

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

## THE REALITY OF NUCLEAR BLUFF IN SOUTH ASIA

**Dr. Rahat Iqbal<sup>1</sup>, Sajid Iqbal<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Saeed Uzzaman<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Zain Ul AbidenMalik<sup>4\*</sup>, Dr. Muhammad Munir<sup>5</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D in International Relations and working as an independent Researcher.

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad , Campus ,Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages, Rawalpindi. Campus ,Pakistan.

<sup>4\*</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Muslim Youth University ,Islamabad Campus ,Pakistan. ([zainulabidenmalik786@gmail.com](mailto:zainulabidenmalik786@gmail.com))

<sup>5</sup>Professor, Head of Department of International Relations, Muslim Youth University ,Islamabad Campus ,Pakistan.

**Dr. Rahat Iqbal, Sajid Iqbal, Muhammad Saeed Uzzaman, Dr. Zain Ul AbidenMalik, Dr. Muhammad Munir, The Reality Of Nuclear Bluff In South Asia, Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(10), 3280-3293. ISSN 1567-214x.**

**Keywords: Nuclear weapons state, nuclear doctrine or policy, Kashmir dispute, peace, India and Pakistan, nuclear bluff, climate change.**

### Abstract:

Possession of nuclear arsenals is considered as a tool for establishing credible deterrence, but simultaneously these nukes also pose a threat to global peace. Nukes have been successful in containing the conventional wars between conflicting states since cold war era. Analyzing the prevailing issue of Kashmir and the Indian surgical strikes has once again given birth to war-like situation between India and Pakistan. The Indian atrocities in Kashmir and Indian manipulation of the law to affect the sovereignty of Kashmiris have jolted the South Asian stability. Surgical

strikes, Operation Swift Retort and revoking of article 370 and 35A by the Indian officials have opened the new phase of war between India and Pakistan. Moreover, few simmering changes in Indian nuclear policy and strategic thinking have further worsened the situation. The Indian strategists have several times called Pakistan first use nuclear policy as a nuclear bluff; however, this may not be the case in reality. The breach of the nuclear threshold between two South Asian belligerents will not only have its adverse effects on India and Pakistan but will have far reaching negative implications on the region. Nuclear breach in South Asia will trigger a devastating human and climate crisis. Indian claims of calling Pakistan's nuclear policy as the nuclear bluff can be misleading and faulty assessments that may lead to an actual nuclear war, especially when Pakistan perceives that its sovereignty has been threatened. In order to maintain peace, the ladder of de-escalation from escalation is crucial for both India and Pakistan to avoid human and climate crisis. To save the world from dangers of nuclear use, the international community needs to take some concrete steps for bridging the conflict between these two states. Bilateral issues and disputes should be resolved through diplomatic means and shall be facilitated by the UNSC and other relevant international organizations as well as the major powers of the world.

## Introduction

Nuclear tests conducted by India in 1974, laid the basis for the nuclearization of South Asia. India achieved the nuclear weapons capability primarily due to its futuristic designs of becoming a regional power. Subsequently, Pakistan also initiated its nuclear development program to have minimum credible deterrence against the possible external threats. The possession of nuclear weapons by both India and Pakistan has helped in containing the conventional wars between these two conflicting states. So far, both states came across three full-fledged conventional wars and one limited war, primarily over the Kashmir dispute. The history of Indo-Pakistan relations elucidates that Kashmir has always remained the bone of contention between these two countries. Analyzing the current political structure, the conflict between India and Pakistan is not only limited to Kashmir rather these neighbours may intend or aim to pursue a national objective beyond Kashmir perspective. US-Indo strategic partnership and subsequent strengthening of Sino-Pakistan relations is another factor for deteriorating relations between India and Pakistan. The so-called Indian surgical strikes of February 2019 and the illegal annexation of Kashmir since August 2019 have once again worsened the South Asian stability matrix. The heightened tensions could have once again led to the risk of war escalation of nuclear ladder between India and Pakistan.

Evolution of nuclear weapons in military affairs has definitely played a vital role in restraining the conventional war among the conflicting states. Hence, to achieve national interest, some of the countries may have opted for other convenient strategies such as indirect wars. Many analysts and voices assert that conventional wars are over now. But on the other hand, these analysts also claim and predict that "war amongst the people," or "hybrid war," or "gray zone operations," or "distributed security missions," are the new versions of war (Dubik, 2017). The shape of the conventional war may be changing but is not completely out of question, as some of the analyst and policy makers believe that danger is already emerging from the convergence of several unfolding trends. Technological advancement and the attainment of the nuclear weapons by both the major powers and few developing states have changed the means of the conventional war. In the current international political dynamics, wars like hybrid war, asymmetric war, guerrilla war,<sup>4<sup>th</sup></sup> and <sup>5<sup>th</sup></sup> generation wars have adopted the shape of conventional warfare. Despite

being nuclear power states, the India-Pakistan relations are always in war-like position whether that is through indirect means or actual.

