Jalal, Ayesha, *The State of Martial Rule, The origins of Pakistan's political economy of defence*, Cambridge University Press, New York, New York, 1990, pgs. 10-12.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵ Naqvi, Tahir, “Migration, Sacrifice and the Crisis of Muslim Nationalism”, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 25 June 2012, Oxford University Press, pgs. 479-490, pg. 480.
- ⁴⁶ Hallinan, Conn, *The Model for Iraq was Ireland, 1692, Divide and Conquer as Imperial Rules*, Center for Research on Globalization, website:
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=4869> , accessed 24 Feb 2012.

⁴⁷ Ahmad, Aftab, Arvind K. Jain, editor, *Historical Antecedents of Corruption in Pakistan*, in “The Political Economy of Corruption”, Routledge, New York, 2001, pgs. 142-154.

⁴⁸ Musharraf, Pervez, *In The Line Of Fire, A Memoir*, Free Press-Division of Simon and Schuster, Inc, New York, New York, 2006, pg. 154.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Banuazizi, Ali, Myron Weiner, *The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY, 1986, pg. 315.

⁵¹ Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institutional Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 7.

⁵² Callard, Keith, *Pakistan - A Political Study*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1957, pg. 53.

⁵³ Ibid, pg. 48.

⁵⁴ Sohail, K., *Prophets of Violence, Prophets of Peace: Understanding the Roots of Contemporary Political Violence*, White Knight Publications, Toronto, 2005, pg. 121.

⁵⁵ Dixit, J. N, *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, 2002, pg. 109.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Gucker, Corinna Jenkins, Kimberly Updegraff, “The Relative Contributions of Parents and Siblings to Child and Adolescent Development”, in *Siblings as Agents of Socialization*, Laurie Kramer, Katherine J. Conger, Editors, “New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development”, Number 126, Winter 2009, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pgs. 19-22 of 13-28.

⁵⁸ Wynbrandt, James, *A Brief History of Pakistan*, Facts on File: New York, 2009, pg. 166.

⁵⁹ Ibid, pg. 167.

⁶⁰ Dasgupta, C., *War and Diplomacy in Kashmir 1947-1948*, Sage Publications Incorporated, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2002, pg. 41.

⁶¹ Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institutional Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 28.

⁶² Thomas, Raju G.C. editor, Gowher Rizvi, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Problem, 1947-1972*, in “Perspectives On Kashmir, The Roots of Conflict in South Asia”, Westview Press, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford, 1992, pg. 51.

- ⁶³ Raghavan, Srinath *War and Peace in Modern India*, Palgrave McMillian Publishers Limited, New York, New York, 2010, pg. 107 and 143-148.
- ⁶⁴ Keay, John, *India, A History*, Grove Press, New York, New York, 2013, pg. 547.
- ⁶⁵ Dixit, J. N, *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, 2002, pg. 115.
- ⁶⁶ Musarrat, Razia, Ghulam Ali, Muhammad Salman Azhar, “18th Amendment and Its Impacts on Pakistan's Politics”, *Journal of Sociological Research*, Vol. 3, No. 1, December 2012, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Pakistan.
- ⁶⁷ Ahmed, Akbar S., *Resistance and Control in Pakistan*, Revised Edition, Routledge, New York, New York, 2004, pgs. 35-38.
- ⁶⁸ Siddiqu, Osama, *The Other Pakistan: Special Laws, Diminished Citizenship and the Gathering Storm*, Lahore University Management Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan, 5 Dec 2012, pg. 6-8, Electronic copy available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2185535> , accessed 5 Jan 2013.
- ⁶⁹ Warwick, Donald P., Fernando Reimers, *Hope or Despair? Learning in Pakistan's Primary Schools*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT, 1995, pg. 49.
- ⁷⁰ Korson, J. Henry, *Contemporary Problems of Pakistan*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1993, pg. 84.
- ⁷¹ No author cited. National Democratic Institute, “*Pakistan to Extend Political Reforms to FATA*”, National Democratic Institute, 455 Massachusetts Ave, NW, 8th Floor, Washington, DC 20001-2621, <http://www.ndi.org>, accessed 5 January 2012.
- ⁷² Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 27.
- ⁷³ Behera, Navnita Chadha, *Demystifying Kashmir*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., 2006, pgs. 74-88.
- ⁷⁴ Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali, *The Myth of Independence*, Oxford University Press, London, UK, pgs. 87-88.
- ⁷⁵ Cohen, Richard, editor, “The Soviets’ Vietnam”, *The Washington Post*, Editorial, 22 April 1988, pg. 22a.
- ⁷⁶ Trahair, Richard C.S., *Encyclopedia of Cold War Espionage, Spies, and Secret Operations*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 2004, pg. 45.
- ⁷⁷ Declassified: Sep 2004, “From [Excised] to DIA (Defense Intelligence Agency - Author’s note.) Washington D.C. [Excised], Cable “[Excised]/Pakistan Interservices Intelligence/Pakistan (PK) Directorate Supplying the Taliban Forces”, October 22, 1996, SECRET, 1 p. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.html>, George

Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #15, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁷⁸ Declassified: Sep 2004, “DI TR 96-008, Central Intelligence Agency, “Hakarat ul-Ansar: Increasing Threat to Western and Pakistani Interests,” August 1996, SECRET, 4 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEPP/NSAEPP227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #10, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁷⁹ Declassified: Sep 2004, “NID (National Intelligence Directive - Author’s note.) 96-0229CX National Intelligence Daily, Central Intelligence Agency, Monday, September 30, 1996, TOP SECRET, 5 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEPP/NSAEPP227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #11, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁸⁰ Declassified: Sep 2004, “DI TR 96-008, Central Intelligence Agency, “Hakarat ul-Ansar: Increasing Threat to Western and Pakistani Interests,” August 1996, SECRET, 4 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEPP/NSAEPP227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #10, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁸¹ Statistics provided by Global Terrorism Database, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), University of Maryland, website located at: http://www.start.umd.edu/start/sitesearch/data_collections/ accessed 15 April 2012.

⁸² Demchak, Chris and Werner, Chris, “Exploring the Knowledge Nexus, India’s Path in Terrorism-Driven Institutional Growth”, *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Winter, 2007, pgs. 58-97.

⁸³ Ibid, pg. 61.

⁸⁴ Ibid, pg. 71.

⁸⁵ Horowitz, Shale and Sharma, Deepti, “Democracies Fighting Ethnic Insurgencies: Evidence from India”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 31:8, 749-773, 2008, pg. 766.

⁸⁶ Musharraf, Pervez, *In The Line Of Fire, A Memoir*, Free Press-Division of Simon and Schuster, Inc, New York, New York, 2006, pg. 201.

⁸⁷ *Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009*, Center For Global Development, 1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Third Floor, Washington DC 20036, http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/_active/pakistan/numbers, , accessed on 5 January 2012.

⁸⁸ S. 1707--111th Congress: *Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009*. (2009). In www.GovTrack.us , Retrieved January 6, 2013, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/111/s962> .

⁸⁹ Declassified: Sep 2004, “From [Excised] to DIA (author’s note Defense Intelligence Agency), Washington D.C., ‘IIR [Excised] Pakistan Involvement in Afghanistan’ November 7, 1996, Confidential, 2 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “*Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather*”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #17, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Declassified: Sep 2004, “Islama 09517 U.S. Embassy (Islamabad) Cable, ‘Afghanistan: Taliban Deny they Are Sheltering HUA Militants, Usama bin Laden,’ November 12, 1996, Confidential, 7 pgs.”, Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “*Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather*”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #18, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁹² Declassified: Sep 2004, “From [Excised] to DIA (author’s note Defense Intelligence Agency), Washington D.C., ‘IIR [Excised] Pakistan Involvement in Afghanistan’ November 7, 1996, Confidential, 2 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “*Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather*”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #17, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁹³ Declassified: Sep 2004, “Islama 007343 U.S. Embassy (Islamabad), Cable, ‘Afghanistan: [Excised] Briefs Ambassador on his Activities. Pleads for Greater Activism by U.N.’ August 27, 1997, Confidential, 5 pgs. [Excised]. Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “*Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather*”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #24, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁹⁴ Declassified: Sep 2004, “State 185645 U.S. Department of State, Cable, ‘Pakistan Support for Taliban,’ September 26, 2000, Secret, 4 pgs. [Excised], Document located at <http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, George Washington University, National Security Archives, Electronic Briefing Book No. 227, “*Pakistan: The Taliban’s*

Godfather”, Barbara Elias - Editor, Posted August 14, 2007, Document #34, accessed 30 December 2012.

⁹⁵ No author, *President Obama’s Requests for \$83.4 Billion for War*, “Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Newsletter”, Volume 4, Number 12, April 10, 2009.

⁹⁶ Gregory, Shaun, “The ISI and the War on Terrorism”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Volume 30, Number 12, 1013-1031, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, Bradford, United Kingdom, October 26, 2007, pg. 1018.

⁹⁷ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*, Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001, pg. 241.

⁹⁸ Federation of American Scientists, *U-2 SENIOR YEAR / AQUATONE / U-2 / TR-1 Overview*, World Wide Web, accessed at: <http://www.fas.org/programs/ssp/man/uswpns/air/special/u2.html> on 5 Feb 2012.

⁹⁹ 6937th Communications Group Alumni Website, Air Force Security Service, located at Peshawar Air Station, Pakistan, <http://6937th.50megs.com/> , accessed on 25 March 2012.

¹⁰⁰ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*, Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001, pg. 174 and 177.

¹⁰¹ Faruqui, Ahmad, *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan*, Ashgate Publishing Company, Burlington, VT, 2003, pg. 41.

¹⁰² Ibid, pg. 42.

