

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

MUMBAI TERRORIST ATTACKS: A CHALLENGE FOR INDIA AND THE  
WORLD

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, December 3, 2008

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

**Moderator:**

DANIEL BENJAMIN  
Senior Fellow and Director  
Center on United States and Europe  
The Brookings Institution

**Speakers:**

STEPHEN COHEN  
Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

BRUCE RIEDEL  
Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

VANDA FELBAB-BROWN  
Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BENJAMIN: Good afternoon. I'm Daniel Benjamin, I'm a senior fellow here at the Brookings Institution and director of the Center on the United States and Europe, and I want to welcome you to this discussion of the terrorist attacks in Mumbai and their consequences.

While most of us were celebrating the Thanksgiving holiday, India went through one of its most traumatic passages in a three-day running battle carried out across a significant part of the city. No one here needs to be told about the consequences or the immediate consequences of that. We have nearly 180 deaths and many more wounded in what I believe will stand as one of the most if not the most consequential terrorist attack since 9/11.

I would argue that it has this status because, unlike I think just about every other attack since 9/11, it has the potential for profound geopolitical consequences in a region of the world

that is uniquely volatile, where there are nuclear weapons, where there are more terrorists than anywhere else, and where there are countries that have had a history of going to war with one another more frequently than perhaps anywhere else.

One of the great pleasures I have to say about working at Brookings is that you get to -- when something like this happens and you want to -- you think of the three people you most want to talk to about what has happened, that you find their phone numbers on your staff list, and it's really a delight for me to be able to moderate this panel today with three colleagues for whom I have the highest regard.

They are in speaking order first Bruce Riedel, who's right here. Bruce was a colleague of mine on the National Security Council staff. He is one of the most distinguished policymakers and policy analysts in the area of the Near East and South Asia that we've had in the U.S. Government. He's a 30-year veteran of the Central Intelligence Agency, and has

been an indispensable part of the Saban Center here at Brookings for the last two years.

Next to him is Stephen Cohen. Steve has been here for a bit longer, and is renowned as one of the world's leading experts on both Pakistan and India. He's written numerous books alternating between one country and the one virtually every year. He served in the U.S. Government in the early 80s dealing with South Asia.

And to his right is Vanda Felbab-Brown, who is a fellow here at Brookings, who works on illicit economies, and has become one of our leading experts on Afghanistan.

All of them have written absolutely critical books that I recommend to you. Bruce's is entitled "*In Search of Al-Qaeda*." It's future ideology and --

MR. RIEDEL: It's leadership ideology --

MR. BENJAMIN: And future. Excuse me. The things after the colon always get me.

Steve has written "*The Idea of Pakistan*" and also the wonderfully titled "*Four Crises and a Peace Process*," predating the Hugh Grant movie, I think, and --

MR. RIEDEL: We ripped it off.

MR. BENJAMIN: You ripped it off? Okay.

And Vanda has a forthcoming book that I think has the best title of all, "*Shooting Up a History of Illicit Economies*."

I'm going to ask Bruce to speak first on what happened and placing this terrorist attack within the history of terrorism in South Asia and within the history of the global Jihad. Afterward, Steve will speak on the political ramifications of the events that we've seen thus far in the way that the governments of the region and our own have dealt with it, and, after that, Vanda will address the implications for Afghanistan. I'll have a few questions after that, and then we will have questions from the audience.

So, thank you very much for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

joining us here today, and now I'll turn it over to Bruce.

MR. RIEDEL: Thank you, Dan, for that very kind introduction and those kind words. And thank all of you for coming here today.

The 60-hour massacre in Mumbai will indeed be remembered as a seminal event in the history of international terrorism, and particularly in the history of the global Jihad. This was an extraordinarily sophisticated and complex plot that had numerous moving parts and which was executed with, one has to admit, a tremendous amount of skill by very well trained terrorists. There was clearly considerable planning involved in this plot over a protracted period of time. The first hints of the length of that time have come from the integration of the only terrorist captured, and he suggests it may have been a year in the making.

This plot was not a plot by amateurs or by a pickup group. This was a plot carried out by professionals who were trained by professionals who

were given a professional plan. It succeeded brilliantly in terrorism's first goal, to get global attention and to inspire fear throughout the globe. Literally, millions of people, hundreds of millions of people were affixed to their televisions watching what went on.

I agree with Dan: In many ways this is the most significant terrorist incident since September 11, and it is in the training and the execution akin to September 11 in many ways, as well. As Dan said, my focus will be on the plot, on the suspects, and on the possible masterminds behind the plot and on the relationship between the plot, to the global Jihad led by Al-Qaeda. But let me caution right from the beginning, that investigation of this massacre is only now beginning. It's in the very early starting phase. There is no serious claim of responsibility or explanation and justification yet in the public media from a known entity. We have a phone call, and that's all. Much is unknown, especially about the planning and the



planners behind the plot. There is tremendous contradictory information available in the public domain, and all of that needs to be sorted out. We also should consider the possibility that the terrorists deliberately brought with them misleading disinformation to throw investigators off of the real scent.

I have been involved in several investigations of terrorist events in the past, including Pan Am 103, and the lesson I've drawn from them is to be very careful about judging the facts until you have the evidence.

Also, we should bear in mind that terrorism in India is a complex phenomenon with multiple actors. The American National Counterterrorism Center said this year that in 2005, India had the second largest number of casualties from terrorism than any country in the world aside from Iraq. The good news for Iraq is that India is probably going place number one in 2008. Most of the attention this year on terrorism in India was devoted to the activities of a new group, the Indian Mujahideen, blamed for attacks in Jaipur

and New Delhi and other places.

We've also recently had evidence of Hindu-inspired terrorism often using a false flag to blame it on Muslims.

A great deal of terrorism in India is sponsored by a rural, Maoist insurgence, Naxalites, who probably kill more people than every group else combined.

And there is additional terrorism in North East India from separatist groups. Mumbai itself is also a frequent target of terrorism. This is the sixth major attack on the City of Mumbai in 15 years. The worst was the first. In 1993, 13 bombs that went off simultaneously in the city that killed more than 250 people. The Indian authorities believed that attack was carried out by a criminal underground with connections to Islamic extremism and to Pakistan.

In 2006, metro bombs killed almost as many, which the Indian police at that time identified was possibly related to the Pakistani Intelligence

Service, the infamous Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate, and the group we're going to talk about the most today, Lashkar e-Tayyiba.

It's worth noting that in all of these cases of terrorism, the linkage back to Pakistan has been prominent in the Indian reporting about it, and, yet, in none of these cases has the Indian Government chosen to use military retaliation against Pakistan. Neither Prime Minister Gujral, Vajpayee, nor Singh has found in the past a viable military response to Pakistan's role in terrorism.

The most recent attacks, 26/11, as it's now being referred to, had several very significant attributes that make them different from the past.

First, the targets were significantly different than what we've seen in the past. The principle targets were Americans, Israelis, and Indians. Indians in by far larger numbers, but it's clear from the activities of the terrorists that Americans and Israelis were very much on their literal

hit list. This is the target set not of an indigenous movement. This is the target set of global jihad.