### **South Asian Nuclear Arms Race and Deterrence**

Nuclear arms race in South Asia began with Indian second phase of nuclear power demonstration conducted on May 13 and 14<sup>th</sup> in 1998, after the gap of 24 years. Government of India has termed the nuclear explosion of 1974 as the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions (PNE), whereas it had definitely marked the beginning of the nuclear competition in South Asia. Pakistan in order to compete India and maintain a credible deterrence, also conducted the underground testing of its nuclear explosives on May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1998. Both, India and Pakistan achieved the nuclear capability as per their own perspectives in which security, state symbol and prestige were the common factors.

It is widely believed that the evolution of nuclear weapons has helped in containing the conventional wars among the conflicting states. The conventional wars of 20th century were spanned over months and years across the globe, however currently this timeframe has been reduced to a great extent. Kenneth Waltz in his book “Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better” have clearly stated that acquisition of nuclear weapons by every state will eventually lead to peace (Waltz, 1981: 5-10). It is a proven fact in comparison to war of pre-cold war era. However, while examining the current India-Pakistan tensions and nuclear threats in South Asia, the situation is far more complex to be examined from a particular theory or lens.

Theory of nuclear deterrence argues that nuclear attack could only be prevented if both the parties are the nuclear weapon states. Theoretical foundation primarily emphasizes upon the preventive measures adopted by a state of which deterrence is the main component; either side cannot attack due to fear of nuclear use and saving the world from disaster. Kargil episode, the limited war in 1999, could be one of the best cases in point. Both India and Pakistan adopted the ladder of de-escalation from escalation, as both were the nuclear power states by that time.

### **Indo-Pakistan Nuclear Stockpiles and Missile Testing**

Nuclear weapons are the instrument of national security and a symbol of prestige and dignity. United States (US) and Russia possess the highest number of weapons while France, China, Britain, India, Pakistan and North Korea have fewer weapons. Initially the quest for nuclear weapons was security driven but with passage of time it also became the symbol of pride for a state. During the Cold War era, the purpose of attainment of the nuclear weapons by both the US and Soviet Union was for the security purposes. Similarly, Pakistan's quest for its nuclear development program was security driven and Indian centric only. On contrary, Indian objectives as a nuclear state are beyond security and deterrence. Vast increase is expected in the nuclear stockpile of both India and Pakistan, by 2025, India and Pakistan will retain around 200-250 nuclear weapons and warheads (Toon et. al, 2019).

India and Pakistan, as observed by many analysts, are entangled in the longstanding competition of nuclear arms and missile race. At present, these two countries (India and Pakistan) are engaged in the development of several missiles such as air-to-air, air to surface, surface-to-surface, and cruise missile proportionate to the ranges as well to increase their nuclear launching capabilities. India, is now preparing the long range or Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) while Pakistan is focusing on short and middle range ballistic missiles. The

history of the missile testing reveals two different postures; i) at one point it illustrated the tit for tat competition while; ii) the other segment depicted the perspective of security drive or deterrence.

So far, Pakistan had launched around 98 missiles with different ranges with the latest one on March, 2021. India, on the other hand, had launched around 228 missiles with the latest one on January 24<sup>th</sup> 2020 (Nuclear Threat Initiative, 2020). These launches have carried out the missile testing within the appropriate time by a state and its responsible authorities.

### **Indo-Pakistan Nuclear Doctrine**

Following the nuclear weapons test in 1998, India had declared a "no first use" (NFU) nuclear policy (Lakshman, 2019)., whereas Pakistan refused to adopt the posture of "no first use" (Salik, 2020). The Indian draft nuclear policy of 1999 opines that India will adhere to i) no first use policy, ii) no nuclear weapons will be used against non-nuclear weapon states, iii) Any threat will be deterred iv) nuclear weapons are meant for the minimum credible deterrence. The Indian nuclear weapons are not country specific and the arsenals are to be under civilian control. On the side, Pakistan has not yet openly stated its nuclear doctrine (Diamond, 2020). The nuclear program of Pakistan is meant for the "Minimum Credible Deterrence" as well as it adopts the first use policy against any external threat (Khan, 2018:31).