¹⁰³ Grimmitt, Richard F., *U.S. Arms Sales to Pakistan*, “Congressional Research Service”, 24 August 2009, Report # RS22757, <http://www.crs.gov> , pg. 1, accessed on 26 March 2012.

¹⁰⁴ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*, Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001, pg. 67.

¹⁰⁵ Khan, Fazal Muqeem, *The Story of the Pakistan Army*, Pakistan Branch, Oxford University Press, 1963, pg. 159.

¹⁰⁶ Malik, Iftikhar, *Pakistan, Democracy, Terrorism, and the Building of a Nation*, Olive Branch Press, Northampton, MA, 2010, pg.94.

¹⁰⁷ Wolpert, Stanley, *A New History of India, Sixth Edition*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York, 2000, pg. 361.

¹⁰⁸ Thomas, Raju G.C. editor, Ashutosh Varshney, *Three Compromised Nationalisms, Why Kashmir Has Been a Problem*, in “Perspectives On Kashmir, The Roots of Conflict in South Asia”, Westview Press, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford, 1992, pg. 216.

¹⁰⁹ Jones, Owen Bennett, *Pakistan, Eye of the Storm*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2009, pg. 275.

¹¹⁰ BBC reporter. Video on World Wide Web “YouTube.com”, available on-line at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PFH1zP69n9c> accessed 27 Jan 2012.

¹¹¹ Shah, Mansoor, *The Gold Bird, Pakistan and its Air Force – Observations of a Pilot*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, 2002, pg. 180 (also 120, 134).

¹¹² Thomas, Raju G. C., “India’s Security Environment: Towards The Year 2000”, *Strategic Studies Institute*, July 29, 1996, U.S. Army War College, available on-line at <http://carlisle.arm.mil/usassi/>, accessed 1/26/2012.

¹¹³ Topping, Seymour, “China Tests Atomic Bomb, Asks Summit Talk On Ban; Johnson Minimizes Peril”, *New York Times*, 16 October 1964, found on <http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/1016.html#article>, accessed 11/3/2012.

¹¹⁴ Jones, Owen Bennett, *Pakistan, Eye of the Storm*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2009, pgs. 94-99.

Stephens, Ian, *Pakistan*, Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, New York, New York, 1963, pg. 265.

¹¹⁵ Arnett, Eric, *Military Capacity and the Risk of War, China, India, Pakistan, and Iran*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York, 1997, pg. 158.

¹¹⁶ Banuazizi, Ali and Myron Weiner, co-editors, *The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY, 1986, pg. 302.

¹¹⁷ Jahan, Rounaq, *Pakistan: Failure in National Integration*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1972, pg. 104.

¹¹⁸ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*, Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001, pg. 178.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, pg. 183.

¹²⁰ Jones, Owen Bennett, *Pakistan, Eye of the Storm*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2009, pg. 156.

¹²¹ Shahid Javed Burki, *Pakistan: Fifty Years of Nationhood*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO., 1999, pg. 42.

¹²² Malik, Iftikhar H., *The History of Pakistan*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 2008, pg. 153-156.

- ¹²³ LaPorte, Jr., Robert, “Pakistan in 1971: The Disintegration of a Nation”, *Asian Survey*, Vol. 12, No. 2, February, 1972, pgs. 97-108, pg. 101.
- ¹²⁴ Dixit, J. N, *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, 2002, pg. 170.
- ¹²⁵ Marwah, Onkar, “India's Military Intervention in East Pakistan, 1971-1972”, *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Cambridge University Press, 1979, pgs. 549-580, pg. 560.
- ¹²⁶ Baster, Craig; Yogendra K Malik., Charles H Kennedy, Robert C. Oberst, *Government And Politics In South Asia*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1998, pg. 387.
- ¹²⁷ Sisson, Richard, and Rose, Leo E., *War and Succession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1990, pg. 245.
- ¹²⁸ Khan, Jehangir, author, *US-Pakistan Relations: the Geo-strategic and Geopolitical Factors/relations Americano-pakistanaises la Geostrategie et Des Facteurs Geopolitiques*, “Canadian Social Science”, Volume: 6, Issue: 2, 2010, Canadian Research & Development Center of Sciences and Cultures, ProQuest LLC, pg. 61.
- ¹²⁹ Baster, Craig; Yogendra K Malik., Charles H Kennedy,.; Robert C.Oberst., *Government And Politics In South Asia*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1998, pg. 388.
- ¹³⁰ Burki, Shahid Javed, *Pakistan: Fifty Years of Nationhood*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO., 1999, pg. 195.
- ¹³¹ Kapur, S. Paul, Chapter 4, “Peace and Conflict in the Indo-Pakistani Rivalry: Domestic and Strategic Causes” in *Asian Rivalries: Conflict, Escalation, and Limitations on Two-Level Games*, by editors Sumit Ganguly; William R. Thompson, Stanford Security Series, Stanford, CA, 2011, pg. 72.
- ¹³² Cirincione, Joseph, *Asian Nuclear Reaction Chain*, “Foreign Policy”, Spring 2000, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Gale Group, pg. 120.
- ¹³³ A. Taylor, Paul D., *India and Pakistan: Thinking about the Unthinkable*, “Naval War College Review” Volume: 54, Issue: 3, 2001, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Naval War College, Provided by ProQuest LLC, All Rights Reserved, pg. 40+.
- ¹³⁴ Dixit, J.N., *India -Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, 2002, pg. 90.

Chapter Three – End Notes

- ¹³⁵ Chol, Ryo Sung, *Korea, The 38th Parallel North*, University Press of the Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2004, pg. 36.

¹³⁶ Ibid, pg.186-215.

¹³⁷ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 49.

¹³⁸ Chol, Ryo Sung, *Korea, The 38th Parallel North*, University Press of the Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2004, pgs. 230-231.

¹³⁹ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pgs. 62-68.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Fehrenbach, T.R., *This Kind of War: The Classic Korean War History – Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*, Brassey's, Dulles, VA, 2001, pg. 113.

¹⁴² Dvorchak, Robert J., *Battle for Korea: A History of the Korean Conflict*, Combined Publishing, Conshohocken, PA, 1993, pg. 47.

¹⁴³ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 90.

¹⁴⁴ Seth, Michael J., *A History of Korea, From Antiquity to the Present*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, Maryland, 2011, pg. 332.

¹⁴⁵ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 106.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, pg. 261.

¹⁴⁷ LeBon, Gustave, *The French Revolution and the Psychology of Revolution*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, CT and London, England, 1980, pg. 110.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, pg. 110.

¹⁴⁹ Gonen, Jay Y., *The Roots of Nazi Psychology, Hitler's Utopian Barbarism*, The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, 2000, pgs. 14, 105-108.

¹⁵⁰ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 353-354.

¹⁵¹ Seth, Michael J., *A History of Korea, From Antiquity to the Present*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, Maryland, pg. 347 citing Andrei Lankov, *From Stalin to Kim-Il Sung: The Formation of North Korea, 1945-1960*, (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002), pg. 63.

¹⁵² Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 131.

¹⁵³ National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and the Response to Terrorism, “Global Terrorism Database”, University of Maryland, (<http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/>), retrieved 16 January 2010.

¹⁵⁴ Seth, Michael J., *A History of Korea, From Antiquity to the Present*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, Maryland, 2011, pgs. 350-351.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, pg. 351.

¹⁵⁶ Shinmun, Dongrip “41 Years, Is the United Nations in a Recurring Theme in North Korea’s International Crime?”, 2010-06-18, (<http://www.independent.co.kr/news/article.html?no=42329english>), retrieved 14 Feb 2011.

¹⁵⁷ Demick, Barbara, *Nothing To Envy, Ordinary Lives In North Korea*, Spiegel & Grau, New York, 2009, pg. 217.

¹⁵⁸ Hwang, Kyung Moon, *A History of Korea*, St. Martins Press, New York, New York, 2010, Introduction pgs. xlv-10.

¹⁵⁹ Caprio, Mark E., *Japanese Assimilation Policies In Colonial Korea 1910-1945*, University of Washington Press, 2009, pgs. 188-193.

¹⁶⁰ Wampler, Robert, “How Do You Solve A Problem Like Korea”, *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 322*, posted 23 June 2010, documents 1-15, (<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB322/index.htm>), retrieved 2/22/2011.

¹⁶¹ Chanlett-Avery, Emma, “North Korea’s Abduction of Japanese Citizens and the Six-Party Talks”, *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, 19 March 2008, pp 2-3.

¹⁶² Report, “Worldwide abductions perpetrated by North Korea in 12 Countries”, *National Association for the Rescue of Japanese Kidnapped by North Korea (NARKIN)*, posted December 2006, (<http://www.sukuukai.jp/narkn/indix.html>), retrieved 22 Feb 2011.

¹⁶³ Takahara, Kanako, “Abductees’ Multinational Kin Unite”, *The Japan Times (English Addition)*, posted 22 Dec 2005, (<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/print/nn20051222a8.html>), retrieved 21 Feb 2008.

¹⁶⁴ Chanlett-Avery, Emma, “North Korea’s Abduction of Japanese Citizens and the Six-Party Talks”, *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, 19 March 2008, pg. 2.

¹⁶⁵ Global Terrorism Database, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), Center of Excellence of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, copyright 2009-2010, (<http://www.start.umd.edu>), retrieved 1/16/2011.

¹⁶⁶ “Korea on the Front Lines: Running”, The History Channel, A&E Television Networks, (<http://www.History.com/Shop #74114>), copyright 2008.

¹⁶⁷ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 196.

¹⁶⁸ Kim, Byung-Yeon, Suk Jin Kim, Keun Lee, *Assessing the Economic Performance of North Korea, 1954-1989: Estimates and Growth Accounting Analysis*, “Journal of Comparative Economics”, Vol. 35, 2007, pg. 569.

