THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

# RESPONDING TO THE HISTORIC FLOODS IN PAKISTAN:

# POLITICAL AND SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, September 1, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

**Introduction and Moderator:**

ELIZABETH FERRIS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement
The Brookings Institution

**Featured Speakers:**

MICHAEL YOUNG
Regional Director for Asia, Caucasus, and Middle East
International Rescue Committee

STEPHEN P. COHEN
Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

GENERAL JEHANGIR KARAMAT (Ret.)
Visiting Fellow, The Brookings Institution

TIM LENDERKING
Director, Office of Pakistan Affairs, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs
U.S. Department of State

MARK WARD
Acting Director, Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
USAID

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. FERRIS: Welcome to Brookings. My name is Beth Ferris. I'm a senior fellow here at Brookings and co-director of the Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement, which looks at humanitarian issues with a particular focus on those who are forced to flee their communities because of war or natural disasters.

Today we've come together to talk about the impact or potential impact of the historic flooding that Pakistan has experienced over the past six weeks or so. We have a very distinguished panel to talk with us today and we're going to begin by looking at the humanitarian situation on the ground.

We'll begin with Mark Ward. You have full bios in your little packet so I'll just highlight some of the characteristics. Mark is acting director of the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance of USAID. AID, I should point out, is the Agency for International Development, not the Agency for Internal Displacement, as is included in your little packet although that might be a really good idea.

Mark is a career foreign service officer. He's twice served in Pakistan. Also Afghanistan, Egypt, Philippines, and Russia. He's worked with USAID's reconstruction taskforces after the 2004 tsunami, 2005 Pakistani earthquake, and reconstruction in Lebanon.

He'll be followed by Mike Young with the International Rescue Committee. Mike is the regional director for Asia, Caucasus, and

the Middle East. Until April of this year, he was IRC's country representative in Pakistan and he's worked on humanitarian issues for countries over the past 14 years, including Afghanistan, Bosnia, Chechnya and Sudan.

We'll then turn to General Karamat, who's with us at Brookings for a few more weeks. He is a former chairman of the Pakistani Joint Chiefs and Chief of Army Staff in Pakistan. He is a former Pakistani ambassador to the U.S. and has been active in dialogue with India in Track II negotiations. He's going to speak about the impact of the flooding on Pakistan perhaps with a focus on the Pakistani military, but also some of the economic issues.

We'll then turn to Tim Lenderking, who's the director of the Pakistan Office of the Department of State where he's been serving since June of this year, a particularly busy time, I would imagine, to be taking on this portfolio. He's a career foreign service officer. He's served in Iraq, Kuwait, Morocco, Bangladesh, Syria, and prior to that he worked on refugee issues also in a variety of countries.

We'll conclude with a presentation by Stephen Cohen, who's one of our own senior fellows here at Brookings, an expert on South Asia in particularly security issues. He's written or edited some 12 books and I saw one of them on the bookstand as we were walking in. He came to Brookings after a successful academic career at University of Illinois, but he's also taught in Singapore, Japan, and India. He can address some of

the regional dynamics or the potential consequences of the flooding.

I've asked each of the speakers to talk for seven to ten minutes so we'll have some time for discussion, so get your questions ready. I think it's bound to be, hopefully, an eye opening and somewhat sobering discussion.

We'll begin with Mark, please.

MR. WARD: Seven minutes, I thought you said 70?

The poor audience. There's room up here if people want seats.

Well, good morning, and thanks to Brookings for having all of us and thank you for focusing on this terribly timely and important topic.

I think everybody knows from media reports about the scale of this disaster. Having worked myself on the tsunami and the Pakistan earthquake, the one comparison that really resonates with me is that the people affected by the floods is greater than the sum of the people affected by the tsunami, the Pakistan earthquake, and the Haiti earthquake.

If you have somebody next to you with a wooden head or some other source of wood, knock on it for a second. The weather's getting better. The water is receding, but we always have to say that knocking on wood. It could go bad again. That has been our greatest challenge so far, is access and access is determined by the weather. The weather looks like it's getting better, knock on wood.

In terms of recent developments, you may be reading this, but what we're seeing is a gradual shift by some members of the international NGO community to the south to respond to the floodwaters. What we've tried to say from the very beginning is that USAID, the U.S. Government's response, has to follow the flood waters, and while we began up in the north where we had a number of NGOs working on the IDP crisis from last year, we pushed hard and with a lot of cooperation from the NGOs, to move them into the Punjab, into Sindh and partly into Balochistan as the waters move down the Indus so that we could have some response there as well. That is happening now. We obviously have to be a little bit concerned what impact that will have where they came from up in the north because we obviously don't want to forget that part of the country, particularly as the flood waters recede there and people start moving home.