It is highly likely that India may bring changes in its nuclear doctrine in the aftermath of surgical strikes or operation swift retort of 2019. Indian Defense Minister Mr. Rajnath Singh, in briefing to several media channels has clearly stated that India's no first use nuclear policy may change in future (Singh, 2020). Rajnath was speaking at an event in Pokhran on the death anniversary of Vajpayee Union (Singh, 2020). He further stated that India may see a major shift in its policy of using nuclear weapons. Speaking at the same event, Rajnath Singh also added that, "Till today, our nuclear policy is 'No First Use'. What happens in future depends on the circumstances" (Singh, 2019). The minister was pointing towards "no first use" commitment. He stressed that this policy is neither absolute nor permanent, and implying that in a conflict, nothing would compel India to abide by it. His statement came after revoking of the special constitution status of Kashmir by the Indian authorities in August 2019. Thus provoking Pakistan for its breakneck reaction against Indian claim of entire territory of Kashmir as part of India (Clary, 2019).

Pakistan has not amended its nuclear policy or doctrine despite, being in awkward situation with India. It still sticks to its claim of "Minimum Credible Deterrence" against any possible or external threat. Changes in nuclear policy by India are a matter of concern which may raise serious repercussions for the region in future. To maintain peace in South Asia and to save the world from nuclear danger, it is important to bridge the gap between India and Pakistan and their bilateral issues be solved through dialogue and through United Nations or international mediation.

### **Revival of the Kashmir Conflict**

Kashmir is a green lush valley occupied with mountain ranges such as Himalayan and Karakorum ranges, rivers and streams. The J&K region is around 224,739 square kilometer (km). Most of its areas still need to be developed as the region and the people of Kashmir are

suffering from war-like situation since the independence of India and Pakistan. Despite having 70% percent of Muslim population, the decision on the status of Kashmir is pending. Kashmir is more popular across the globe for its beauty, scenic, culture and water resources. The topography of Kashmir is definitely an attraction due to high snow-clad mountains, scenic views, stunning valleys, ice-cold rivers, eye-catching lakes and springs and ever-green fields and thick forests enhance its grandeur and are a source of great attraction for tourists.

Kashmir is widely known for its diverse agricultural products, flora and fauna, saffron, minerals, precious stones, handicrafts including woolen carpets, shawls and premium embroidered clothes. During summer, one can enjoy the beauty of nature, trout fishing, game hunting and during winter climbing mountain peaks and sports of skating and skiing on snow are common. Moreover, Pilgrimage to renowned religious Hindus and Muslim shrines make Kashmir a great religious tourist attraction. Sheikh Sadia, a great Persian poet once said, "If there is any heaven on earth, it is here in Kashmir" (Raina, 2002).

However, the beauty of the Kashmir valley is affected by the prolonged conflicts, freedom fight, genocide and the insurgencies. If the wars on the smaller scale can have an adverse effects on scenic of the valley, then the affects of nuclear incident must also be taken in account on the topography and climate of Kashmir in particular and South Asian region in general. Kashmir is a prolonged dispute between India and Pakistan, with no visible suitable solution since the independence of both countries. The unfair division of J&K by the British has remained the stumbling block in the maintenance of peaceful relations between India and Pakistan. Both these neighbours confronted each other in the battle field soon after their independence.

The green lush valley of J&K has remained the epicenter of discord between the two powerful states of South Asia. The dispute has led to the fighting of three conventional wars since the initial days of the division of the subcontinent. Kashmir has been declared as the international disputed territory in United Nation Security Council (UNSC) in 1948 (India Today, 2019). Unfair division of the Indian subcontinent is the root cause of the conflict as each nation strives for its national identity and self-determination. Hence, the nation of Kashmir is deprived from such identity. Due to existence of the major Muslim population in the valley of J&K, the region was supposed to fall into the domain of Pakistan. During partition of 1947, the former viceroy of India the Lord Mountbatten and Sir Cyril Radcliffe, the British Commissioner, divided the areas on the proportion of majority of population. Seventy percent of the population of Kashmir is Muslim, which provided legitimacy to Pakistan demand to annex the state of Kashmir (Reuter, 2019). In the inception phase of the controversy over Kashmir dispute, very early, the territory was discovered as a homeland for Muslims in South Asia. India, on the other hand, proclaimed it secular democracy and sought control of Kashmir to prove its secular authority.