¹⁶⁹ Eberstadt, Nicholas, *Policy and Economic Performance in Divided Korea during the Cold War Era: 1945-1991*, The AEI Press, Washington D.C., 2010, pg. 254.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, pg. 54.

¹⁷¹ Martin, Bradley K., *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*, Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martins Griffin, New York, 2006, pg. 317.

¹⁷² Ibid, pg. 504.

¹⁷³ Ibid, pg. 633.

¹⁷⁴ Bluth, Christoph, *Korea, Hot Spots In Global Politics*, Polity Press, Malden, MA, 2008, pg. 76.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, pgs. 77-80.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, pg. 148.

Chapter Four -- End Notes

¹⁷⁷ Erdoes, Richard, Alfonso Ortiz, *American Indian Myths and Legends*, Pantheon Books, New York, New York, 1984, pg. 166.

¹⁷⁸ Dixit, J. N., *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, United Kingdom, 2002, pgs. 223-225.

¹⁷⁹ Rizvi, Hasan-Askari, *Military, State, and Society in Pakistan*, Macmillan, Houndmills, England, 2000, pg. 130.

¹⁸⁰ Dixit, J. N., *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, United Kingdom, 2002, pgs. 201-203.

¹⁸¹ Elbaradei, Mohamed, *The Age of Deception, Nuclear Diplomacy In Treacherous Times*, Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company LLC, New York, New York, 2011, pg. 225.

- ¹⁸² Gordon, Philip H. - Editor, John Lewis Graddis, Ernest R. May, Jonathan Rosenberg- Editor, *Cold War Statesmen Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy since 1945*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999, pg. 211.
- ¹⁸³ Gurtov, Melvin, *China and Southeast Asia, the Politics of Survival: a Study of Foreign Policy Interaction*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1974, pg. 102.
- ¹⁸⁴ Khan, Roedad, *The British Papers, Secret and Confidential India, Pakistan, Bangladesh Documents 1958-1969*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002, pg. 175.
- ¹⁸⁵ Ibid, pgs. 175-176, 200, 202.
- ¹⁸⁶ Nizamani, Haider K., *The Roots of Rhetoric, Politics of Nuclear Weapons in India and Pakistan*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, 2000, pg. 58.
- ¹⁸⁷ Kennedy, Charles H. and Rasul Bakshu Rais editors, *Pakistan: 1995*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1995, pg. 160.
- ¹⁸⁸ Severino, Rodolfo C., "Southeast Asia in Search of an Asean Community: Insights from the Former Asean Secretary-General", *Institute of Southeast Asian Studies*, Singapore, 2006, pg. 169.
- ¹⁸⁹ Smith, Hedrick, 1974, "Bhutto Rebuffed On Moscow Visit, Soviet Leaders Fail to Back Nuclear-Free Zone Plan", *The New York Times*, 27 October 1974, front pg., <http://www.nytimes.com> (15 Oct 2012).
- ¹⁹⁰ Busky, Donald F., *Communism in History and Theory: Asia, Africa, and the Americas*, Praeger, Westport, CT, 2002, pg. 54.
- ¹⁹¹ Shafqat, Saeed, *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: From Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Benazir Bhutto*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1997, pg. 104.
- ¹⁹² Ibid, pg. 105.
- ¹⁹³ Rizvi, Hasan-Askari, *Military, State and Society in Pakistan*, Macmillan, Houndmills, England, 2000, pg. 141.
- ¹⁹⁴ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 208.
- ¹⁹⁵ Bowman, John S., *Columbia Chronologies of Asian History and Culture*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2000, pg. 380.
- ¹⁹⁶ Dixit, J. N., *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*, Routledge, London, United Kingdom, 2002, pgs. 236-237.

¹⁹⁷ Oldenburg, Phillip, *India, Pakistan, and Democracy, Solving the Puzzle of Divergent Paths*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, New York, New York, 2010, pgs. 134-135.

¹⁹⁸ Nizamani, Haider K, *The Roots of Rhetoric: Politics of Nuclear Weapons in India and Pakistan*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT, 2000, pgs. 98-99.

¹⁹⁹ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2007, pg. 18.

²⁰⁰ Bhutto, Zulfikar, *The Myth of Independence*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 15 April 1969, pgs. 152-155.

²⁰¹ Esposito, John L., John O. Voll, *Islam and Democracy*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York, 1996, pg. 109.

²⁰² Ziring, Lawrence, *Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development*, WM Dawson and Sons, Folkestone, England, 1980, pgs. 128-131.

²⁰³ Ibid, pg. 206.

²⁰⁴ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 212.

²⁰⁵ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2007, pg. 21.

²⁰⁶ Ibid, pg. 20.

²⁰⁷ Ibid, pg. 12.

²⁰⁸ Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 212.

²⁰⁹ Ibid, pg. 216.

²¹⁰ Khan, Feroz Hassan, *Eating Grass, The Making Of The Pakistani Bomb*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA 2012, p 135. Cited as "Interview with Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, *The New York Times*, 10 October 1974"

²¹¹ Malik, Zahid, *Dr. A.Q. Kahn and the Islamic Bomb*, Hurmat Publications, Islamabad, Pakistan, 1992, pgs. 127-128.

²¹² Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 222.

²¹³ Ibid, pg. 224.

²¹⁴ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company Incorporated, New York, New York, 2008, pg. 21.

²¹⁵ Ibid, pgs. 26-27.

²¹⁶ Ibid, pg. 28.

²¹⁷ Ibid. pg. 17.

²¹⁸ Peimani, Hooman, *Nuclear Proliferation In The Indian Subcontinent, The Self-Exhausting 'Superpowers' and Emerging Alliances*, Praeger, Westport, CT, 2000, pgs. 15-16.

²¹⁹ No author cited, "Retracing Khan's Path", *Arms Control Today*, Vol. 34, No. 3, April 2004, pg. 9.

²²⁰ Corera, Gordon, *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*, Oxford University Press Incorporated, Oxford, UK, 2006, pgs. 5-8.

²²¹ Venter, Al J., *Allah's Bomb, The Islamic Quest For Nuclear Weapons*, The Lyons Press, Guilford, CT, 2007, pgs. 41-43.

²²² Ibid, pgs. 25-27.

²²³ Malik, Zahid, *Dr. A.Q. Khan and The Islamic Bomb*, Hurmat Publications Ltd, Islamabad, Pakistan, 1992, pgs. 55-56.

²²⁴ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2007, pg. 21.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Malik, Zahid, *Dr. A.Q. Khan and The Islamic Bomb*, Hurmat Publications Ltd, Islamabad, Pakistan, 1992, pg. 70.

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2007, pg. 38.

²³⁰ Venter, Al J., *Allah's Bomb, The Islamic Quest For Nuclear Weapons*, The Lyons Press, Guilford, CT, pg. 198.

²³¹ Cable, letter, and notes from Department of State, Office of the Under Secretary of State, dated October 4, 1978, Declassification Authority NND50947 on 5-7-2010, National Archives' Archival Research Catalog: <http://arcweb/archives.gov/> (10 Nov 2012).

²³² Ibid.

²³³ Schmidt, Fritz W., "The Zangger Committee: Its History and Future Role", *The Nonproliferation Review*, Fall 1994, pgs. 38-44, <http://www.zanggercommittee.org/documents/Monterey/1994.pdf> (10 Nov 2012).

²³⁴ Despres, John, "Monthly Warning Report", *National Intelligence Officer for Nuclear Proliferation, Interagency Intelligence Working Group on Nuclear Proliferation*, Director of Central Intelligence, 18 January 1979, Declassified and Approved for Release 2007/06/29 CIA-RDP83B01027R000300120032-0.

²³⁵ No Author, "Step Toward Pilotless War", *The Science News-Letter*, Volume 60, No. 12, 22 Sep 1951, pgs. 179-180.

²³⁶ Mindling, George and Robert Bolton, *U.S. Air Force Tactical Missiles 1949-1969 The Pioneers*, Lulu.com Publishing, Morrisville, North Carolina, 2008, Revised 2011, pg. 146.

Additional Matador Program information available at: U.S. Air Force Tactical Missiles on World Wide Web, <http://www.mace-b.com/38tmw/missiles/mace.html> (29 July 2012).

Information also available at the USAF National Museum of the Air Force: <http://www.nationalmuseum.af.mil/factsheets/factsheet.asp?id=378> , (12 August 2012).

²³⁷ Robert S Norris, William M. Arkin & William Burr , "Where They Were", *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Volume 55, Issue 6, November 1, 1999, pgs. 26-35, <http://www.archives.gov/pidb/meetings/where-they-were.pdf>, (21 Oct 2012).

²³⁸ Classified conversation between U.S. President George H. Bush and South Korea President Roh, 7/11/91 – 7/22/91, OA/ID Number 91109-001, FOIA/SYS Case # 2009-0275-S, Released in Part, Declassified 10/7/10, George Bush Library, <http://www.bushlibrarymuseum.gov> (29 July 2012).

²³⁹ U.S. Department of State, 21 Oct 1994, "Agreed Framework Between The United States of America And The Democratic People's Republic of Korea". Arms Control Association, <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/agreedframework>, (11 Nov 2012).

²⁴⁰ Pollack, Jonathan D., “The United States, North Korea, and the End of the Agreed Framework”, *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 56, No. 3, Summer 2003, pgs. 11-49, pg. 18.

²⁴¹ Ibid, pgs. 18-19.

²⁴² Nanto, Dick K. “North Korea: Chronology of Provocations, 1950-2003, Updated March 18, 2003”, *Congressional Research Service*, Library of Congress, pg. CRS-17.