As you probably know, so far the United States has pledged $200 million for the effort. It is very likely that number will go up, almost certainly that number will go up in terms of long-term response. We will know more as the floodwaters recede and we're able to get greater access to see what the real needs are.

Through the end of August, the efforts of the U.S. military were tremendous. With their, I think, about 29 helicopters now, they were able to rescue almost 9,000 people, I'm sure they will pass 9,000 people. They're not going anywhere, and delivered 2.5 million pounds of relief

supplies.

The weather had an impact on them. When it was raining badly they couldn't get off the ground, but on most days they were tremendously helpful and useful and probably contributed those rescue efforts to the relatively low death rate that we've seen for this disaster. We were able to get into communities quickly and get out injured people, elderly people that needed critical care.

USAID has had three priorities during this initial relief phase. In no particular order, shelter, and what we've been focusing on is trying to get the very durable plastic sheeting that we always use for transitional shelter, into the temporary camps that have been set up. We estimate that we've got enough plastic sheeting now in the country for about 150,000 people. That plastic sheeting will also be very useful as people go home to rig up some temporary shelter while they begin to rebuild their homes.

Another shipment of plastic sheeting arrived today in Islamabad.

Food. We're getting greater access every day to people that need food and working closely with the World Food Program, we estimate that we're now getting food to about 2.2 million people, but we know we have a ways to go. There's at least 6 million people that need food during this urgent phase, but again, with the weather getting better, with the floods receding, every day we're getting better access to deliver more

food.

And finally, health. I think you've all read about the concerns about waterborne diseases. We've been very concerned about this. We're very happy that our investments in something called the Disease Early Warning System two years ago with WHO have really paid off because we're able to get reporting very quickly from Pakistani health centers all over the flood-affected areas when they see a potential case of cholera and we're able to get medical professionals to the scene very quickly to deal with it and including talking to the community around that potential victim so that they know what to do to improve hygiene and keep the cholera, if it is cholera, from spreading.

We've sent in water filtration units, millions of kits for cleaning water, and we're very grateful for the donations that Procter & Gamble has made, hundreds of thousands of water cleansing sachets called PUR, which they actually manufacture in Karachi, are going across the area as well.

Let me say a little bit about -- before I close -- challenges. We're -- what are the rules here today in terms of -- is this all going to be attributed to Mark Ward?

MS. FERRIS: Yes, this is on the record.

MR. WARD: All right. Well, then I'll water these down a little bit. Thank you. Glad I asked.

Because it's Pakistan, because there are concerns about

security, we have not -- we, the U.S. Government team that's out there that works for me, the Disaster Assistance Response Team, as well as the very capable men and women at the embassy -- we've not had the access that we'd like to have, not just because of the weather, but because of security concerns, and that has made it harder for us, not only to know what needs to be done, but to be able to determine that what help we're providing is actually being effective. So, that has been an issue, but that's been an issue for a long time in Pakistan.

And that gets to the issue of branding. A fascinating debate that's going on, and always goes on when there's a natural disaster that hits Pakistan, is, how much do we brand that the commodities that we're bringing in, the plastic sheeting, the food, the tents, the pharmaceuticals, are coming from the United States of America? We're obviously most concerned about the safety of the brave men and women that are working for NGOs to carry out this work, but we also recognize this is Pakistan, it's very important for the Pakistani people to know that the American people are standing behind them during this very difficult time, so there's a very interesting challenge for us in weighing the branding desire with the safety and security of the humanitarians in the field.

The transition to the long term. The DART team, my team from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, we will come home relatively soon. The U.S. military will pull its assets out relatively soon. But the long-term reconstruction effort, if the earthquake is any example,

will go on for a very long time, will go on for years. We are still finishing the schools in the earthquake-affected area and it's been almost five years and I think that's a good thing that it's taken that long. But the challenge is convincing the Pakistani people that when we pull out the very visible military assets and the assets associated with OFDA, that the United States is not leaving. In fact, the United States is going to be there for a very long time.

And then finally, the last challenge -- and I'm sure Tim will talk about this as well -- is private giving has been poor. It's getting better and this is one reason why we really appreciate Brookings doing this and helping to keep this issue alive and in public awareness, but private giving for the flood's response has paled by comparison with private giving for the tsunami, for the Pakistan earthquake and for Haiti, and we're doing all we can at State and AID and various other organizations around town, to keep this issue alive and to provide people information about how they can give, but we need those contributions because as I've said, we're going to be at this for a very long time.

Thanks very much.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Turning now to Mike Young.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you. So, in this overview I'll give a perspective from the humanitarian NGO community and not speaking specifically on behalf of my own organization, National Rescue Committee, but more widely of the NGO community itself.

The international relief presence in Pakistan is largely organized into a network body called the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum, of which ISA is currently the chair, and these issues reflect a broad members' set of concerns from that forum.