In order to resolve the Kashmir conflict UN, have passed a resolution in 1948. The United Nations (UN) resolution focuses on plebiscite to be held in Kashmir. The commission that set the cease-fire and also the truce arrangement were set forth in Part I and II of the Commission resolution commenced on August 13, 1948. The arrangements for the plebiscite were carried which focused on analyzing the whole scenario, the United Nation Security Council (UNSC)

passed a series of resolutions to provide the right of self-determination to the people of Kashmir (Document, 1949: 15). Despite being first to take the matter in to the UNSC, India did not adhere to the resolutions passed by UNSC. The Australian Judge Sir Owen Dixon failed to convince the two countries for de-militarization of Kashmir. He admitted that he could not agree Indian Government to provide the right of self-determination to the nation of the disputed valley. He further views that: "I became convinced that India's agreement would never be obtained" (Document, 1949: 40-41).

Pakistan's ex-President Mr. Pervaiz Musharraf and Indian ex-President Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee during their rule have made several trials in order to maintain peaceful relations between these neighbouring countries. The preference of Mr. Pervaiz Musharraf was to stabilize the relations between the two hostile neighbours. This act would not have only benefitted the two countries but the whole of South Asia. To bring peace and stability was the top agenda of Pakistan's foreign policy during President Musharraf regime as well as of Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayi on the Indian side. President Musharraf proposed a historic proposal what is reckoned as "four-point solution," to Kashmir dispute however like the past peace processes, this one could not yield fruitful results too (Cheema, 2014).

Mumbai attacks in 2008 have opened the new phase of conflict between India and Pakistan. Thus, once again the relations between these two neighbours deteriorated. Elias Davidson in his book titled as "The Betrayal of India: Revisiting 26/11 Evidence" have termed the 26/11 as false-flag operation (Davidson, 2017: 20—42). Significantly, despite the eruption of violence, both rival states avoided any offensive against each other. Nevertheless, the interstate relations between India and Pakistan took a sharp turn under the leadership of Prime Minister Narendra Modi. India with the tacit approval of the US and in contrast to the past patterns of strategic engagements, adopted aggressive posture towards Pakistan which is evident in shape of India's implementation of surgical strike stratagem under the nuclear overhang (Noor, 2020).

### **Palwama-Balakot Crisis**

The attack on the armed forces in Kashmir is considered as deadliest attack since the emergence of rebellion in India. On February 14, 2019, more than 40 Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) personnel were killed in a suicide attack (Gurung, 2019). The impact of the explosion was such that it was heard at a distance of 10 km from the site of the explosion. The Indian officials have once again blamed Pakistan for these attacks. On February 26, 2019, India conducted surgical strikes against Pakistan. This act did not only violate the Line of Control (LOC) but it threatened the sovereignty of Pakistan. Indian government claims to be targeting some of the militant groups in the territory without any authentic sources or proofs. Pakistan has several times assisted India in the investigation against any claims.

In a befitting response to the second attempt of the surgical strike by India, Pakistan Air Force (PAF) in a compulsive mode and launched Operation Swift Retort and shot down Mig-21 Indian fighter jet and further captured Indian pilot. The February episode between heightened the tensions between the two nuclear armed rivals. During the crisis, Pakistan had sensibly played its role by involving the foreign officials in order to avoid escalation. The international actors such as the US and China mediated between the both states and persuaded them to act rationally.

to ensure peace and stability in the region. Pakistan released Indian pilot, Abhinandan Varthaman in a peace gesture on March 1, 2019 (Dawn News, 2019). Pakistani leadership's rationalistic decision of returning of Indian pilot assisted in de-escalation of tensions (Noor, 2020). Nevertheless, the February episode once again highlighted Kashmir as a nuclear flashpoint between the two South Asian rivals where any miscalculation can escalate the crisis to strategic levels.

### **Revocation of Article 370**

On August 5, 2019, the Indian government revoked Article 370 and 35 A of its constitution. Under these articles' special status and political autonomy was granted to people of Kashmir. The Indian government officials were of the opinion that integrating the regions of J&K and Ladakh into the Indian Union would help it in stabilizing the country's political situation. The Indian unilateral action increased unrest and fear in J&K and further, it is predicated that situation will further worsen with the passage of time (Salam, 2020). India's revocation of articles 370 and 35A is in line with Modi's government implementation of extremist Hindutva ideology. On the interstate level, this act further worsened the crisis-stability matrix of India with Pakistan and added more flames to the conflict (Lunn, 2019). Moreover, Indian leadership has time and again threatened to block the flow of rivers towards Pakistan. Indian Defence Minister, Rajnath Singh also expressed offensive intentions of squeezing Pakistani-controlled part of J&K. The heightened tensions between the rival states can be observed in shape of increased frequency of border skirmishes on the LoC along the de-facto border. Significantly, the already fragile strategic stability between the two nuclear armed rivals, together with lack of crisis management and restraint mechanisms at the bilateral levels, is now under severe stress (Salik, 2019).