²⁴³ Snyder, Scott, “Pyongyang’s Pressure”, *The Washington Quarterly*, Volume 23, Issue 3, June 01, 2000, pgs. 166-167.

²⁴⁴ Demick, Barbara, *Nothing To Envy, Ordinary Lives In North Korea*, Spiegel & Grau, New York, 2009, pg. 146.

Also found at: Flake, Gordon L. and Scott Snyder, *Paved With Good Intentions: The NGO Experience In North Korea*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT, 2004, pgs. 25-26.

²⁴⁵ Howard, Peter, “Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats, Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 48, Issue 4, December 2004, 804-828, pg. 820.

²⁴⁶ Gurtov, Mel, Peter Van Ness, *Confronting the Bush Doctrine: Critical Views from the Asia-Pacific*, Routledge, New York, 2004, pg. 42.

²⁴⁷ Corera, Gordon, *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, pg. 87.

²⁴⁸ ⁷²Ibid, pgs. 86-87.

²⁴⁹ Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark, *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*, Walker Publishing Company, New York, New York, 2007, pg. 248.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Rajain, Arpit, *Nuclear Deterrence In Southern Asia, China, India, Pakistan*, Sage Publications, London, England, pgs. 303-304.

²⁵² Corera, Gordon, *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, pgs. 136-137.

²⁵³ The Nuclear Files.Org, Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “Timeline of the 1990’s”, http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/timeline/timeline_decade.php?decade=1990 (10 Nov 2012).

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ United Nations, International Court of Justice, “Legality Of The Threat Or Use Of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, International Court of Justice Reports” 8 July 1996, p 226, website: <http://www.icj-cji.org/docket/files/95/7497.pdf>, (10 Nov 2012).

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ The Nuclear Files.Org, Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “Timeline of the 1990’s”, http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/timeline/timeline_decade.php?decade=1990 (10 Nov 2012).

²⁵⁸ MacIntyre, Sandy, “French Resume Nuclear Tests”, *The Seattle Times*, 6 September 1995, Seattle, Washington, Article from the Seattle Times Trinity website located at: <http://Seattletimes.com/special/trinty/supplement/france.html> (28 October 2012).

²⁵⁹ No Author, “First Subcritical Experiment Conducted at Nevada Test Site” history timeline of National Nuclear Security Administration, dated July 02, 1997, Nevada Test Site, NV, http://nnsa.energy.gov/about_us/our_history/nnsatimeline/firstsubcriticalexperimentconductedatnevadatestsite (10 Nov 2012).

Chapter Five – End Notes

²⁶⁰ Yesilbursa, Behcet Kemal, *The Baghdad Pact: Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959*, Frank Cass Publishing, London, 2005, pgs. 87, 101.

²⁶¹ Khan, Roedad, *The British Papers, Secret and Confidential India, Pakistan, Bangladesh Documents 1958-1969*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002, pg. 277 (paragraph 7).

²⁶² Ibid, pg. 271.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Ibid, pg. 276.

²⁶⁵ Ibid, pg. 277.

²⁶⁶ Ibid, pg. 363.

²⁶⁷ Ibid, pg. 461.

²⁶⁸ Gandhi, Sajit - editor, “The Tilt: The U.S. and the South Asian Crisis of 1971”, *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 79*, December 16, 2002, found at website: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB79/>, accessed 23 February 2013.

Declassified Document: Document 40, United States Embassy (Islamabad) Cable, Top Secret/ Exclusive Eyes Only, December 15, 1971, 1 pg.

Declassified In Accordance With Executive Order 12958 section 3.6, per 3.4(b)(1) greater than 25 years, NLN00-07/11, Department of State 5-5-2000, By: KMG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date: 3-14-2002, 1 pg..

NOTE 5: American military assistance was cutoff to Pakistan following the commencement of violence in East Pakistan. Then in early December 1971, when the conflict grew to an India-Pakistan war, aid to India was also suspended. See documents **23** and **29**. In the former, Kissinger acknowledges that American assistance to Pakistan is forbidden by Congress, whereas in the latter Harold Saunders observes that "by law," the U.S. "cannot authorize" any military transfers, including third party transfers, unless the administration was willing "to change our own policy and provide the equipment directly."

²⁶⁹ Gandhi, Sajit - Editor, "The Tilt: The U.S. and the South Asian Crisis of 1971", *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 79*, George Washington University, December 16, 2002, found at website: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB79/>, accessed 23 February 2013.

Declassified Document: Document 44, United States Embassy (Tehran), Cable, *F-5 Aircraft to Pakistan*, Secret, December 29, 1971, 3 pgs. Includes DOD cable, Source: Nixon Presidential Materials Project (NCMP), National Security Council Files, Indo-Pak War, Box 575.

²⁷⁰ Ibid, Document 42.

Declassified Document: Central Intelligence Agency, Intelligence Memorandum, *India-Pakistan Situation Report (As of 1200 EST)*, Top Secret, December 16, 1971, 6 pgs., Source: Nixon Presidential Materials Project (NCMP), May Release, Mandatory Declassification Review # 4.

Declassified In Accordance With Executive Order 12958 section 3.6, NLN00-07/8 per 3.4(b)(1)(6), By: KMG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date: 3-13-2002.

²⁷¹ Kux, Dennis, "*The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*", Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 199-203.

²⁷² Burr, William - Editor, "The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict, 1969: U.S. Reactions and Diplomatic Maneuvers", George Washington University, June 12, 2001, found at website: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB49/>, accessed 22 January 2013.

Declassified Document #1: U.S. Department of State, Director of Intelligence and Research, Intelligence Note - 139, "USSR/China: Soviet and Chinese Forces Clash on the Ussuri River", March 4, 1969, Secret/No Foreign Dissemination/Controlled Dissemination, Source: National Archives, Record Group 59, Department of State Records, Subject-Numeric Files 1967-69 [hereinafter cited as SN 67-69, with file location], Pol 32-1 Chicom-USSR.

Declassified by Authority NND 969000, By EG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date 1/17/1997.

²⁷³ Ibid, Document #4.

Declassified Document: #4, U.S. State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research: Intelligence Note, "Communist China: Peking Inflates Soviet War Threat", 3 June 1969, Secret/No Foreign Dissemination, Source: National Archives and Records Administration, SN 67-69, Pol Chicom-USSR.

²⁷⁴ Cann, Terry, Alan Jenkins, *The Geography of Contemporary China: The Impact of Deng Xiaoping's Decade*, Routledge, London, 1990, pg. 277.

²⁷⁵ Burr, William - Editor, *The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict, 1969: U.S. Reactions and Diplomatic Maneuvers*, George Washington University, June 12, 2001, found at website: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB49/>, accessed 22 January 2013.

Declassified Document #7: U.S. State Department, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Office of Asian Communist Affairs, "Implications of Sino-Soviet Developments: Meeting of June 21 and 23 June 1969, Secret, Source: National Archives, SN 67-69, Pol 32-1, Chicom-USSR.

Declassification Authority NND 969000, By EG, National Archives and Records Administration, 1/17/1997.

²⁷⁶ Kux, Dennis, "*The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*", Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington D.C., 2001, pg. 192

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ Syed, Anwar Hussain, *China & Pakistan: Diplomacy of an Entente Cordiale*, University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, MA, 1974, pgs. 117-118.

²⁷⁹ Nelson, W. M, A. J Finch, K. J Hart, *Conduct Disorders: A Practitioner's Guide to Comparative Treatments*, Springer, New York, New York, 2006, pg. 52

²⁸⁰ Klever, Phillip, "Multigenerational Stress and Nuclear Family Functioning", *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 27/2, June 2005, Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., pg. 233

²⁸¹ Nelson, W. M, A. J Finch and K. J Hart, "*Conduct Disorders: A Practitioner's Guide to Comparative Treatments*", Springer, New York, New York, 2006, pg. 52

²⁸² Snow, Robert L, *Deadly Cults: The Crimes of True Believers*, Praeger, Westport, CT, 2003, pgs. 167-168.

- ²⁸³ Norris, Robert S., William M. Arkin & William Burr, “Where They Were”, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Volume 55, Issue 6, November 1, 1999, pgs. 26-35, <http://www.archives.gov/pidb/meetings/where-they-were.pdf>, (21 Oct 2012).
- ²⁸⁴ Noland, Marcus, Sherman Robinson, Tao Wang, “Famine In North Korea: Causes and Cures”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 49, No. 4, July 2001, pgs. 741-767.
- ²⁸⁵ Bush, George W., “Bush Coins the Term ‘Axis of Evil’”, State of the Union Address, January 2002, located on Internet, YouTube, web link: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3DqHyIcsO8E>, accessed 3 March 2013.
- ²⁸⁶ Gonen, Jay Y., *The Roots of Nazi Psychology, Hitler’s Utopian Barbarism*, The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, 2000, pg. 13.
- ²⁸⁷ Malik, Iftikhar, *Pakistan, Democracy, Terrorism, and the Building Of A Nation*, Olive Branch Press, Northampton, MA, 2010, pgs. 34-35.
- ²⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁸⁹ Ibid, pgs. 138-140.
- ²⁹⁰ Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institutional Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 234-235.
- ²⁹¹ Grau, Lester W., “PAKISTAN: Eye of the Storm” by Owen Bennett Jones, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2002, as critiqued in *Military Review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, March/April, 2004.
- ²⁹² Taha, Siddiqui, “New UN Plan to Get Girls in School Boosted by Malala's Father”, *The Christian Science Monitor*, 1December, 2012, pg. number unavailable
- ²⁹³ Haqqani, Husain, *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*, The Brookings Institutional Press, Washington D.C., 2005, pg. 315.
- ²⁹⁴ Lee, Chong-Sik, Se-Hee Yoo, *North Korea in Transition*, Institute of East Asian Studies, Berkeley, CA, 1989, pg. 142.
- ²⁹⁵ Note: Declassified Document, Report from the GDR Embassy in the DPRK, “*Note concerning a Conversation in Moscow on 12 May, 1976, with the Head of the Far East Department, Comrade Kapitsa, and the Head of the Southeast Asia Department, Comrade Sudarikov.*”” May 27, 1976, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Political Archive of the Federal Foreign Office, Berlin (PolA AA), MfAA, C 6857. Translated for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114290> , accessed 11 March 2013.