Ayman al-Zawahiri, the ideological leader of Al-Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden have spoken many, many times to their followers about the danger posed to Islam by what they call the Crusader-Zionist-Hindu Alliance. Crusader-Zionist-Hindu Alliance, and that is precisely the target set that we saw here.

They have often urged Pakistanis to fight against the Crusader-Zionist-Hindu Alliance as well as against their own apostate government, which they claim collaborates with it.

Secondly, the target was clearly an economic one. Going after the two most prominent hotels in the most important economic hub in India was an intent to inflict catastrophic, economic damage on the Indian state, to burst the bubble of India's economic renaissance. This, too, is consistent with the targeting of the global jihad.

For the last several years, Osama Bin Laden has spoken again and again to his followers about the

need to go after economic targets, that economic targets should be at the top of the list. Al-Qaeda believes that it's winning that war, that the global economic meltdown is a sign of its victory in the war against the Crusader-Zionist-Hindu Alliance. It wants to accelerate that process through acts of terror.

Secondly, the tactics are innovative, are very unique mixture of new and old. Trained, suicidal killers operating in small bands, communicating with each other as they do so, going after multiple targets in a staggered, pre-planned array, the use of global positioning satellite information, multiple cell phones with multiple SIM cards, and the seaborne approach to the attack site, an approach we understand front the Pakistani mega-city of Karachi, long a stronghold of the global jihad.

This use of trained killers is very reminiscent of Al-Qaeda's attack that failed on the American Embassy in Sana'a, Yemen, last September, and

on the Taliban, Al-Qaeda attack on the Serena Hotel in Kabul in January of this year.

Timing is always a critical question to look at in a terrorist incident. We don't know yet whether there was some significance to the timing of this particular event. It's highly unlikely it was related to the Thanksgiving holiday. I'm sorry to have to disappoint many millions of CNN watchers. But we do know that it came at a point in which Indian and Pakistan were engaged in a mini rapprochement.

Probably in some of the best moves towards easing relations in a long time, this mini rapprochement was driven largely by the new-elected civilian leadership in Islamabad, and, in particular, by President Zardari's very public comments promising to bring the ISI under control, to cease having it fight on both sides on the war on terror. His comment to the *Wall Street Journal* that "India has never been a threat to Pakistan," a comment that did not go well with op-ed writers in Pakistan, and his promise on the eve of the attack in a video to an Indian think-tank

that Pakistan would adopt a no first use of nuclear weapons, a strategic shift in Pakistan's thinking.

At the same time, we saw a trade, albeit in very limited amounts, begin across the Line of Control in Kashmir for the first time in 60 years. The response in India has been guarded, but the *Hindustani Times*, just two days before the attack, published an op-ed saying let's trust Zardari. And you have to wonder how many letters they've gotten in the week since.

The attack is also reminiscent in this regard to the December 13, 2001 attack on the Indian Parliament, which was also timed by the terrorists to break an imminent change in Pakistani policy towards Afghanistan and the Taliban, and designed to divert the Pakistan Army away from its border with Afghanistan to the border with India in order to permit the retreating Al-Qaeda and Taliban followers to find safe haven. That attack, of course, was brilliantly successful in its implications.

The prime suspect in the attacks of

26/11 is the group Lashkar e-Tayyiba or LeT. The director of National Intelligence, in his speech yesterday, confirmed that it is the number one suspect on American intelligence. And the Indian Government has said the same thing.

This is a group that was founded in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the assistance of the ISI and with the assistance of Osama Bin Laden, who was an important early fundraiser for the group. Osama Bin Laden's then spiritual mentor, a Palestinian named Abdullah Azam, was one of the charter members in the creation of the LeT. It was formally announced as an organization, however, in Afghanistan in Konar Province, long a stronghold of Al-Qaeda.

The LeT was linked in 1999 to the hijacking of the Indian aircraft out of Kathmandu to Kandahar in Afghanistan, IA-814, a plot that was masterminded by Osama Bin Laden and the Al-Qaeda.

It's also been linked to the March 2000 massacre of Sikhs on the eve of President Clinton's visit to India, to the 2001 parliament attack, which



I've already mentioned, and to the July 11, 2006 Mumbai metro attacks.

It was banned by President Musharraf in Pakistan in 2002, but continued under a new cover name, Jamaat ud-Dawa. You can go to their Web site. It's got both Hindi, Urdu, and English. [www.jamaat.org](http://www.jamaat.org). On it, they deny any involvement in the attacks. It has engaged in a great deal of charitable work in Pakistan over the last several years, especially during the Kashmiri earthquake. But this, too, is altogether typical of various Islamic extremist movements.

It has been seen fighting alongside with the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, and, according to the central command, LeT operatives have also been fighting in small numbers in Iraq against the American forces there. It has provided hideouts on numerous occasions for key Al-Qaeda operatives. The first major Al-Qaeda operative captured after September 11, Abu Zubaydah, was captured in a hideout of the LeT.

It has also been linked to the July 7, 2005 London metro bombing plot, one of the four metro suicide bombers, Shehzad Tanweer, was allegedly trained in a LeT camp. His martyrdom video taken in that camp was later shown in an Al-Qaeda video featuring Ayman al-Zawahiri.

This was an extraordinary radical movement to begin with, and, over the last decade, it has become increasingly radical. It does not seek simply the end of the Indian occupation of Kashmir or to create an Islamic state in Muslim majority parts of South Asia, rather it seeks the creation of a caliphate to dominate all of South Asia well into Central Asia, something akin in its mind to a recreation of the Mughal Empire.

This group has extremely close links and very active in the Pakistani Diaspora in the United Kingdom. Some 800,000 strong. And, in the Persian Gulf, almost 2 million strong, where it raises much of its funding.

The big question mark, of course, is the extent of its current ties to the Pakistani Intelligence Service. If there is anything that is a \$64 million question today, it is finding out the answer to that.

Pakistani Government, of course, claims there are no such links, but it's difficult to believe that no connections remain, given the size of its activities in Pakistan. We still need to know much more about the origins of this plot and the masterminds behind it, but what we can say for certain today is that whoever they were, they were heavily influenced by the ideology and narrative of Al-Qaeda. This attack demonstrates that the ideology and narrative of Al-Qaeda and the overall global jihad movement remains potent, continues to inspire deadly terrorism, and remains a formidable threat today.

Thank you.

MR. COHEN: Good afternoon. I've just gotten off an airplane, so, I may be a little bit more disorganized than usual, but I want to begin by

acknowledging David Good is present. David is the representative of Tata in the United States, and a lot of us have stayed in various Tajs, including the Taj Mumbai. I certainly communicate our sorrow and sympathy, but we'll stay there again. That's the first thing I'll do when I get to Bombay, is make a point to stay at that Taj.

Yes, I've written a book, co-authored a book, "*Four Crises and a Peace Process*," and I've written to both my co-authors should we do another addition *Five Crises and a Peace Process*? They said, well, hold off. It may not be necessary, but they were both ambiguous about whether this is going to evolve into a crisis. And the earlier crisis we wrote about, beginning with the 1987 crisis, the Brass Tacks crisis and three since then. Three of them involved nuclear threats, which really alerted a lot of people. We're not sure whether this is going to evolve in that direction or not, but it has the potential of doing so.