### **Indo-Pakistan Nuclear Bluff**

India and Pakistan are two major countries of South Asia and the only nuclear states of the region. Nevertheless, both states remained indulged in conflictual relations throughout their history. The longstanding crisis over Kashmir has entangled the two countries into a complex situation. The prevailing strained circumstances between India and Pakistan have raised concerns among the international community regarding the use of nuclear weapons by either side. Interestingly, the Indian officials opine that Pakistan may not prefer use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances against India. The Indian Army Chief, General, Mr. Manoj Mukund Naravane has called Pakistan as nuclear bluff. The claim was made after the conduct of surgical strikes in the aftermath of Uri and Pulwama incidents in 2016 and 2019 respectively (Unnithan, 2020). He further stated that how the nuclear threshold had been pushed by India after the air attack on Balakot. He assured that there was a huge room for reciprocal routed without having the fear of nuclear weapons. In addition, the Indian army chief was keen to explain that "If you see historically, nuclear weapons have been a good deterrent and that is where their role ends. We have seen on two or three occasions, we can still carry out the kind of operations that we have carried out without any nuclear portion coming into play," (Unnithan, 2020). The other Indian defense specialist claims that since 1990s, Pakistan is involved in what is called 'Nuclear Weapons Enabled Terrorism' (NWET) or in other words it threatens to use nuclear arsenals if India crosses the international boundary line or intend to conduct the vindictive strikes in response to the terrorist attack.

Fear of crossing the nuclear threshold prevented Indian military reaction after the 2001 parliament attack and the 2008 attacks on Mumbai. Nevertheless, in contrast to past, Modi regime adopted offensive posture and launched surgical strike stratagem in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in the Indian Illegally Occupied Jammu and Kashmir (IIOJK) in 2016 and 2019. In 2016, India claimed to conduct ground surgical strike against terrorist launch pads across the LOC and in 2019, IAF jet fighters crossed the international boundary and dropped their payloads deep inside the territory of Pakistan to bomb alleged terrorist training camp in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province (Unnithan, 2020).

Both, India and Pakistan possess about 140 to 150 nuclear weapons. Nuclear clash is a possibility between India and Pakistan due to prolonged strained relations between the South Asian rivals. Astonishingly, India has started considering Pakistan nuclear stance as a nuclear bluff: however this may not be the case in some specific scenarios. To protect the sovereignty of state, Pakistan can go to any extent as Pakistani leadership is prepared for "all eventualities" (Khan, 2020). Both nuclear armed states avoided a major war since the advent of nuclear weapons; however India development of new technologies and offensive war-fighting strategies to express its hegemony in the South Asian region creates strategic instability compelling Pakistan to come-up with counter measures to ensure its survival. Nevertheless, this very uncertainty and fear may lead to any miscalculation generating crisis situation that may not remain limited in nature and could end up into a nuclear holocaust (Sultan, 2020).

### **Consequences on Breach of Nuclear Threshold**

The devastating effects due to the breach of nuclear threshold will not be limited to India and Pakistan only but will have regional and global ramifications. The consequences for the breach of nuclear threshold are discussed in the following section of the study.

### **Regional and Global Climate Change Effects**

The proliferation in nuclear arsenals and frequent development in missiles definitely have its adverse effects on climate. The change in climate is contributed by deforestation, use of plastics, under ground and air-testing of missiles and newly developed devices. Previously, the US and Russia were considered as a threat to the climate change due to its increase in developing nuclear arsenals. At present, the newly or emerging power states particularly the smaller or weaker states may also wreak havoc to global climate and ecosystem. North Korea, although possess comparatively a weak nuclear capability but still if used will have severe effects on climate, environment and humanity. So how can one think of the most powerful weapons. It is essential to notify that the effects of the use of nuclear weapons by either side will not be limited to particular countries or region.

Lets consider a nuclear war in South Asia involving the use of 100 Hiroshima-size weapons. In these simulations, more than five million tons of smoke will strike the high altitude, where it absorbs sunlight before it can reach the lower atmosphere (Toon et al., 2007b). Resultantly, surface temperature will fall and precipitation will decline (Robock et al., 2007b). The estimated results show a 10 percent global drop in precipitation, with the largest losses in the low latitudes due to failure of the monsoons.



An estimated climate model shows that global average temperatures colder than ever experienced on Earth in past 1,000 years and growing seasons shortened by 2-3 weeks in the main mid-latitude areas of both hemispheres. These effects persist for several years, which would threaten a significant fraction of the world food supply, perhaps jeopardizing a billion people who are now currently marginally fed (Helfand, 2012). New simulations of the effects of these climate changes on crop production predict reductions of staple crops production in the US Midwest and of rice production in China, of 20 percent for several years. Imagine the disruption in world food trade with such heavy losses of production. The smoke would also heat the upper atmosphere by as much as 50 degrees for many years. Consequently, ozone levels over the mid-latitudes of both hemispheres would be reduced to values, currently found only in Antarctica (Mills et al., 2008).