²⁹⁶ Lee, Chong-Sik, Se-Hee Yoo, *North Korea in Transition*, Institute of East Asian Studies, Berkeley, CA, pg. 33 quoting “Nicholas D. Kristof, "Great Leader to Dear Leader," *New York Times Magazine*, August 20, 1989, pgs. 45.

²⁹⁷ Menke, Martin, “Thy Will Be Done: German Catholics and National Identity in the Twentieth Century”, *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2, CUA Press, April 2005.

²⁹⁸ Lee, Julie, Charles M. Super and Sara Harkness, “Self-Perception of Competence in Korean Children: Age, Sex and Home Influences”, *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 6, 2003, pgs. 133-147, pg. 145.

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

³⁰¹ Park, Nansook, “Life Satisfaction Among Korean Children and Youth: A Developmental Perspective”, *School Psychology International*, Volume 26, Issue 2, May 2005, pgs. 209-233, pg. 218.

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Sung, Helen Y., “The Influence of Culture on Parenting Practices of East Asian Families and Emotional Intelligence of Older Adolescents”, *School Psychology International*, Volume 31, Issue 2, April 2010, p. 199-214, pg. 210.

³⁰⁵ Moazam, Farhat, “Families, Patients, and Physicians in Medical Decision-making: A Pakistani Perspective”, *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 30, No. 6, November 2000, pg. 28.

³⁰⁶ Central Intelligence Agency, World Fact Book, website located at: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html> , accessed 24 Jan 2013.

³⁰⁷ Yazbeck, Yvonne, Adair T. Lummis, *Islamic Values in the United States: A Comparative Study*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1987, pg. 134.

³⁰⁸ Moazam, Farhat, “Families, Patients, and Physicians in Medical Decision-making: A Pakistani Perspective”, *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 30, No. 6, November 2000, pg. 28.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

³¹⁰ Ibid. Note: Author is citing R. M. Zaman, "The Adaptation of Western Psychotherapeutic Methods to Muslim Societies," *World Psychology* 3, 1997, pgs. 65-87.

Chapter Six – End Notes

- ³¹¹ Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations, The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Edition, Revised, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978, pgs. 4-15.
- ³¹² Morgenthau, Hans J. “*Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*”, University of Chicago Press, 1946, Chicago, IL, p. 43 as quoted in: Griffiths, Martin, “Realism, Idealism, and International Politics: A Reinterpretation”, Routledge, New York, 1994, pg. 37.
- ³¹³ Remarque, Erich Maria *All Quiet on the Western Front*, Little Brown, Boston, MA, 1929, pgs. 206-209.
- ³¹⁴ Lamb, Michael E, Brian Sutton-Smith, *Sibling Relationships: Their Nature and Significance across the Lifespan*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 1982, pgs. 236-238.
- ³¹⁵ Jackson, Jay M., *Social Psychology, Past and Present, An Integrative Orientation*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 1988, pg. 33.
- ³¹⁶ Keohane, Robert O., *Neorealism and Its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1986, pg. 4.
- ³¹⁷ Dunne, Tim, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford University Press, New York, New York, 2007, pgs. 288-307.
- ³¹⁸ Sen, Amartya, *Development As Freedom*, Anchor Books, New York, New York, 2000, pgs. 40-41.
- ³¹⁹ Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations, The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Edition, Revised, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978, pgs. 4-15.
- ³²⁰ Viotti, Paul R., Mark V. Kauppi, *International Relations Theory, Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond*, Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA, 1999, pgs. 1-22.
- ³²¹ Bechtel, William, *Philosophy of Science: An Overview for Cognitive Science*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 1988, pgs. 61-63.
- ³²² Neumann, Iver B. and Ole Waever, John Vincent and the English School of International Relations, in “*The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?*”, Routledge Publishers, London, UK, 1997, pg. 42.
- ³²³ Rengger, N. J., *International Relations, Political Theory, and the Problem of Order: Beyond International Relations Theory?*, Routledge, London, UK, 2000, pgs. 13-15.

³²⁴ Sagan, Scott D., Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons, A Debate Renewed*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, New York, 2003, pgs. 3-45.

³²⁵ Keohane, Robert O., *Neorealism and Its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, New York, 1986, pg. 18

³²⁶ Ibid, pg. 11.

³²⁷ Kratochwil, Fredrich, “Constructing a New Orthodoxy? Wendt's 'Social Theory of International Politics' and the Constructivist Challenge”, *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, volume 29, no. 1, 2000, pgs. 73-101.

³²⁸ Keohane, Robert O., *Institutions, Law and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, Routledge Publishers, New York, New York, 2002, pg. 1.

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ No author, “Pakistan Profile - Chronology of Key Events”, *BBC News - South Asia*, 18 April 2013, accessed at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-12966786?print=true> , last accessed 21 April 2013.

³³¹ Almond, Paul, Michael Apted, Directors, “The Up Series!”, documentary, Granada Television, Episodes 1-8, first aired 5 May 1964, available electronically at: <http://amazon.com/instantvideo>, Episode 1, “Seven Up”, accessed 5 Jan 2013.

³³² Nasir, Ayesha, “Murder in Islamabad: Pakistan's Deepening Religious Divide”, *Time Magazine*, Tuesday, Jan. 04, 2011, Lahore, Pakistan, found on: <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2040735,00.html#> , accessed on 6 April 2013.

³³³ Unknown reporter, “Pakistani Shias Demand Special Parliamentary Session on Quetta Killings”, *The Islam Times*, 24 Feb 2013, accessed at: <http://www.islamtimes.org/prtgqx9x3ak9tx4.5jra.html>, 7 April 2013.

³³⁴ Keohane, Robert O., *Neorealism and Its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1986, pgs. 21-22.

Bibliography

- 6937th Communications Group Alumni Website, Air Force Security Service, Peshawar Air Station, Pakistan, <http://6937th.50megs.com/> (accessed 25 March 2012).
- Ahmad, Aftab, Arvind K. Jain, ed. "Historical Antecedents of Corruption in Pakistan." *The Political Economy of Corruption*. New York, New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Ahmed, Akbar S., *Resistance and Control in Pakistan*. New York, New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Ali, Tariq. *The Duel, Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*. New York, New York: Simon and Schuster, Incorporated, 2008.
- Almond, Paul, Michael Apted, Directors. *The Up Series!* Granada Television. Episodes 1-8 first aired 5 May 1964. Episode 1, "Seven Up". <http://amazon.com/instantvideo>, (accessed 5 Jan 2013.)
- Arnett, Eric. *Military Capacity and the Risk of War, China, India, Pakistan, and Iran*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Banuazizi, Ali, Myron Weiner. *The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Bastelson, Jens. "The Social Construction of Globality." *International Political Sociology*. Volume 4, Issue 3, (1 September 2010): 219–235.
- Baster, Craig, Yogendra K Malik, Charles H Kennedy, and Robert C. Oberst. *Government And Politics In South Asia*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1998.
- BBC reporter. *Interview of Pakistan Air Force Pilot in 1965 Pakistan-India War*. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PFH1zP69n9c> (accessed 27 Jan 2012).
- Bechtel, William. *Philosophy of Science: An Overview for Cognitive Science*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- Behera, Navnita Chadha. *Demystifying Kashmir*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2006.
- Bhargava, Rajeev. "India." *Dissent*, Volume 56, Issue 1, (Winter 2009): 40-43.
- Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali. *The Myth of Independence*. London, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Bluth, Christoph. *Korea, Hot Spots In Global Politics*. Malden, Massachusetts: Polity Press, 2008.

Bowman, John S. *Columbia Chronologies of Asian History and Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Burki, Shahid Javed. *Pakistan: Fifty Years of Nationhood*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1999.

Burr, William. *The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict, 1969: U.S. Reactions and Diplomatic Maneuvers*. June 12, 2001. <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB49/> (accessed 22 January 2013).

---Declassified Document #1: U.S. Department of State, Director of Intelligence and Research, Intelligence Note – 139. “USSR/China: Soviet and Chinese Forces Clash on the Ussuri River”, March 4, 1969. Secret/No Foreign Dissemination/Controlled Dissemination. Source: National Archives, Record Group 59, Department of State Records, Subject-Numeric Files 1967-69 [hereinafter cited as SN 67-69, with file location], Pol 32-1 Chicom-USSR.

Note: Declassified by Authority NND 969000. By EG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date 1/17/1997.

---Ibid, Declassified Document #4. U.S. State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research: Intelligence Note, “Communist China: Peking Inflates Soviet War Threat”, 3 June 1969. Secret/No Foreign Dissemination. Source: National Archives and Records Administration, SN 67-69, Pol Chicom-USSR.

Note: Declassified by Authority NND 969000. By EG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date 1/17/1997.

---Ibid, Declassified Document #7: U.S. State Department, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs. Office of Asian Communist Affairs. “Implications of Sino-Soviet Developments: Meeting of June 21 and 23 June 1969. Secret, Source: National Archives, SN 67-69, Pol 32-1, Chicom-USSR.

Note: Declassification Authority NND 969000. By EG, National Archives and Records Administration, 1/17/1997.