In fact, I think one of the plans behind this attack, which was brilliant in its own

perverted way, was to provoke or was to put further strains on India-Pakistan relations. Clearly, this is a goal of the terrorists and of the jihadists in Pakistan. And, to some extent, some Indians would agree that normalization between India and Pakistan is not the way to go.

And, so, in the past year or two since we published -- actually, we published the book earlier this year -- people assure me there's a peace process underway between India and Pakistan. I urge them to read the last chapter of the book. The peace process is not serious for various reasons, and I don't want to blame it on anybody, but, clearly, it was a euphemism for dialogue, and nothing was going on. I'll get to that point in a minute.

So, we may do another book or an update on the five crises and a peace process, and, hopefully, we won't have to do that.

I want to, in a sense, because I've been out of touch with information and I just learned something from Bruce's excellent presentation about what our DNI

has said about responsibility, I'd like to pull back to the policy level, and I think regardless of the specific information in the last 24 hours or even 48 hours, the policy issues are pretty well drawn, and that is you have three interrelated puzzles or policy puzzles or knots, and they're connected to each other, but each is individually complicated. And I'll go through these one, two, three, and then I'll conclude.

I think the first puzzle is the Pakistan military's reluctance to give up its support even if tacit, even if looking the other way, of groups like the Afghan Taliban, for which they've been criticized regularly by the U.S. Government or the Lashkar e-Tayyiba, and perhaps other groups.

They have turned against the so-called Pakistani Taliban. That is Taliban Pashtuns with the Taliban ideology that threaten Pakistan itself.

And, finally, there is serious military action in Fatah, but they've done nothing that I know of, nor the other Pakistani security services,

regarding the Taliban sitting in Quetta, nor, of course, have they wound up in any significant way at all. Lashkar e-Tayyiba, which, of course, was banned by President Musharraf in 2002.

There's a long history, apparently, which I'm not part of, but I've heard about it, of the American Government promising the Indian Government or pledging to the Indian Government that it would stop Pakistani support for terrorism. I think there's also an equally long history of the American Government not being able to do this, and, in a sense, that's created a crisis in our position in Afghanistan and a crisis in our relations with Pakistan. Pakistan's toleration of Taliban. They're there in Quetta, alive and well and happy and virtually untouched.

So, the first puzzle or the first policy issue is Pakistan's military reluctance to give up it's support for both Taliban and other radical groups. Why do they do this? Why don't they do this? Why do they perhaps look the other way, and why do they tolerate it? Why has Pakistan not been serious?

For  
strategic reasons. That is, in the case of the Taliban and also the case of Lashkar, they see these groups, which they help to found a number of years ago, as instruments of Pakistani foreign policy against India. The Taliban are useful to, I'm sure, Pakistani presence to balance the Indian presence in Afghanistan, and, of course, Lashkar e-Tayyiba is useful to provoke the Indians or to go with the Indians one way or another.

So, I think the motives are strategic. And maybe the solutions have to be strategic, also.

The second puzzle, which is something that I spent my professional career writing about, is this curious interplay between civil and military power in Pakistan. And it comes down to maybe an aphorism or short statement. The Pakistan Army can't govern Pakistan. We know that time and time again, it's tried, it cannot govern it, but it won't let anybody else govern either. So, in a sense, that's Pakistan's



dilemma, and it has always been Pakistan's dilemma since the 50s.

Pakistan generals tell me there's nobody who can really run our state, but we're going to do it ourselves. Musharraf himself told me right after the last coup, when I assured him, I said, you're going to have new elections, going to reset the system, lost some civilian parties to come, and he said, no, we're going to straighten out these johnnies once and for all, which is exactly what Ayub Khan said 20 years, 30 years earlier.

So, that army's in a dilemma, it doesn't trust the politicians in part because it doesn't trust the politicians to deal with India, but it can't govern Pakistan itself, so, I think that's the second puzzle. A very complex puzzle.

The third is India's profound ambiguity regarding Pakistan. I've just published an article actually written for the Norwegians, and it's on the Brookings' Web site, and the subtitle tells everything. And the title is: "*India's Policy*

*Towards Pakistan.*" And the next is: "*If You Don't Know Where You're Going, Any Road Will Take You There.*" Both Lewis Carroll and George Harrison. That is, the Indians are profoundly ambiguous as to Pakistan. Some would like to embrace Pakistan, create normalized relations with Pakistan, respond to Zardari's overtures, which I think are sincere, and but probably won't go anywhere.

Others, for example, a friend of mine sitting at a conference earlier this year wrote me a little note of all the reasons why a broken-up Pakistan would be in India's interest. And how you break up Pakistan, that's anybody's guess.

And then, others simply would like to ignore Pakistan. A shining India, India, Incorporated, they're out of Pakistan's league. Pakistan is a wretched, half-ass country, excuse me, CSPAN. A country in which won't amount to anything. India shouldn't pay any attention to Pakistan.

Well, and the Pakistani view is we'll make them pay attention to us by being nasty if that's the

only means. So, I think there's a dilemma for the Indians that they have no settled Pakistan policy, or if they want to use military force to coerce Pakistan, with a nuclear Pakistan, that's out of the question. The crisis book deals with a couple of -- in large part with Indian decision making in the face of a nuclear Pakistan.

So, where does this wind up? Where does this lead us?

The Bush Administration, in a sense, had a policy towards Pakistan, towards South Asia, which consisted of three elements. One was a close strategic relationship with India, and the U.S.-India Nuclear Deal, which I favored, but which automatically guaranteed Pakistani suspicion. If American officials are going to declare that they want to make India a major Asian power and provide India with a special exception for nuclear energy, nuclear power, well, the Pakistani conclusion is America sided with India once and for all, you cannot trust the Americans.

So, the other leg of our policy was to accept subcontractor Pakistan policy to President Musharraf, and when he clearly failed, picked Benazir Bhutto, you be our man or our lady in Pakistan, well, that was her death warrant, in a sense, by making her the American agent in Pakistan. She became the target for all the people who hated America and also hated Musharraf and certainly hated her.

So, I think the third element of American policy towards South Asia has been hope, and I worked for George Schultz once on the policy planning staff, and Schultz told us once, he said, hope is not a policy. So, I think there was a lot of wishful thinking going on in Washington the past eight years or seven, eight years towards South Asia that we could make India a great power, that we can work with the Pakistanis, even though we committed ourselves to a strategic relationship with India, and that Pakistan would somehow carry through on its commitments in terms of Taliban, and also in terms of support for other terrorists.

I think now we're entering in a new phase, clearly, with Rice there. I hope she's communicating to the Obama people. And a policy that deals with these crises has to involve both the Pakistan military, Pakistan civil military relations, and also India. In a sense, India's part of the solution. It's part of the problem, but it's also part of the solution. In the Pakistan book, there's a whole box in there. In a nutshell, I argue that India can do more for Pakistan than any other country, but I think America should be looking for a coalition not only with India, but also with the Chinese, the Saudis, and the Europeans, in a sense, to rescue Pakistan.

The future, if we don't do that, is very grim. Until now, we've been concerned about Pakistan largely because of its support for terrorism or its implicit context with terrorists, and that's a serious issue, especially in Afghanistan and now in India, but I think five years from now, six years from now, if Pakistan continues to unravel, another issue will displace that, and that is the Pakistani nuclear

weapons program. They have between 80 and 100 nuclear weapons. By then, it should be up to 150. If a crumbling Pakistan decides to go out of business in style, they might not take the Russian route, the Soviet route, they might do it with a big bang figuratively and literally. So, in a sense, we can't afford not to deal with Pakistan, and, of course, the country that's most affected by the future of Pakistan is India after Afghanistan.