### **Regional and Global Environmental Effects**

Alan Robock, a professor in environmental sciences at the University of Rutgers in New Jersey and the co-author of the paper published by Science Advances exemplifies that the year of 2025 will be worrisome. A scenario is created where it has been described that the extent of obliteration and destruction in South Asia, will not have its effects on the region but it will lead to global devastation. Many people across the globe will have to suffer from starvation and will have its adverse effects on sunlight as well (AFP, 2019). The US used nuclear bomb against Japan in the World War–II which resulted in unprecedented human catastrophe (Selden, 2007). Repercussions of those explosions are still faced by the masses of the country besides its affects on the climate of that area. In comparison, the index of nuclear proliferation is quite high in the South Asian region. The research also stated that the urban areas will be targeted and around 125 million people could be killed if both India and Pakistan continue to expand the quantity of their nuclear weapons. The capability and intensity of current nuclear weapons is six times stronger than the weapons used on Hiroshima, Japan. One explosion from such a bomb could kill 2 million people and injure 1.5 million, but most of the deaths will come from the violent firestorms that ensue.

The paper presented by Mr. Robock also reveals that “India would suffer two to three times more fatalities and casualties than Pakistan because, in our scenario, Pakistan uses more weapons than India and because India has a much larger and more densely populated cities,” (Toon et al., 2007). Alternatively, the issue can somehow pave the way for the beginning of the nuclear disaster among other countries. The investigation showed that firestorms can release from 16 to 36 million tons of soot (black carbon) into the upper atmosphere, spreading around the world in a few weeks. Soot will absorb solar radiation, heating up and rising above. Sunlight reaching the surface will decrease by 20–35 percent, cooling the planet by 3.6–9 degrees Fahrenheit (2–5 degrees Celsius) and reducing rainfall by 15–30 percent.

People living alive, will come across the food shortages for a decade due to the nuclear attack. Mr. Robock, further stated that “I hope our work will make people realize that you can’t use nuclear weapons, they are weapons of mass genocide,” (AFB, 2019). The paper could be a support in terms of evidence in order to strengthen the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons presented in 2017. The columnist in Quartz India Johann Chacko claims that the work “helps the global community evaluate the cost of nuclear war for everyone, not just

the combatant nations,” particularly its climatic impacts (AFB, 2019). He also added that, “There’s very little in the history of Indo-Pakistan kinetic conflict to suggest that leadership on either side would continue escalating until they annihilated the other,” (AFP, 2019).

These concerns are the reflection of the concurrent tensions between India and Pakistan over the illegal annexation of Kashmir by India and the so-called Hindutva ideology. The index of national authorities reports that both belligerent states possess approximately 140-150 nuclear warheads. There is a huge possibility in hike of these numbers of arsenals in future also. It is expected to rise upto 200 or more. Moreover, several missiles are being developed for preemptive and preventive measures. Robock further stated “Unfortunately, it’s timely because India and Pakistan remain in conflict over Kashmir, and every month or so you can read about people dying along the border,” (The Japan Times, 2019).

Changes in climate of the region may also occur due to deforestation, use of plastic, testing of missiles and other explosives whether on surface or underground. This has its effects on climate only but on global warming. Climate is the most sensitive issue to be highlighted especially in the growing era of technological advancement.

### **The Reality of Nuclear Bluff**

In August, 2019, the Indian Prime Minister Modi, has scrambled the sovereignty of the Indian illegally occupied Jammu and Kashmir (IIOJK) (Lalwani & Gayner, 2020). Pakistan reiterated to help the Kashmiri Muslims to achieve their right of self-determination. To prevail peace, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Imran Khan had frequently alerted the world and the International arena at the United Nation Security Council meeting held on September 27, 2019 in New York. PM Imran Khan insisted that if the crisis with India, continuous to get deeper, than Pakistan can go to any extent. This extent would be for protection of Pakistan sovereignty as well for safeguarding the people of Kashmir. To save the world from danger, the international community is advised to take some concrete steps rather than observing silence on this sensitive issue. The two countries have come across a limited conflict on borders in February 2019. The situation was about to worsen due to the Indian surgical strikes and Pakistan retaliating response.