Bush, George H. Classified conversation between U.S. President George H. Bush and South Korea President Roh, 7/11/91 – 7/22/91. OA/ID Number 91109-001. FOIA/SYS Case # 2009-0275-S. Released in Part, Declassified 10/7/10. George Bush Library. <http://www.bushlibrarymuseum.gov> (accessed 29 July 2012).

Bush, George W., “Bush Coins the Term ‘Axis of Evil.’” *State of the Union Address*, January 2002, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3DqHyIcsO8E> (accessed 3 March 2013).

Busky, Donald F. *Communism in History and Theory: Asia, Africa, and the Americas*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2002.

- Callard, Keith. *Pakistan - A Political Study*. London, United Kingdom: Allen and Unwin, 1957.
- Cann, Terry, Alan Jenkins. *The Geography of Contemporary China: The Impact of Deng Xiaoping's Decade*. London: Routledge, London, 1990.
- Caprio, Mark E.. *Japanese Assimilation Policies In Colonial Korea 1910-1945*. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2009.
- Center for Global Development. "Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009." <http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/active/pakistan/numbers> (accessed 5 January 2012).
- Central Intelligence Agency, World Fact Book. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html> (accessed 24 Jan 2013).
- Chanlett-Avery, Emma. "North Korea's Abduction of Japanese Citizens and the Six-Party Talks." *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, 19 March 2008.
- Chol, Ryo Sung. *Korea, The 38th Parallel North*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of the Pacific, 2004.
- Cirincione, Joseph. "Asian Nuclear Reaction Chain." *Foreign Policy*. (Spring 2000).
- Cohen, Richard, editor. "The Soviets' Vietnam." *The Washington Post*. Editorial, 22 April 1988, pg. 22a.
- Corera, Gordon. *Shopping For Bombs, Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Dasgupta, C.. *War and Diplomacy in Kashmir 1947-1948*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Incorporated, 2002.
- Demchak, Chris, Chris Werner. "Exploring the Knowledge Nexus, India's Path in Terrorism-Driven Institutional Growth", *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, (Winter 2007): 58-97.
- Demick, Barbara. *Nothing To Envy, Ordinary Lives In North Korea*. New York: Spiegel & Grau, 2009.
- Despres, John. Declassified and Approved for Release 2007/06/29 CIA-RDP83B01027R000300120032-0. "Monthly Warning Report." *National Intelligence Officer for Nuclear Proliferation, Interagency Intelligence Working Group on Nuclear Proliferation*. Director of Central Intelligence, 18 January 1979.
- Dixit, J. N.. *India-Pakistan in War & Peace*. London, England: Routledge, 2002.

Dunne, Tim, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Dvorchak, Robert J. *Battle for Korea: A History of the Korean Conflict*. Conshohocken, Pennsylvania: Combined Publishing, 1993.

Eberstadt, Nicholas. *Policy and Economic Performance in Divided Korea during the Cold War Era: 1945-1991*. Washington D.C.: The AEI Press, 2010.

Elbaradei, Mohamed. *The Age of Deception, Nuclear Diplomacy In Treacherous Times*. New York, New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company LLC, 2011.

Elias, Barbara Elias – ed. “Pakistan: The Taliban’s Godfather.” *National Security Archives Electronic Briefing Book No. 227*:

Document #10 Declassified: Sep 2004. “DI TR 96-008, Central Intelligence Agency, “Harakat ul-Ansar: Increasing Threat to Western and Pakistani Interests,” August 1996, SECRET, 4 pgs. [Excised]. Posted August 14, 2007
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm> (accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #11 Declassified: Sep 2004. “NID (National Intelligence Daily - Author’s note.) 96-0229CX. Central Intelligence Agency. Monday, September 30, 1996, TOP SECRET, 5 pgs. [Excised]. Posted August 14, 2007.
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm>, (accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #15 Declassified: Sep 2004, “From [Excised] to DIA (Defense Intelligence Agency - Author’s note.) Washington D.C. [Excised], Cable “[Excised]/Pakistan Interservices Intelligence/Pakistan (PK) Directorate Supplying the Taliban Forces”, October 22, 1996, SECRET, 1 p. [Excised].
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.html>, Posted August 14, 2007. (accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #17 Declassified: Sep 2004. “From [Excised] to DIA (author’s note Defense Intelligence Agency.) ‘IIR [Excised] Pakistan Involvement in Afghanistan’ November 7, 1996, Confidential, 2 pgs. [Excised].
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm> Posted August 14, 2007. (accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #18 Declassified: Sep 2004. “Islama 09517 U.S. Embassy (Islamabad) Cable, ‘Afghanistan: Taliban Deny they Are Sheltering HUA Militants, Usama bin Laden,’ November 12, 1996, Confidential, 7 pgs.”.
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm> Posted August 14, 2007. (accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #24 Declassified: Sep 2004. “Islama 007343 U.S. Embassy (Islamabad), Cable, ‘Afghanistan: [Excised] Briefs Ambassador on his Activities. Pleads for Greater

Activism by U.N.' August 27, 1997, Confidential, 5 pgs. [Excised].
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm> Posted August 14, 2007.
(accessed 30 December 2012).

Document #34 Declassified: Sep 2004. "State 185645 U.S. Department of State, Cable, 'Pakistan Support for Taliban.' September 26, 2000, Secret, 4 pgs. [Excised].
<http://www.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB227/index.htm> Posted August 14, 2007.
(accessed 30 December 2012).

Erdoes, Richard, Alfonso Ortiz. *American Indian Myths and Legends*, New York, New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Esposito, John L., John O. Voll. *Islam and Democracy*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Faruqi, Ahmad. *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan*. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003.

Federation of American Scientists. *U-2 SENIOR YEAR / AQUATONE / U-2 / TR-1 Overview*.
<http://www.fas.org/programs/spp/man/uswpns/air/special/u2.html> (accessed 5 Feb 2012).

Fehrenbach, T.R. *This Kind of War: The Classic Korean War History – Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*. Dulles, Virginia: Brassey's, 2001.

Fitzpatrick, Mark. *The Iranian Nuclear Crisis, Avoiding Worst-Case Outcomes*. New York, New York: Routledge, 2008.

Gandhi, Sajit. "The Tilt: The U.S. and the South Asian Crisis of 1971", *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 79*, December 16, 2002,
<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB79/> , (accessed 23 February 2013).

---Declassified Document # 40. United States Embassy (Islamabad) Cable. Top Secret/ Exclusive Eyes Only. December 15, 1971, 1 pg.

Declassified In Accordance With Executive Order 12958 section 3.6, per 3.4(b)(1) greater than 25 years, NLN00-07/11. Department of State 5-5-2000. By: KMG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date: 3-14-2002, 1 pg..

¶

¶ NOTE 5: American military assistance was cutoff to Pakistan following the commencement of violence in East Pakistan. Then in early December 1971, when the conflict grew to an India-Pakistan war, aid to India was also suspended. See documents [23](#) and [29](#). In the former, Kissinger acknowledges that American assistance to Pakistan is forbidden by Congress, whereas in the latter Harold Saunders observes that "by law," the U.S. "cannot authorize" any military transfers, including third party transfers, unless the

administration was willing "to change our own policy and provide the equipment directly."

---Declassified Document 42. Central Intelligence Agency. Intelligence Memorandum, *India-Pakistan Situation Report (As of 1200 EST)*. Top Secret. December 16, 1971, 6 pgs., Source: Nixon Presidential Materials Project (NCMP), May Release, Mandatory Declassification Review # 4.

Declassified In Accordance With Executive Order 12958 section 3.6, NLN00-07/8 per 3.4(b)(1)(6), By: KMG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date: 3-13-2002.

---Declassified Document # 44. United States Embassy (Tehran), Cable. *F-5 Aircraft to Pakistan*. Secret. December 29, 1971. 3 pgs. Includes DOD cable, Source: Nixon Presidential Materials Project (NCMP), National Security Council Files, Indo-Pak War, Box 575.

Declassified In Accordance With Executive Order 12958 section 3.6, NLN00-07/8 per 3.4(b)(1)(6), By: KMG, National Archives and Records Administration, Date: 3-13-2002.

Ganguly, Sumit. *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions Since 1947*. New York City, New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

German Democratic Republic. Declassified Document, Report from the GDR Embassy in the DPRK. "Note concerning a Conversation in Moscow on 12 May, 1976, with the Head of the Far East Department, Comrade Kapitsa, and the Head of the Southeast Asia Department, Comrade Sudarikov." May 27, 1976. History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Political Archive of the Federal Foreign Office, Berlin (PolA AA), MfAA, C 6857. Translated for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114290>. (accessed 11 March 2013).

Global Terrorism Database. National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). Center of Excellence of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Copyright 2009-2010. <http://www.start.umd.edu> (accessed 1/16/2011).

Gonen, Jay Y.. *The Roots of Nazi Psychology, Hitler's Utopian Barbarism*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Gordon, Philip H., John Lewis Graddis, Ernest R. May, and Jonathan Rosenberg, eds. *Cold War Statesmen Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy since 1945*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Grau, Lester W.. Review of *PAKISTAN: Eye of the Storm*, by Owen Bennett Jones. *Military Review*, Volume 84, No. 2, (March/April, 2004) 75.