I'm going to group the issues in three broad areas which will speak to its complexity, the disaster's complexity, the scale of the disaster, and the logistics associated with the disaster. And necessarily these are going to be headlines. I'm going to gallop through them because time is short, and hopefully we can talk in more depth in the question and answer session. And also note that although I'm grouping them under these kind of large headlines, all the issues are intertwined, so every issue touches upon another which is part of the complexity of the situation.

So, as Mark just pointed out, we're dealing with a natural disaster of staggering scale, but that happens within the overall context, of course, of a chronic, complex emergency. Pakistan was already struggling in terms of many key social and human development indicators before the insurgency sharpened in the last several years, before this disaster.

That chronic complex emergency of course features powerful political and security dynamics which influence every aspect of the humanitarian response. So, I'm just going to mention perhaps three or four of those dynamics, as headlines, again, just to touch upon them.

First of all, most obviously, security. As you know, I mean,

the Taliban have made overt threats against the humanitarian aid effort and against humanitarian aid workers. However, what I'd like to emphasize is that is not necessarily something new. The Taliban have made those threats before. Every agency that is a member agency of the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum is familiar with working in this environment. We have very robust security protocols, we have very strong links with the communities that we work with, and we do share security information and we're setting up a new strengthened security advice service to serve every humanitarian NGO in that network. So, we are doing everything that we can to assure the safety of our staff, our partners and communities and our assets. And again, one other thing to emphasize in terms of security and in a wider context is that although the International Rescue Committee and every other member agency of the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum is an international relief organization, our face on the ground in Pakistan is Pakistani, 99.9 percent of IRC staff are Pakistani, and that will not change during this emergency. We'll bring in very few extra expatriate expert advisors to deal with this.

Secondly, linked to the security issue, civil military coordination issues. It's a very sharp issue in Pakistan. There's a lot of work going on talking to the various stakeholders, whether that is the Pakistani military itself, the Pakistani government at provincial and federal level, UN agencies, or the stakeholders such as the U.S. embassy, about putting together a comprehensive civil-military coordination architecture for

Pakistan which will be the first time that has ever happened with a sovereign national army.

But it is exceedingly critical, of course, because it complicates any use by humanitarian agencies which adhere to humanitarian principle, which include principles of impartiality and independence, to use military assets in a relief effort. And the member agencies of the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum are, at the moment anyway, are not using Pakistani military assets to undertake aid work because of the increased threat that exposed as humanitarian agencies and workers and partner communities to.

A second civil-military coordination issue, but linked to a wider kind of governmental issue, is the whole issue of what's called registration, in kind of shorthand in Pakistan. The Pakistani government intends to register all of the flood-affected people in order to provide them with compensation and that is obviously a very good thing. It mirrors an effort made by the Pakistani authorities during the displacement crisis to provide IDPs with registration and therefore access to both government and non-governmental humanitarian supplies. But it is a complicated and sometimes contentious issue because how do you define the criteria for registering? How do you deliver aid? Is aid confined only to those who are registered? This was a big issue during the displacement crisis. So, there's a number of complexities to work through in what is a broadly positive initiative, but can be, sometimes, damaging, can be destabilizing.

Lastly, in terms of complexity, you of course have what you might term the blow up on the bruise, yes? This is a climate-related disaster, however, many of the people affected by it, particularly those affected up in the northwest, what's now Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa Province, are displaced people, whether those Afghan refugees -- and you probably will have seen that, you know, for instance a whole Afghan refugee camp, Azakhel, is completely obliterated, and Afghan refugees in Pakistan are now in a very vulnerable and marginalized situation. And those are still Pakistanis themselves that are still displaced from the ongoing conflict between the Pakistani military and the Pakistani Taliban, many of whom are from the tribal agencies along the Afghan-Pakistan border.

So, there's complexity also in terms of the scale and the phasing, as is obvious, as Mark pointed out. This is a situation where in some areas flood waters will still be rising or will be breaching, levees and barrages to flood new areas, in other areas water is already receding, such as in some areas in the northwest.

So, in terms of scale, just a few points to note. I mean, the scale is, if it wasn't infelicitous in relation to Pakistan you could truly call it Biblical. It is, for the humanitarian relief community, we are running at top speed at the outside edge of our capacity just to stay in place right now. It is challenging our normal response capacity right across the board for every member of the humanitarian community. It is challenging traditional ways of responding to disasters.

For example, how do you provide temporary housing solutions for a population of millions in Sindh Province that is on the move? It's a mobile population. Traditional solutions would look at family or clan-based solutions in terms of trying to give some individualized housing. That may not be appropriate or even feasible within this context, so people are having to really think of new and creative ways to respond to many of the fundamental human needs of this crisis because of scale.