### **Conclusion**

Despite, the historical background of the issue, we should also be more concerned about the recent surge in tensions between India and Pakistan. The Kashmir issue can become a cause of nuclear flashpoint between these two countries. The governments at both ends claim for the use of nuclear weapons as retaliation if the sovereignty of the respective state is threatened, particularly Pakistan. There are pieces of evidence that India may initiate a war with Pakistan to divert the attention of international arena from the deteriorated situation in Kashmir. India may try to hide its war-crimes in Kashmir by engaging Pakistan in a full-scale war. Pakistan Foreign Ministry has issued a statement that “The substance and timing of the Indian Defense Minister’s statement is highly unfortunate and reflective of India’s irresponsible and belligerent behavior. It further exposes the pretense of their No First Use policy, to which we have never accorded any credence. No First Use pledge is non-verifiable and cannot be taken at face value, especially when the development of offensive capabilities and force postures belie such claims. Pakistan has always proposed measures relating to nuclear restraint in South Asia and has eschewed measures that are offensive in nature. Pakistan will continue to maintain a credible minimum

deterrence posture” (Awan, 2019). Any misfortune on the part of India can cost mankind great losses. Its impact cannot be limited only to Pakistan, but can harm the entire region and the world. The international community must act immediately before it is too late. Moreover, the climate scientists’ alert that the repercussion of the nuclear war will not only be limited to the South Asian region. Eventually, it will adversely affect the global environment and humanitarian catastrophe, if either state even prefers to use just a little proportion of their nuclear arsenal. Nuclear bluff can always shape into a real world scenario if situation gets worsened. In order to save the world, the governments at both ends need to adopt the diplomatic and peaceful means for resolving the dispute. In addition, the international arena such as UNSC and the major countries need to take some concrete steps for avoiding nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan before its too late and complete globe suffers its implications.

## Reference

- AFP, (2019). “India-Pakistan nuclear war could kill 100 million”, Gulf News: Retrieved from <https://gulfnews.com/world/asia/india-pakistan-nuclear-war-could-kill-100-million-1.1570055562648>.
- AFP. (2019). “India-Pakistan nuclear war could kill 100 million: study”, The Express Tribune: Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2071121/pakistan-india-nuclear-war-kill-100-million-study>.
- AFP. (2019). “India-Pakistan nuclear war could kill 100 million”, Gulf News: Retrieved from <https://gulfnews.com/world/asia/india-pakistan-nuclear-war-could-kill-100-million-1.1570055562648>.
- Awan, Z. A. ( 2019). “Kashmir-A nuclear flashpoint”, Modern Diplomacy: Retrieved on 15/11/2019 from <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2019/08/18/kashmir-a-nuclear-flash-point/>.
- Baruah, A. (2007). Dateline Islamabad. Penguin Books, India.
- Cheema, P. I. (2014). The Kashmir Dispute: Key to South Asian Peace. IPRI Journal, 1-20.
- Clary, C. (2019). “Why India wants to break its decades old nuclear pledge”, .BBC.
- Davidson, E.( 2017). The betrayal of India: revisiting the 26/11 Evidence. Pharos.
- Dawn News (2019). “Pakistan frees captured Indian pilot Abhinandan in peace gesture,”.Retrieved on 17/12/2021 from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1466951/pakistan-frees-captured-indian-pilot-abhinandan-in-peace-gesture>.
- Diamond, H. (1999). India releases nuclear doctrine, looks to emulate P-5 arsenals. Arms Control Today, 29(5), 23.
- Document. (1949). “Resolution adopted for India and Pakistan at the United Nation Commission in 1949”, (Document No. 5/1196 para. 15, dated the 10th January, 1949).