- Gregory, Shaun. "The ISI and the War on Terrorism." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*. Volume 30, Number 12, (October 26, 2007): 1013-1031.
- Griffiths, Martin, *Realism, Idealism, and International Politics: A Reinterpretation*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Grimmett, Richard F.. "U.S. Arms Sales to Pakistan, 24 August 2009." *Congressional Research Service*. Report # RS22757. <http://www.crs.gov> (accessed 26 March 2012).
- Gucker, Corinna Jenkins, Kimberly Updegraff, "The Relative Contributions of Parents and Siblings to Child and Adolescent Development." *Siblings as Agents of Socialization*, Laurie Kramer, Katherine J. Conger, Editors, *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. Number 126, (Winter 2009): 13-28.
- Gurtov, Melvin. *China and Southeast Asia, the Politics of Survival: a Study of Foreign Policy Interaction*. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Gurtov, Melvin, Peter Van Ness. *Confronting the Bush Doctrine: Critical Views from the Asia-Pacific*, New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Hagerty, Devin T., *The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation, Lessons from South Asia*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.
- Hallinan, Conn. *The Model for Iraq was Ireland, 1692, Divide and Conquer as Imperial Rules*, Center for Research on Globalization. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=4869> (accessed 24 Feb 2012).
- Haqqani, Husain. *Pakistan, Between Mosque and Military*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institutional Press, 2005.
- Horowitz, Shale, Deepti Sharma. "Democracies Fighting Ethnic Insurgencies: Evidence from India." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Volume 31, Number 8, (2008): 749-773.
- Howard, Peter. "Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats, Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy." *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 48, Issue 4, (December 2004): 804-828.
- Hwang, Kyung Moon. *A History of Korea*. New York, New York: St. Martins Press, 2010.
- Hymans, Jacques, E. C.. *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation, Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Jackson, Jay M.. *Social Psychology, Past and Present, An Integrative Orientation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.

- Jackson, Roy. *Mawlana Mawdudi & Political Islam, Authority and the Islamic State*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Jahan, Rounaq. *Pakistan: Failure in National Integration*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Jalal, Ayesha. *The State of Martial Rule, The Origins of Pakistan's Political Economy of Defence*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Jervis, Robert. *The Illogic of American Nuclear Strategy*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Jones, Owen Bennett. *Pakistan, Eye of the Storm*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Kanti, Bajpai. "The BJP and the Bomb." in *Inside Nuclear South Asia*. Ed. Scott D. Sagan, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Kapur, S. Paul, Sumit Ganguly and William R. Thompson, eds. "Peace and Conflict in the Indo-Pakistani Rivalry: Domestic and Strategic Causes". *Asian Rivalries: Conflict, Escalation, and Limitations on Two-Level Games*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Security Series, 2011.
- Kapur, S. Paul. *Dangerous Deterrent, Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- "Ten Years of Nuclear Instability in a Nuclear South Asia." *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 2, (Fall, 2008): 71-94.
- Keay, John. *India, A History*. New York, New York: Grove Press, 2013.
- Kennedy, Charles H., Rasul Bakshu Rais eds. *Pakistan: 1995*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1995.
- Keohane, Robert O., *Neorealism and Its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Keohane, Robert O., *Institutions, Law and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, New York, New York: Routledge Publishers, 2002.
- Kerry, John. *Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009*. S. 1707--111th Congress. <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/111/s962> (accessed January 6, 2013).
- Khan, Fazal Muqeem. *The Story of the Pakistan Army*. Lahore, Pakistan: Oxford University Press, 1963.

- Khan, Feroz Hassan. *Eating Grass, The Making Of The Pakistani Bomb*. Stanford, Connecticut: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- Khan, Jehangir. "US-Pakistan Relations: the Geo-strategic and Geopolitical Factors/relations Americano-pakistanaises la Geostrategie et Des Facteurs Geopolitiques." *Canadian Social Science*. Volume 6, Issue: 2, (2010): 61-79.
- Khan, Roedad. *The British Papers, Secret and Confidential India, Pakistan, Bangladesh Documents 1958-1969*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Khan, Saira. *Nuclear Proliferation Dynamics In Protracted Conflict Regions, A Comparative Study of South Asia and the Middle East*. Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002.
- Kim, Byung-Yeon, Suk Jin Kim, and Keun Lee. "Assessing the Economic Performance of North Korea, 1954-1989: Estimates and Growth Accounting Analysis." *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 35, (2007): 564-582.
- Klever, Phillip. "Multigenerational Stress and Nuclear Family Functioning." *Contemporary Family Therapy* 27/2, (June 2005), 233-250.
- "Korea on the Front Lines: Running." The History Channel. A&E Television Networks. <http://www.History.com/Shop #74114> Copyright 2008.
- Korson, J. Henry. *Contemporary Problems of Pakistan*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.
- Kratochwil, Fredrich. "Constructing a New Orthodoxy? Wendt's 'Social Theory of International Politics' and the Constructivist Challenge." *Millennium Journal of International Studies*. Volume 29 no. 1. (2000): 73-101.
- Kristof, Nicholas D. "Great Leader to Dear Leader." *New York Times Magazine*, August 20, 1989, 45. <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/08/20/magazine/great-leader-to-dear-leader.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm> (accessed 20 July 2013).
- Kux, Dennis. *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000, Disenchanted Allies*. Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001.
- Lamb, Michael E, Brian Sutton-Smith. *Sibling Relationships: Their Nature and Significance across the Lifespan*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1982.
- LaPorte, Jr., Robert. "Pakistan in 1971: The Disintegration of a Nation", *Asian Survey*, Volume 12, No. 2, (February, 1972): 97-108.
- LeBon, Gustave. *The French Revolution and the Psychology of Revolution*. New Brunswick, CT: Transaction Books, 1980.

- Lee, Chong-Sik, Se-Hee Yoo. *North Korea in Transition*, Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1989.
- Lee, Julie, Charles M. Super and Sara Harkness. "Self-Perception of Competence in Korean Children: Age, Sex and Home Influences." *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 6, (2003): 133-147.
- Levy, Adrian, Catherine Scott-Clark. *Nuclear Deception, The Dangerous Relationship Between the United States and Pakistan*. New York, New York: Walker Publishing Company, 2007.
- MACE-B Organization.
<http://www.mace-b.com/38tmw/missiles/mace.html> (accessed 29 July 2012).
- MacIntyre, Sandy. "French Resume Nuclear Tests." *The Seattle Times*. 6 September 1995.
<http://Seattletimes.com/special/trinty/supplement/france.html> (accessed 28 October 2012).
- Malik, Iftikhar. *Pakistan, Democracy, Terrorism, and the Building Of A Nation*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2010.
- Malik, Iftikhar H.. *The History of Pakistan*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2008.
- Malik, Zahid. *Dr. A.Q. Khan and The Islamic Bomb*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Hurmat Publications Ltd, 1992.
- Martin, Bradley K.. *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader, North Korea and the Kim Dynasty*. St. Martins Griffin, New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2006.
- Marwah, Onkar. "India's Military Intervention in East Pakistan, 1971-1972." *Modern Asian Studies*, Volume 13, No. 4, (1979): 549-580.
- Menke, Martin. "Thy Will Be Done: German Catholics and National Identity in the Twentieth Century." *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2, (April 2005): 300-320.
- Metcalf, Barbara; Thomas R. Metcalf. *A Concise History of Modern India (Cambridge Concise Histories)*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Mindling, George, Robert Bolton. *U.S. Air Force Tactical Missiles 1949-1969 The Pioneers*, Morrisville, North Carolina: Lulu.com Publishing, 2011.
- Minnett, Ann M., Deborah Lowe Vandell, and John W. Santrock. "The Effects of Sibling Status on Sibling Interaction: Influence of Birth Order, Age Spacing, Sex of Child, and Sex of Sibling." *Child Development*, Vol. 54, No. 4, (August 1983): 1064-1072.
- Moazam, Farhat. "Families, Patients, and Physicians in Medical Decision-making: A Pakistani Perspective." *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 30, No. 6, (November 2000): 28.

- Morgenthau, Hans J.. *Politics Among Nations, The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Fifth Edition, Revised. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. “*Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*”, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Musarrat, Razia, Ghulam Ali, and Muhammad Salman Azhar. “18th Amendment and Its Impacts on Pakistan's Politics.” *Journal of Sociological Research*, Vol. 3, No. 1, (December 2012): 1-7.
- Musharraf, Pervez. *In The Line Of Fire, A Memoir*. New York, New York: Free Press-Division of Simon and Schuster, Inc., 2006.
- Nanto, Dick K. “North Korea: Chronology of Provocations, 1950-2003.” *Congressional Research Service*. (Updated March 18, 2003): 1-29.
<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL30004.pdf> (accessed 26 July 2013).
- Naqvi, Tahir. “Migration, Sacrifice and the Crisis of Muslim Nationalism.” *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Volume 25, No. 3, (25 June 2012): 479-490.
- Nasir, Ayesha, “Murder in Islamabad: Pakistan's Deepening Religious Divide”, *Time Magazine*, Tuesday, Jan. 04, 2011. Lahore, Pakistan.
<http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2040735,00.html#> , (accessed 6 April 2013).
- National Museum of the Air Force.
<http://www.nationalmuseum.af.mil/factsheets/factsheet.asp?id=378> (accessed 12 August 2012).
- Nazeer, Mian M., “Urban Growth in Pakistan.” *Asian Survey*, Volume 6, Number 6, (1966): 310-318.
- Nizamani, Haider K. *The Roots of Rhetoric, Politics of Nuclear Weapons in India and Pakistan*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2000.
- Nelson, W. M, A. J Finch and K. J Hart. “*Conduct Disorders: A Practitioner's Guide to Comparative Treatments*.” New York, New York: Springer, 2006.
- Neumann, Iver B., Ole Wæver, John Vincent and the English School of International Relations. “*The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?*” London, UK: Routledge Publishers, 1997.
- Noland, Marcus, Sherman Robinson, and Tao Wang. “Famine In North Korea: Causes and Cures.” *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (July 2001): 741-767.