So, with that, let yield to Vanda. Thank you.

DR. FELBAB-BROWN: Good afternoon. My colleagues have both alluded in several ways to the implications of the horrific attacks in Mumbai and the resulting tensions between Indian and Pakistan for Afghanistan. And let me elaborate now on these implications which are, in fact, rather severe.

As you probably know, Afghanistan has suffered very serious declines in security over the past two years. In fact, it was recently termed by U.S. officials that Afghanistan was in a downward

spiral. And, certainly, by any number of measures, the level of the Taliban insurgency, a complex amalgam, were various groups at the core of which is the Afghanistan Taliban, has gained great strength.

In the south of the country, they pretty much dominate the countryside, and NATO forces there control the cities, but government officials and GOs and other forces, including local, tribal elders frequently find it impossible to travel outside of the provincial cities.

The Taliban has opened an eastern front, and aided of it was for a long time believed to be under secured and success of the insurgence of policy there. And even the north, which has enjoyed much greater security, is not safe, and there are dangers that could be destabilized. This is in the context, of course, of an extremely poor country that still suffers from multiple ails, including a burgeoning poppy economy and still faces critical shortages of food.

For example, this year, several million people are pretty much dependent on food aid to avoid basic starvation.

There are multiple reasons why the Taliban insurgency has become strengthened, one of which is the critical weakness of the national government in Kabul and increasing not simply its weakness, but its more and more fractured nature, its corruption, its inability to deliver to the population on any of the promises or most of the promises made in Berlin and subsequent conferences.

But critical to the resurgence of the Taliban, no doubt, are the safe havens in Pakistan. Across the border in Balochistan, Quetta, where the Taliban leadership, the so-called Quetta Shura of Mullah Omar is located, but elsewhere in Fatah, increasingly northwest frontier province.

And, for a long time, Pakistan was rather reluctant to take measure against both the Afghan Taliban and other groups, other Jihadi groups, be their Hekmatiar(?) networks or (inaudible) networks



increasing with (inaudible) Taliban, the Pakistani Taliban.

And did so, as a result, essentially of U.S. pressure or aid, so, the U.S. either will pressure Pakistan by multiple means, including conducting attacks. Attacks, most of the time in the Fatah areas seeking to take out some of the most prominent (inaudible) commanders, and, at the same time, it would seek to induce Pakistan to embrace the effort by providing large levels of aid.

Until recently, at least neither of these (inaudible) particularly successful, and to the extent that Pakistan did cooperate in trying to shutdown the various safe havens and various networks, in did so reluctantly. Its efforts were lukewarm, at best, and fickle, and frequently focused on certain groups. Neighbors of Al-Qaeda, which is important, but, at the same time, they were not willing to act against the Afghanistan Taliban.

And, as Steve already mentioned, that one of the reasons was that Pakistan had long nurtured and viewed Taliban as a strategy weapon against India.

And this strategy or view of Pakistan goes really beyond simply asymmetry warfare against India. Crucial to that, is a perception in the Pakistan that Afghanistan is an area of necessary strategy that in the conventional confrontation within the eastern front, Pakistan would likely not be able to hold the border, and, hence, for a long time believed it needed Afghanistan to fall back into the territory so that it could recoup its forces and launch the counterattack.

Anyway, at the minimum, Afghanistan was very critical and is very critical in Afghanistan strategy thinking, and what Pakistan wants to avoid, above all, is an encirclement by two hostile powers or possibly more hostile powers: India on the one side and Afghanistan on the other side.

So, critical to what was emerging as the new framework to be adopted by the new administration was a view that it is important to help in India and

Pakistan resolve the tensions on a eastern war, the tensions about Kashmir, but beyond Kashmir, so that Pakistan could be relieved of its fear of encirclement and genuinely focus forces on its western front.

This approach was all the more important given that Pakistan is very seriously concerned about being carved up between India and Afghanistan. Not only does it not have a border on its eastern front resolved, the Line of Control in Kashmir, but it's a symbol border in securities on its western front, where the Afghan Government does not recognize the Durand line and the Pastun Tribe span both sides of the border.

At the same time, it has for a long time faced an insurgence in Balochistan. So, there is great sense of fear that it could be carved up between India and Afghanistan, and the truncated Pakistan would be even more vulnerable than the existing country.

It is hard to imagine how the initiative to help India and Pakistan, to resolve conflict on the

eastern front can easily be launched in the current levels of insecurity and tensions between the two countries.

Perhaps, it is too early to say that it cannot be resurrected in the future, but, certainly, right now, it probably needs to be put on ice. Nonetheless, it is critical to develop a regional framework toward Afghanistan as well as towards South Asia, framework which will include other actors beyond the two, China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, and multiple actors which are critical for the regional stability and for stability of Afghanistan.

It's all the more important given that Afghanistan has, for centuries, suffered from being the (inaudible) for proxy war among regional powers, as well as great powers.

The danger still exist there today that Pakistan and India will avoid going to some major confrontation, yet will act out the fears and hostilities in Afghanistan. Certainly, during the 1980s, when the United States and Pakistan supported

the Mushahadeen, India supported the persevered government of President (inaudible) in Afghanistan.

In the 1990s, the competition became even more overt and more intense when, during the civil war, Pakistan helped create and sustain the Taliban movement, and India, of course, fully supported along with other regional actors the Northern Alliance.

These dangers continue to exist there today. Already prior to the latest crisis, Pakistan viewed India's actions in Afghanistan with the greatest suspicions. India has opened a number of consulates, and while this might be perfectly understandable in giving the economic interests that India has in Afghanistan, Pakistan was frequently persuaded that these are spying outfits for Indians. At minimum and possibly even more perniciously, means to support the Balochistan insurgency.

Similarly, Indian economic projects, including roads building and dams in Konar have been viewed with great suspicion, generating fears in

Pakistan that they are, perhaps, meant to divert water from Pakistan. And Pakistan is rather dependent on Indian water sources for its water supplies.

Whatever level of correctness was there to these fears, there is great danger that the two powers could easily be sucked into a proxy war in Afghanistan and pull in other forces, as well, which would have very serious negative repercussions for the governance crisis that's already going on in Afghanistan.

As you know, there are national elections in Afghanistan next year, and the politic of fever is at its peak, great level of distrust that's reverberating through various tribal ethnic and clan arrangements with great levels of hostilities. In many ways, governance has pretty much collapsed outside the major cities and frequently even in the major cities. And it would be very tempting for various Afghan politicians and leaders to court the external(?) sponsors as they have been used to in the 1980s and 1990s. And that would yet further fracture the political landscape, complicating the

ability to deliver to any of the promises given to the population, and, thus, indirectly but powerfully fueling the Taliban insurgency.

And, perhaps, most immediately, I should mention the tension between Indian and Pakistan, and if it escalates, could most directly diminish the tension and resources that Pakistan devotes to its western front.