- Dubik, J. M. (2017). "Conventional warfare: not dead yet". Retrieved on 2/02/21 from [https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/03/17/conventional\\_warfare\\_not\\_dead\\_yet\\_110989-2.html](https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/03/17/conventional_warfare_not_dead_yet_110989-2.html).
- Gurung, S. K. "What happened at Pulwama and history of terror attacks on convoys". Retrieved on 21/11/2019 from <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/what-happened-at-pulwama-and-history-of-terror-attacks-on-convoys/articleshow/68019194.cms?from=mdr>.
- India Today. (2019). Kashmir internationally recognised disputed territory: Chinese envoy". Retrieved on 4<sup>th</sup>/11/2019 from <https://www.indiatoday.in/world/story/kashmir-internationally-recognised-disputed-territory-chinese-envoy-1578474-2019-08-08>.
- Japan Times. (2019). "India-Pakistan nuclear war could trigger global cooling and kill worldwide for a decade: researchers", Japan Times.
- Kenneth Waltz, K. (1981). Spread of nuclear Weapons: more may be better. London. Adelphi Papers. Institute of Strategic Studies.
- Khan, S. (2020). "Pakistan will respond to un-called for Indian aggression at time, place of its choosing: NSC": The Dawn.
- Khan, Z. (2018). "Pakistan's nuclear policy: A minimum credible deterrence". London: Routledge.
- Lakshman, N. (2019). "Will India change its 'no first use' policy? The Hindu. Retrieved on 23/3/21 from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/will-india-change-its-no-first-use-policy/article29247139.ece>.
- Lalwani, S., & Gayner, G. (2020). India's Kashmir Conundrum: Before and After the Abrogation of Article 370. United States Institute of Peace.
- Lunn, J. (2019). "Kashmir, the effects of revoking article 370", Insight UK Parliament. Retrieved on 8/2/21 from <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/kashmir-the-effects-of-revoking-article-370/>.
- Noor, S. (2020). "Pulwama/Balakot and The Evolving Role of Third Parties in India-Pakistan Crises," Stimson Centre, Retrieved on 17/12/2021 from <https://www.stimson.org/2020/pulwama-balakot-and-the-evolving-role-of-third-parties-in-india-pakistan-crises/>.
- Nuclear Threat Initiative, "The CNS India and Pakistan missile launch database". Retrieved on 23/01/20202 from <https://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/cns-india-and-pakistan-missile-launch-databases/>.

- Raina, A.(2002). Geography of Jammu and Kashmir state”.Retrieved on 21/3/21 from <http://www.ikashmir.net/geography/doc/geography.pdf>.
- Reuter, ‘ Factbox: Kashmir’s history-India’s revoking of special status in context’, August 5th. 2019. Retrieved on 4/11/2019 from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-india-kashmir-factbox/factbox-kashmirs-history-indias-revoking-of-special-status-in-context-idUSKCN1UV0RK>
- Salam, K. (2020). “Kashmir One Year Later,” Foreign Policy.Retrieved on 17/10/2021 from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/04/kashmir-article-370-blackout-arrest-covid-pandemic-modi/>.
- Salik, N. (2019). “Kashmir and the Abrogation of Article 370: A Pakistani Perspective,” Future Directions International.Retrieved on 17/10/2021 from <https://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/kashmir-and-the-abrogation-of-article-370-a-pakistani-perspective/>.
- Salik,N. (2019). “The evolution of Pakistan’s nuclear doctrine”: The Nuclear Learning-Next Decade in South Asia. Center on Contemporary Conflict, Naval Postgraduate College p. 61.Retrieved on 23/3/21 from [https://nps.edu/documents/104111744/106151936/6+Nuclear+Learning\\_Salik.pdf/3457bf32-507c-4120-8c74-45d71d4340b7](https://nps.edu/documents/104111744/106151936/6+Nuclear+Learning_Salik.pdf/3457bf32-507c-4120-8c74-45d71d4340b7).
- Selden, M. (2007). A forgotten holocaust: US bombing strategy, the destruction of Japanese cities and the American way of war from World War II to Iraq. The Asia-Pacific Journal, 5(5), 1-29.
- Singh, R. (2019). ”No first use nuclear policy may change in future, says Rajnath Singh on India's defence strategy”, India Today.
- Singh, R. (2020). “Rajanath Singh’s hint on no first use is a message to...”Hindistantimes.
- Sultan, A. (2020).“India’s ‘Surgical Strike’ Doctrine: Implications for South Asian Strategic Stability,” Centre for Aerospace and Security Studies, <https://casstt.com/post/india-s-surgical-strike-doctrine-implications-for-south-asian-strategic-stability/179>.
- The News.(2019). “India-Pakistan once again on verge of full-scale war”,The News.
- Toon, O. B, Bardeen, G.C , Robock, A, Xia, A, Krestens, H, Mckinze, M, Peterson, R. J, Harrison,S. C, lovenduski, N. S and Turco, R. (2019). “Rapidly expanding nuclear arsenals in Pakistan and India portend regional and global catastrophe”. Retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup>/12/2019 from <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/10/eaay5478>.
- Toon, O. B., Turco, R. P., Robock, A., Bardeen, C., Oman, L., &Stenchikov, G. L. (2007). Atmospheric effects and societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts and acts of individual nuclear terrorism. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 7(8), 1973-2002.

Unnithan, S.( 2020). “We have called Pakistan's nuclear bluff: Army chief General ManojMukundNaravane”, New Delhi, India Today.

Unnithan,, S.(2020). “We have called Pakistan's nuclear bluff: Army chief General ManojMukundNaravane”, New Delhi, India Today.