- Norris, Robert S., William M. Arkin, and William Burr. "Where They Were." *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* Volume 55, Issue 6 (November 1, 1999): 26-35.
<http://www.archives.gov/pidb/meetings/where-they-were.pdf>, (accessed 21 Oct 2012).
- Nuclear Files Org. Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. "Timeline of the 1990's."
http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/timeline/timeline_decade.php?decade=1990
 (accessed 10 Nov 2012).
- Nuclear Security Administration. "First Subcritical Experiment Conducted at Nevada Test Site." July 02, 1997. NV: Nevada Test Site. <http://nnsa.energy.gov/about us/our history/nnsatimeline/firstsubcriticalexperimenconductedatnevadatestsite>
 (accessed 10 Nov 2012)
- Oldenburg, Phillip. *India, Pakistan, and Democracy, Solving the Puzzle of Divergent Paths*. New York, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2010.
- O'Neill, Philip, Jr., *Verification in an Age of Insecurity, The Future of Arms Control Compliance*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- "Pakistan Profile - Chronology of Key Events." *BBC News - South Asia*. 18 April 2013.
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-12966786?print=true>. (accessed 21 April 2013).
- "Pakistani Shias Demand Special Parliamentary Session on Quetta Killings." *The Islam Times*. 24 Feb 2013. <http://www.islamtimes.org/prtgqx9x3ak9tx4.5jra.html>, (accessed 7 April 2013).
- "Pakistan to Extend Political Reforms to FATA, 15 August 2011." National Democratic Institute <http://www.ndi.org> (accessed 5 January 2012).
- Park, Nansook. "Life Satisfaction Among Korean Children and Youth: A Developmental Perspective." *School Psychology International*, Volume 26, Issue 2, (May 2005): 209-233.
- Peimani, Hooman. *Nuclear Proliferation In The Indian Subcontinent, The Self-Exhausting 'Superpowers' and Emerging Alliances*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2000.
- Pepitone, Emmy A., *Children In Cooperation and Competition*. Lexington, Massachusetts, D.C. Heath and Company, 1980.
- Perkovich, George, Peter Gizewski. *India's Nuclear Bomb, The Impact of Global Proliferation*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002, pgs. 404-418.
- Pollack, Jonathan D.. "The United States, North Korea, and the End of the Agreed Framework." *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 56, No. 3, (Summer 2003): 11-49.

- “President Obama’s Requests for \$83.4 Billion for War” “*Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Newsletter*”, Volume 4, Number 12, (April 10, 2009).
- Raghavan, Srinath. *War and Peace in Modern India*. New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan Publishers Limited, 2010.
- Rajain, Arpit. *Nuclear Deterrence In Southern Asia, China, India, Pakistan*. London, England: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Remarque, Erich Maria. *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1929.
- Rengger, N. J. *International Relations, Political Theory, and the Problem of Order: Beyond International Relations Theory?* London, UK: Routledge, 2000.
- “Retracing Khan's Path.” *Arms Control Today*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (April 2004): 9.
- Rizvi, Hasan-Askari. *Military, State, and Society in Pakistan*. Houndmills, England: Macmillan, 2000.
- Rosen, George. *Western Economists and Eastern Societies: Agents of Change in South Asia, 1950-1970*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Sagan, Scott D., Kenneth N. Waltz. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons, A Debate Renewed*. New York, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Schmidt, Fritz W. “The Zangger Committee: Its History and Future Role.” *The Nonproliferation Review*. (Fall 1994): 38-44.
<http://www.zanggercommittee.org/documents/Monterey/1994.pdf> (accessed 10 Nov 2012).
- Schneider, Ann, Mara Sidney. “What Is Next for Policy Design & Social Construction Theory?” *The Policy Studies Journal*, Volume 37, Number 1, (23 Feb 2009): 103-119.
- Sen, Amartya. *Development As Freedom*. New York, New York: Anchor Books, 2000.
- Seth, Michael J.. *A History of Korea, From Antiquity to the Present*. Lanham, Maryland, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011.
- Severino, Rodolfo C. *Southeast Asia in Search of an Asean Community: Insights from the Former Asean Secretary-General*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies Publishing. 2006.
- Shafqat, Saeed. *Civil-Military Relations in Pakistan: From Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Benazir Bhutto*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997.
- Shah, Mansoor. *The Gold Bird, Pakistan and its Air Force – Observations of a Pilot*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Shahid Javed Burki. *Pakistan: Fifty Years of Nationhood*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1999.
- Shinmun, Dongrip. "41 Years, Is the United Nations in a Recurring Theme in North Korea's International Crime?" *Independent News*. 06-18-2010.
<http://www.independent.co.kr/news/article.html?no=42329english> (accessed 14 Feb 2011).
- Siddiqu, Osama. *The Other Pakistan: Special Laws, Diminished Citizenship and the Gathering Storm*. Lahore, Pakistan: Lahore University Management Sciences, 5 Dec 2012.
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2185535> (accessed 5 Jan 2013).
- Sisson, Richard, Leo E. Rose. *War and Succession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1990.
- Smith, Hedrick. "Bhutto Rebuffed On Moscow Visit, Soviet Leaders Fail to Back Nuclear-Free Zone Plan." *The New York Times*, 27 October 1974, front page.
<http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed 15 Oct 2012).
- Snow, Robert L. *Deadly Cults: The Crimes of True Believers*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.
- Snyder, Scott. "Pyongyang's Pressure." *The Washington Quarterly*, Volume 23, Issue 3 (June 1, 2000): 163-170.
- Sohail, K.,. *Prophets of Violence, Prophets of Peace: Understanding the Roots of Contemporary Political Violence*. Toronto, Canada: White Knight Publications, 2005.
- "Step Toward Pilotless War." *The Science News-Letter*, Volume 60, No. 12, (22 Sep 1951): 179-180.
- Stephens, Ian. *Pakistan*. New York, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1963.
- Sung, Helen Y. "The Influence of Culture on Parenting Practices of East Asian Families and Emotional Intelligence of Older Adolescents." *School Psychology International*, Volume 31, Issue 2, (April 2010): 199-214.
- Syed, Anwar Hussain. *China & Pakistan: Diplomacy of an Entente Cordiale*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974.
- United Nations, International Court of Justice. "Legality Of The Threat Or Use Of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, International Court of Justice Reports." 8 July 1996.
<http://www.icj-cji.org/docket/files/95/7497> (accessed 10 Nov 2012).
- Taha, Siddiqui. "New UN Plan to Get Girls in School Boosted by Malala's Father." *The Christian Science Monitor*. 1 December, 2012.

- Takahara, Kanako. "Abductees' Multinational Kin Unite." *The Japan Times*. (English addition), 22 Dec 2005. <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/print/nn20051222a8.html> (accessed 21 Feb 2008).
- Tan, Tai Yong, Gyanesh Kudaisya. *The Aftermath of Partition in South Asia*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Taylor, Paul D. "India and Pakistan: Thinking about the Unthinkable." *Naval War College Review*, Volume: 54, Issue: 3 (2001): 40-51.
- Thomas, Raju G.C. editor, Gowher Rizvi, "India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Problem, 1947-1972." *Perspectives On Kashmir, The Roots of Conflict in South Asia*. Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1992.
- Thomas, Raju G. C. "India's Security Environment: Towards The Year 2000." *Strategic Studies Institute*, (July 29, 1996): 1-33. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=118> (accessed 1/26/2012).
- Topping, Seymour. "China Tests Atomic Bomb, Asks Summit Talk On Ban; Johnson Minimizes Peril." *New York Times*, 16 October 1964, <http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/1016.html#article> (accessed 11/3/2012).
- Trahair, Richard C.S.. *Encyclopedia of Cold War Espionage, Spies, and Secret Operations*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2004.
- U.S. Department of State. "Agreed Framework Between The United States of America And The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, 21 Oct 1994." *Arms Control Association*. <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/agreedframework> (accessed 11 Nov 2012).
- U.S. Department of State, Office of the Under Secretary of State, Cable, letter, and notes dated October 4, 1978, Declassification Authority NND50947 on 5-7-2010. National Archives' Archival Research Catalog: [http://arcweb/archives.gov/](http://arcweb.archives.gov/) (accessed 10 Nov 2012).
- Venter, Al J.. *Allah's Bomb, The Islamic Quest For Nuclear Weapons*, Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press, 2007.
- Viotti, Paul R., Mark V. Kauppi. *International Relations Theory, Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.
- Walt, Stephen M. *The Origins of Alliances*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.

- Wampler, Robert. "How Do You Solve A Problem Like Korea." *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 322*. posted 23 June 2010, documents 1-15, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB322/index.htm> (accessed 2/22/2011).
- Warwick, Donald P., Fernando Reimers. *Hope or Despair? Learning in Pakistan's Primary Schools*, Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1995.
- Wolpert, Stanley. *A New History of India, Sixth Edition*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- "Worldwide abductions perpetrated by North Korea in 12 Countries." *National Association for the Rescue of Japanese Kidnapped by North Korea (NARKIN)*. December 2006. <http://www.sukuukai.jp/narkn/indix.html> (accessed 22 Feb 2011).
- Wynbrandt, James. *A Brief History of Pakistan*, New York: Facts on File, 2009.
- Yazbeck, Yvonne, Adair T. Lummis. *Islamic Values in the United States: A Comparative Study*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Yesilbursa, Behcet Kemal. *The Baghdad Pact: Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959*. London: Frank Cass Publishing, London, 2005.
- Zaman, R. M. "The Adaptation of Western Psychotherapeutic Methods to Muslim Societies." *World Psychology* 3, (1997): 65-87.
- Ziring, Lawrence. *Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development*. Folkestone, England: WM Dawson and Sons, 1980.