Bruce already spoke about the attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001. One of the effects of which was that Pakistan deployed its army to the eastern front and its western front was pretty much unguarded, and this was one of the critical factors that allowed key Al-Qaeda leaders to slip across the border into Fatah, as well as Taliban leaders and slowly build their forces there up again.

Pakistan has already mentioned during the last few days that if tensions escalate, it would, in fact, redirect the 90,000 troops that it has right now on the western front toward India. And, once again, this would allow the various Jihadi groups there to

train, re-supply, organize financing, train their fighters, and further strengthen the insurgency.

The insurgency at this point, the Taliban insurgency is self-sustaining and it has an internal base in Taliban. So, resolving the saving issue is not a guarantee to succeeding in feeding the insurgency. The situation has spun out of hand so much right now that even without the safe havens, it would continue.

Nonetheless, the safe havens are absolutely key in strengthening and facilitating the operations of the Taliban and need to be tackled, and, so, our diplomacy really needs to focus to reducing tensions between India and Pakistan, a very delicate matter for several reasons: India faces national elections soon and obviously is the victim here. So, it will find it possibly difficult to have a very moderate response, but, nonetheless, this response might very well be in the best interest of India itself.

But, at the same time, India cannot believe that our approach to India is simply because we are



concerned about Afghanistan. There needs to be feeling that this, in fact, part of a genuine and robust relationship with India.

And, similarly, on the Pakistani side, both Bruce and Steve talked about the fertility of the political leadership and the tensions between the military intelligence establishment and the civilian government. And while full cooperation on the part of the Azardari Government is necessary, the level of pressure that can be exerted needs to be moderated by the fact that the government is rather weak and faces a lot of internal oppositions, as well as a sense that the war against terrorism, the war in Fatah, it's not its own, and it's imposed from abroad, from the U.S.

And here I think lies the key to enabling to the escalating tensions and enabling progress in relations and on counterterrorism, and that's for Pakistan to realize that, ultimately, the various Jihadi groups, they have nurtured and maintained relations to have come to threatened Pakistan itself.

Pakistan has gone through multiple terrorist attacks, some very significant ones, including the Marriot Hotel bombing, as well as many others. And, at this point, it's up to Pakistan leadership, as well as the Pakistani people to realize that terrorism and the Jihadi groups threaten themselves and their own national interests.

MR. BENJAMIN: Well, I want to thank our panelists. Let me thank our panelists for three very lucid, comprehensive, and deeply depressing presentations. And I had a few follow-up questions for them, which I would like to get their thoughts on, and then we'll turn it over to you in the audience.

The first one, Bruce, is for you.

You mentioned a number of different Lashkar e-Tayyiba activities that had resulted in terrorist attacks or terrorist plots outside of Pakistan, outside of Kashmir, its traditional area of operations. And I am curious as to your thoughts about whether or not we are seeing the emergence of another group that wants to go global along the lines

that Al-Qaeda has.

And just to underscore what a worrisome prospect that would be, I remember when I was doing some research for a book I was writing on all of this, Lashkar e-Tayyiba obliged by having a big rally in the home of its headquarters in Muridke and 200,000 people turned out. And if that wasn't a scary demonstration of the power of Islamist militancy, I don't know what is.

But why don't you tell us if we have any idea as to where they're headed?

MR. RIEDEL: Well, resuming this is LeT, and, as I stress, the evidence is still not as positive, but pretty strong. I think it's very disturbing because if LeT know does want to take on the enemies of the global jihad in as visible and massive a manner as it demonstrated in Mumbai, then our intelligence services and those of our allies have a whole new problem set to worry about. That's not the LeT has not been on our intelligence and security services scopes for some time, it has, but it hasn't

had the priority clearly that Al-Qaeda has. And one of the takeaways here is that it probably now is going to need to have that.

We've seen a phenomenon in Al-Qaeda's operational activities in the last several years, which I would call the Pakistan-ization -- there's a hard word to pronounce. Pakistan-ization of Al-Qaeda's operational activities, which is more and more of its activities outside of the South Asian arena, and particularly in Western Europe, used Pakistanis, principally members of the Diaspora and the United Kingdom, but also Pakistanis in Denmark, Germany, and Spain.

The most visible symbol of that, of course, was the foiled plot in August of 2006, which was designed to simultaneously blow up 10 jumbo jets over the North Atlantic en route from the United Kingdom to North America, both the U.S. and Canada. That plot involved using the descendents of Pakistani immigrants who had British passports, who would be easy to get in and out of the United States, who found it easy to go

back to Pakistan, where the plot was being orchestrated by Al-Qaeda.

That plot also had, at its heart, an economic target, and that was the destruction of the international airline business. Imagine if it had succeeded. No one in their right mind would have gotten on an airplane again anywhere in the world for probably a long, long time. If Al-Qaeda can now work with LeT, which has established cells in many of these communities, it's a much more serious threat.

MR. BENJAMIN: Steve, did you have anything you wanted to add on that or shall I inflict a different question on you?

MR. COHEN: Another question.

MR. BENJAMIN: Okay. In every crisis, there's an opportunity for a breakthrough and even for greatness, and if you look at what President Zardari has done thus far in his tenure, he's actually been rather surprising. You mentioned a number of things he had said and new departures that he had taken.

Is there an opportunity here for him to use this tragedy as a pivot against radicalism in Pakistan and to improve relations with India, improve Pakistan's international image, perhaps build the coalition he needs domestically to come down a bit harder on some of the rogue elements in ISI, and is there something the U.S. can do to help him in this, or are we talking about a test that would be beyond even a politician of real genius?

MR. COHEN: Well, Zardari is in a very fragile position. Ironically, he won the second free election Pakistan has ever had, but he doesn't have much legitimacy in Pakistan, and the military, I think, would brush him aside if he seemed to be overstepping his boundaries.

On the other hand, there's no plan C, and plan C is a containment strategy which acknowledges that Pakistan is headed down a dead-end and will eventually either combust, break up itself, or something awful will happen, but I think we need to recruit the Indians, that we cannot subordinate our

policy towards India, and they can't subordinate their policy towards us.

We have a Chinese interest here. The Chinese are very active in expressing their concerns about Pakistan. The Saudis have a lot of influence in Pakistan. So, I think we should -- I won't want to say internationalize it, but draw on the countries that have influence on Pakistan. And, frankly, it's up to the Pakistanis. If they didn't regard the Marriott Hotel as a wakeup call, I'm not sure what they did. They attacked the (inaudible), they've been killing Pakistani generals, and the army has responded by going after the internal Taliban. But, still, that's not enough in a sense you can't allow one terrorist group to thrive and try and clamp down on others. They have these interconnections.

So, I think that we should work with Zardari, we should encourage the Indians to work with Zardari, another military crisis won't do anybody any good.

On the other hand, we should be prepared for failure, that Zardari can't make it, he'll be pushed out, we'll get another general in power or even something even worse than the military, and we're going to have to deal with that kind of Pakistan.

MR. BENJAMIN: Let me just follow-up on that, we should work with the Indians.

Can you give us some insight into Indian strategic thinking about having a neighbor that, as they say increasingly, is a failing or failed state? This is now going to be the textbook example of how non-state actors can drag states into confrontations that they don't want to be in. how is the Indian strategic class, political class thinking about this?

MR. COHEN: Well, as I said, they're divided among themselves about what to do. The army strategy after 2001, 2002 was to launch a short attack across the border in Pakistan to punish the Pakistanis. What it would do after it did that, nobody was quite clear. That's clearly failed, they did not deter the Pakistanis who regarded that strategy as silly.



Some civilians would like to normalize with Pakistan, some diplomats would like to negotiate with Pakistan indefinitely. India could come to a conclusion on a number of issues, not Kashmir itself that's a big, politically difficult thing to do, but there's a Sir Creek issue, there's a Siachen Glacier issue, a number of little issues, and if Zardari could come back and tell the Pakistani people I've gotten more out of the Indians than anybody else has, that would be a big help for him.

MR. BENJAMIN: Vanda, just following-up on your description of the Pakistan-India-U.S. triangle that exists in Afghanistan -- this is also sort of a policy question and Steve may have thoughts, as well -- the Pakistanis are convinced that the Indians are trying to rob them of their strategic depth there, as you pointed out.

Is there any reason for the United States not to say to New Delhi do you really need all of those consulates? Can you help us out here and let's

ratchet down the temperature a bit? What's your thought on that?

DR. FELBAB-BROWN: It is clearly important to restrain India's activities in Afghanistan. These activities are frequently legitimate and it's in their own economic, national interest and absolutely appropriate activity to have consulates, to have economic aid.

We have restrained the Indians, for example, from volunteering actual military forces, even though President Karzai has at least, at times, used this as a way to retaliate against inflammatory remark from Pakistan. But, so, there is one important way to calm tensions by not allowing this to happen, and, so, of course, there's not an easy one because we are acutely suffering from a lack of forces by the NATO coalition and its other partners, which has multiple repercussions.

But I think it's equally important to point out to Pakistan that, ultimately, it's in their interest to have a stable Afghanistan, especially as

they come to understand that the Islamist groups on both sides of the border are no longer easy to control and a fundamental threat to the Pakistani state itself. And this then should provide framework that needs to be (inaudible) within the larger, regional framework that could help ease the tensions. I think especially given the tensions right now, it's really important to step back from focusing solely on India-Pakistan as a risk to Afghanistan and pull in other important regional actors: China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia.

MR. BENJAMIN: I've always wondered why the Pakistanis believe in the strategic depth idea since they don't have the infrastructure in Afghanistan to support the kind of military withdrawal that they're talking about.

But, Steve, you had something you wanted to add.

MR. COHEN: No, Vanda mentioned Iran. I think that not this administration, they can't do it, but the next administration might have discussions

with the Iranians, but a sliver of relationship which would allow us more access to Afghanistan.

During World War II, we did a deal with the Soviets so they could fight the Nazis better. We worked with the devil in order to balance the bigger devil. And I think if we worked with the Iranians against the Taliban, that's something worth considering. In a sense, the whole strategy in Afghanistan, the biggest threat we have over the Pakistanis is, in fact, to make their nightmare come true, that we will work with the Indians. But I don't think we should do that, but at least we should think about it.

The leverage we had in 2001, 2002 was over Pakistan. There were two levers, one, we could destroy their economy. There were in terrible shape, and, now, again, they're in bad shape. The other was that we would strategically align with India and forget about Pakistan.

Now, Pakistan provides us access to Afghanistan. if there was another way of getting into

Afghanistan, maybe that's a way to go, but I think we should work with Pakistan until it's demonstrated that they're unyielding on this issue.

MR. BENJAMIN: Well, thank you very much. At this point, I could keep asking questions, but we do have people who came to hear this, so, ask their own.

SPEAKER: Excuse me, can I speak?

MR. BENJAMIN: Well, actually, we didn't invite anyone to come here to speak, and, in fact, when you ask a question, I would like you to identify yourself and please make sure there is a question mark at the end of your question.

There's a hand all the way in the back, so, I'm going to call on that one to begin with.

MR. MILLAKIN: Al Millakin, American Independent Writers.

What have any of you come across as far as jihadists or Islamists commentary about claims it is winning in terms of world economic breakdown and

destruction this so-called "Crusader-Zionist-Hindu Alliance" or axis of evil or folly?

MR. BENJAMIN: Would you like to take a crack at that?

MR. COHEN: I'd be happy to. First, I will shamelessly plug my own book again. If you want to read about what Al-Qaeda sees as its ideology, its narrative, and how it describes the enemy, I try to do that in 150 pages.

From the beginning --

MR. BENJAMIN: It's available in the bookstore, by the way. On your way out.

(Laughter)

MR. BENJAMIN: Also on a table right outside the door.

MR. COHEN: It's also cheaper at Amazon, but.

(Laughter)

MR. RIEDEL: The purpose of 9/11, and, as I've suggested, I think the purpose of Mumbai have many ramifications, but one of them is this economic

issue. What Al-Qaeda wanted to do, and it said so very clearly since then, was to lure the United States into what it calls a bleeding war in Afghanistan. A war which would replicate the war that defeated the Soviet Union.

The formative experience of all of these men's lives was that war against the Soviet Union, and that's the default role model they continue to look at. But the United States gave them a two-for. We not only invaded Afghanistan, but then, for reasons that were purely mysterious to Al-Qaeda, we invaded Iraq. They now believe that the consequence of those two invasions, which have now cost the United States more than \$1 trillion, is precisely the economic meltdown that they were hoping for, the kind of economic meltdown that they saw in the Soviet Union in the late 1980s.

A year ago, Osama Bin Laden put out a video statement in which he talked about the home mortgage bubble in the United States and the impending crisis on Wall Street. The *Wall Street Journal* had a field

day with this piece saying he's now suddenly become a real estate agent.

Well, since the beginning of October, that tape looks in a very different way, and I would suggest that one of the next clues in the mystery of Mumbai is going to be the next statement we hear from Al-Qaeda, they are nothing if not frequent commentators on world events, and I would expect that we will hear in the next few days or few weeks a commentary on this probably from Ayman al-Zawahiri, which will try to put it in the context of the global jihad for Al-Qaeda's audience around the world.

SPEAKER: Sir?

MR. BUTT: My name is Kami Butt. I write for the *Pakistani Spectator*.

My question to Ms. Brown is that you said so much about Pakistan and against Pakistan, and I just wondered that if you read article yesterday in *New York Times* written by Ms. Mishra. She said 80,000 Kashmiri have been killed in Indian-occupied Kashmir. I'm a Kashmiri, and I know my life is not as important



as non-Kashmiri's lives, but I just wondered that 80,000 number is a very, very big number.

And my question to Mr. Steve Cohen is that: How would Mr. Bill Clinton's assignment be affected by this Mumbai tragedy?

And my question to Mr. Riedel that: Can we push Pakistan to accept Line of Control as a reality?

Thanks.

MR. BENJAMIN: I'm not sure I understood the reference to President Clinton.

MR. COHEN: As a negotiator between India and Pakistan.

MR. BENJAMIN: Oh, okay. All right.

Steve?

MR. RIEDEL: Yes, actually there's no news to report or basis, in fact, that Clinton will become or be asked to become a negotiator between India and Pakistan on Kashmir. I think that's a debatable idea.

If there is an American initiative at any level, whether it's overt and visible or quiet and

diplomatic, the first thing the person who does that should do is read a book -- Brookings is publishing another book by Ambassador Howard Schaffer, which recounts the history of American attempts to solve the Kashmir puzzle. Everything you can imagine has been tried by Americans. It goes back to the 1950s. So, my advice to whoever becomes Clinton's advisor if he gets it, read that book, you'll approach it more -- he might not take the job.

(Laughter)

DR. FELBAB-BROWN: Let me add --

MR. BUTT: (Off mike) Kashmiri who have been killed in India.

DR. FELBAB-BROWN: All I can say is that any loss of life is tragic. It's especially tragic if keeps repeating itself, and, unfortunately, here was a situation, rapprochement between India and Pakistan that also offered some hope for Kashmir, including lessening the visa restrictions, expanding control, and even prior to the current crisis, this really disintegrated by the riots to very heavy-handed

response by the Indian forces in Kashmir over the summer.

However, I would urge us to step back and not allow this isolated attack (inaudible) to unravel a process of accommodation that is possible. There was much talk about a self-concept of borders, where even if there would be no final resolution of the Line of Control, travel would be facilitated, economic exchanges would be facilitated.

There were a lot of interests on the part of the Valley Muslims to engage in a trade with Pakistan much closer than to mainland or the rest of India. A lot of opportunities, yet, very easy for spoilers to disrupt these peace processes in various forms, and we should -- both the government and the analysts should not allow themselves to be trapped into the game of terrorists of disrupting what is possible.

MR. BENJAMIN: Steve, if I could just follow-up quickly, even outside what the United States or other outside parties do, there was something going on regarding Kashmir between the two countries.

I know it's early day still, but do you have any forecasts for the future of that incipient process?

MR. COHEN: No, I think that, historically, when the Indians are ready, the Pakistanis are not ready. When the Pakistanis are ready, the Indians are not ready. It's like a teeter-totter, but there may be a moment or two in time when they're both ready, but that moment usually passes very quickly, and I think one of the purposes of this attack was to ensure that the teeter-totter tilted in such a direction that they wouldn't negotiate on Kashmir.

MR. BENJAMIN: Sir?

MR. HARRIET: Judd Harriet, documentary film producer.

My question regards the possible failure of the state in Pakistan. If this occurs, how would it likely take place? And are there contingency plans likely being made on behalf of India and the United States in that event?

MR. BENJAMIN: Steve, that one has your name written all over it.

MR. COHEN: Okay. Well, my book is about the whole question of the failure of Pakistan or the failure of the idea of Pakistan. And Pakistan has failed along many dimensions in bits and pieces. It has not failed comprehensively, and there's still a residual state there embodied in the military, but, clearly, the economy has failed, so, the social system has failed, political system never even matured, the bureaucracy has collapsed. So, the issue is, as you say, how do you deal with a mega-state that's 170, 180 million people with nuclear weapons and a commitment by some of its citizens to terrorism? It's a nightmare. And, in the last sentence of the book, I said "This could become the biggest foreign policy problem for America in the last half of the decade." The book was published in 2004. By 2006, I was sure that this would be Pakistan's place in our -- but there are no plans now, there's no

discussion except some coups in terms of the break-up of Pakistan.

Our best option is, in fact, to sustain the present Pakistan, but find partners in this. We can't do it alone.

MS. PRESSWELL: Hi, my name is Jenny Presswell. I'm from the Civil Rights Office at Homeland Security, and I do outreach to the South Asian community.

My first question is for all three of you is: What can the very well-integrated South Asian community in the United States do to help this situation? And, also, do you think LeT, if there's a possibility of any homegrown attacks here from the influence of LeT in the U.S., if there is any?

Thank you.

MR. COHEN: Why don't I start with the second part of that question?

There have been several court cases in the United States in which individuals have been indicted and convicted of carrying out

fundraising activities and other illegal activities on behalf of the LeT. So, there is a domestic U.S. security question potentially out there. This is an organization to which very skillfully uses its humanitarian work, which is sizable, significant, and important, probably among the most important that there was during the Kashmir earthquake, to develop networks of supporters ,and then just like we've seen Hezbollah and Hamas and other groups, within that humanitarian charitable framework, to also conduct illicit activities. And I would think that one of the takeaways, as I said earlier, is not just going to be on the international stage, but it's going to have to be on domestic security, is to make sure that we have been focusing resources and priorities on these kind of questions.

The question of the South Asian community, the South Asian community has a tremendous opportunity here to be abridged between the United States and both India and Pakistan. It's been doing that brilliantly for the last several years. These are the two most

successful immigrant groups in American history. And I would hope that within the South Asian community in the United States, there will be an effort here to avoid the kinds of scandalous attacks on each other which we seen in the South Asian press already. I mean, we've already got Pakistani television, one commentator saying that this was a Mossad Indian plot dreamed up to put the blame on Pakistan. Exact repetition of the kind of scandalous, scurrilous attacks that we saw after September 11.

Let's be responsible about these things, let's let the investigation run its course, and let's try to remember, at the end of the day, there is not a war option here for resolving this question.

MR. BENJAMIN: Would you agree that the greatest danger to the U.S. interest from LeT would actually probably be posed either in the U.K. or from U.K.-based radicals where --

MR. COHEN: Absolutely. The 800,000-strong Pakistani Diaspora in the U.K., the vast majority of which are law-abiding people who have no interest in



violence, but that is Al-Qaeda's number one target today for recruiting individuals that can be used to target both United Kingdom and the United States.

MR. BENJAMIN: All right.

Right there. No, I'm sorry. It's not that I don't want to give the mike to that person, but I did pick on the person right there who has his hand up.

It wasn't him either, but that's okay.

MR. ELAKAMI: Vijay Elakami, NEI.

I'm not sure exactly where China fits in. It looks like the U.S.-Pakistani policy has been to take aid from the U.S., but China has a lot more influence, and China, having a border with Pakistan, I would have thought would be interested in a stable state, but they seem to be like facilitating or at least being neutral on the destabilization of Pakistan. They seem to have a lot of influence on Pakistan, whether the military, as well as the civilians.

MR. BENJAMIN: Chinese influence on the Pakistanis?

MR. COHEN: I'll give a short answer to that. That is that Chinese are now both officially and unofficially very worried about the future of Pakistan, partly because Pakistan was trading (inaudible) and other Chinese in Pakistan, and they talked to us and there have been context, but the Chinese don't usually lecture their friends. They leave that to the Americans.

(Laughter)

MR. COHEN: We're the ones who are always scolding or lecturing, the Chinese stay back and that's why the Pakistanis think China is their best friend. But in the last visit that Zardari made to Beijing, he did not get money, nor did he get it from the Saudis. So, there's something going on in China, but I think the Chinese should step up and act like a responsible great power. In a sense, they also have a role in Kashmir because they're physically and legally there courtesy of the Pakistanis. So, if

there was a Chinese initiative, maybe more important than an American initiative, we'll control the Pakistanis, we'll settle the Kashmir thing as far as we're concerned, and that'll be a great step. I don't expect it to happen, but it's something a mature China should be doing or thinking about.

DR. FELBAB-BROWN: Well, let me add here that during the 2001, 2002 standoff, China did, in fact, play a very important, quiet role, but very effective role, and there certainly are possibilities for harmonizing reactions from China to decrease tensions, and I think China has a great interest. It's, perhaps, not willing to do so in a very overt and public manner, but it is interested and probably ready to cooperate.

At the same time, China is, of course, concerned that the pressure in Pakistan does not resolve in further destabilization of Pakistan, which is the dilemma for everyone. There's a lot of outside pressures that, if mishandled, could very easy

destabilize Zardari in the (inaudible) civilian leadership.

MR. BENJAMIN: In the interest of equity, the man who had his hand up directly behind you on my right. No, on my right. There you go. Perfect.

MR. ROBINSON. Thanks. Chris Robinson, National Defense University.

Real simple, how do you think the upcoming elections in India are going to influence the (inaudible) government's response to this, especially given if there's a solid Pakistani connection to the attacks?

MR. COHEN: I'm not sure if the BJP expect -- that is the Hindu Conservative Party -- expects us to push them into the victory column, but, under any circumstances, if the BJP could only come to power in a coalition. So, a lot of this may depend on what the coalition, what the state-based parties themselves decide about the meaning of this event.

Let me add one thing to the earlier question. Pakistan was always important to the United

States for 30 years, 40 years because it was a strong state. It was a militarily powerful, moderate, Muslim state. It's becoming important now because it's a weak state and a potentially failing state in a sense their asset is this: help us or else. That if we put pressure on them, as when Donna said they could go under, and this is a dilemma for both us and for the Chinese and for the Indians, and the Chinese are quite right that too much pressure on Zardari would certainly push him out. But, again, what's the replacement, what's the alternative?

MR. BENJAMIN: Bruce?

MR. RIEDEL: Let me just add one other point about the domestic Indian political process. The congress was going to be in a lot of trouble anyway. Indian voters have demonstrated a very consistent policy of throwing out the incumbent every chance they get, and with the Indian economy suffering as part of the global economic meltdown, even though that suffering may still show 6, 7 percent growth rate this year, that's significantly less than the growth rate

that Indians have gotten used to. This adds to an already very, very difficult picture for congress as it looks towards these elections, and I think it'll be very interesting to see whether our congress's leadership and Ms. Gandhi in particular decides that maybe it's time for a new candidate to be the spearhead in these elections. Early days are certainly something well worth keeping an eye on.

MR. BENJAMIN: Sir? Right behind you, Gary?

MR. GROSS: Wolfe Gross, a former U.S. army foreign area specialist in the region.

The events of 26/11 suggest to me that the worldwide jihad never does the same thing twice. And we react to it the way the U.S. Army has always reacted, fighting the last war. Whether it's the guy who wore the shoes with the so-called bombs on the airplane that has us taking off our shoes every time we get on an airplane anymore.

(Laughter)

MR. GROSS: And God knows how much that costs. Would somebody like to comment on the voracity of my point, that they never repeat themselves?

MR. RIEDEL: I'd be very happy to.

What is very striking about Al-Qaeda and its partners in the global jihad, and LeT may now deserve that title as a partner, is their innovativeness, as you just said. They are astute students of our countermeasures and try to develop new countermeasures around them.

The 2006 plot, bringing explosives onboard an airplane in different quantities and then mixing them, that was a very, very clever way around all the security procedures that we've done after September 11, including taking your shoes off. So, now you have to take your shoes off and you can't drink on an airplane other than what they provide you at absorbent rates.

But what is also very striking about them is their consistent intent to go back to certain targets over and over again. And I would suggest Mumbai

demonstrates that again. Once you get on the target list, it doesn't seem you get off. World Trade Center didn't get off. The international airline industry, which is the single most hardened part of the world since September 11, remains very much on their focus, and I wouldn't be surprised at all if we didn't see a further attempts against the international airline industry, which would derivatives of the 2006 plot.

MR. COHEN: And the hotel industry.

MR. BENJAMIN: I would just add to that, that not only do they not give up once you're on the list, but once they have an approach that they think is useful, although they are hugely innovative and like to go high, like to go low, different levels of techniques, the 2006 plot was a variation on the Bojinka plot from the 90s of mixing the explosive onboard.

And the Cole bombing, for example, was a repetition of a failed effort that they tried against the U.S. warship earlier, the U.S.S. Sullivan. So, I think once they have a good idea, they really do want



to follow through with it, but I think you're absolutely right that they are tactically both opportunistic and innovative, and that's a huge problem for large, lumbering bureaucracies, which tend not to think in the most flexible way. But we'll have to bring you back into the government to figure that out since you've clearly cracked the code.

MS. SINGH: Thank you. Surgite Mon Singh, American University.

My question is addressed both to Steve and to Bruce because Steve particularly raises the spectrum of Pakistan as a failed state, and, in fact, Steve once expressed it even better with General Musharraf holding a pistol to his head and saying unless you give me everything I want, I shoot myself.

Now, I remember vividly in the fall of 2001 when the Bush Administration was embracing General Musharraf and initiating this multi-billion dollar military aid scheme. There was some assurances given by the U.S. Government that it had taken control or

was capable of taking control of Pakistan's nuclear establishment.

Now, what happened to that? Why now do we have another scenario of if you don't give me everything I want, we blow the whole world up with our hundred nuclear weapons?

MR. BENJAMIN: That's a cheerful question. Okay.

MR. COHEN: Yes, I think that the Pakistan Government has reassured all comers and visitors effectively that they have a system to control their nuclear weapons. I think there's been a lot of hysteria here about that system. If you look at it and if you talk to them, it's a very strong system, and it's modeled after ours, it's modeled after other countries. There's no doubt about it.

So, I don't think there's anything to worry about now, but, in the context of five or six years from now, and also looking at Pakistan's past history as a state that actually actively proliferated nuclear technology, do you accept Pakistani assurance is now

about their future, and what concerns me -- and the book has a whole scenario about this -- if Pakistan should begin to come apart at the seams and things really look bad, who gets possession of the nukes? What do they do with them? I don't know. It's a very problematic issue.

A second issue, and, in fact, adding to the target list, I've read Indian commentators -- an Indian commentator, that he was surprised that they didn't send a frogman team out to blow up part of the Indian Navy, which was sitting in Bombay Harbor. But I wouldn't go further down the Bombay Harbor, Mumbai Harbor. There's the Indian nuclear facility there, and you could imagine, as the Tamil Tigers have done, the seaborne attacks in effect of using attacking very high-value target.

So, India has a couple of reactors on its ocean, on the east side and also on the west side. Other countries do, too. I think that might be a target set that might be added to this list, and I'd be very concerned about this in

the future, and that's something the international community should be very worried about.

MR. BENJAMIN: The good news is that reactors are very, very hard to target. But what you may missed while you were winging your way here from Cleveland is that they found two more bombs in the Mumbai train station. They appear to have been left by the attackers, but it's not entirely evident that there wasn't a later plot.

I'm afraid that this brings us to the end of our time. Bruce, I think, has to go off and instruct the young at another institution. But I want to think Vanda and Steve and Bruce a great deal for what I thought was a tremendous conversation on a difficult and rather well daunting set of issues connected with the Mumbai attacks.

So, please join me in thanking them.

(Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

## CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public # 351998  
in and for the  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
My Commission Expires:  
November 30, 2008

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190