Now, again, the multiplicity of challenges within the disaster response increase daily. You know, you see increases in the effected population in factors of millions within a week. Again, to point out, some areas are recovering now. We're entering a very early recovery phase while others face eminent danger of flooding. And what does that mean?

For the humanitarian community that means triage. You have to decide what is the priority in terms of your resources, what makes the most difference to the most people? But triage also means that resources are sucked to the cutting edge of the disaster and that right now means Sindh. Sindh is an inland sea at the moment, let's face it. But that pulls resources and attention away from areas, for instance, in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, which now there's an opportunity to engage with communities that have early recovery prospects, that are thinking about or already are returning or have been isolated by flood waters. So, again, that's something that you -- a tricky balance you always have to keep in play.

Now, scale also links to the last set of issues which is around logistics, because the first and fundamental logistical problem is cash. Funding is still critically low given the massive scale of need. Last time I looked the Unified Humanitarian Community response plan which is under the aegis of the United Nations, it's about 64, 65 percent funded, and that's a plan that's made on a very conservative basis, so it's a plan for 3 months, it's a plan for a population size that's probably going to be 50 to 60 percent of what the population that we have to actually serve and assist. So, it's a small plan that's just over half funded six weeks into the crisis and that translates directly into any ability to move ahead of running to stay in place and start to work at the scale that's needed if we're going to have any chance of really properly addressing really basic human needs.

There's a chronic challenge, I think, not just in this disaster, but in every other disaster response, in translating pledges and commitments into money on the ground, money that's working on the ground. Bureaucratic mechanisms come into play, money gets stuck, even when money is free you have to spend time procuring, hiring staff, et cetera, et cetera, so there's always a time lag and sometimes that time lag is just simply not acceptable. Here I have to point out I'm not referring to OFDA. OFDA have been, not to give them kind of feigned praise, but have been the most responsive, the most useful, the best agency active on the ground in Pakistan right now, have been consistently for several

years, actually. They responded immediately with significant resources and their teams have been very flexible, and as you said, we have a dialogue, an ongoing dialogue on many issues with OFDA.

Just to say that, I mean, what we've seen is there has been some pick up in private giving. It's still at a lower level than, for instance, the Haitian earthquake response, but I think what we fear right now is that pick up is going to be momentary and it's going to drop off as the media attention to the floods drops off and already you see news stories about the floods slipping right down the kind of news media priority list and I think that's why events like this and any other public advocacy efforts essentially keeping attention on the floods, and specifically as we move into an early recovery phase because funding that early recovery phase is going to require a lot of money and a lot of money is going to need a lot of attention to generate it.

Access is still a big issue, that's the second logistical problem. Areas of Sindh are still heavily underwater. The areas move around, so the inland sea it moves around, it moves around fast, and it scours as it goes so that, from the mountains on the Afghan-Pakistan border right down to the mouth of the Indus, places have been wiped clean, villages have been wiped clean, infrastructure taken away, as you know. So it's -- we've had to cut roads into the upper Swat Valley by using our partners in communities cut miles and miles of roads to get relief supplies into isolated communities that have been cut off by the floods in

the mountains in northern Swat. So, that's just an example of some of the logistical challenges we're facing.

Coordination. Coordination's always a challenge. Now, I have to tell you that there's lots of coordination in Pakistan. People coordinate a lot. There are coordination meetings, several of them every day. Now, the question would be, is all of that effective, is it efficient? It's a good question. But, you know, there is a structure in place and we are talking to each other and we are trying to do our best to share information, to plan and to reduce duplication, but maximize impact, but it's still a real challenge.

And lastly, the early recovery strategy will be key and we need to get ahead of the curve on this. Right now it is somewhat of an empty hull in terms of the humanitarian response and I think one of the key things about having an early recovery strategy I place is our ability then to market it, to market it to the donor community, to market it to private givers, because that will be essential in being able to translate quickly into aid on the ground, and what we saw, for instance, in the displacement crisis in return over the last two years, is that there was this big gap between the humanitarian response and the early recovery strategy actually getting mobilized, and that was a very damaging gap.

So I'm going to conclude now because I'm probably well out of time. Apologies for the superficiality of that. Apologies for any lacunae that I've left in that. I'd like to end by underlining three points and giving

you kind of three blessings in this situation. Very quickly, underlying funding is still desperately short given the scale and the urgency of the needs which are still evolving. Secondly, remember this is a complex political and security context which -- all of which directly affect humanitarian response and constrain humanitarian space. Thirdly, let's get that early recovery strategy in place quickly because it's absolutely essential.

Three blessings, end on a bright note, these are all rooted in solutions that are within Pakistan itself, so, Pakistan is rich in human resources. As I said, 99 percent of our staff are Pakistani, Pakistan is rich in some of the people most vital to the early recovery effort -- engineers, water engineers, civil engineers, doctors, et cetera. There is no need to truck in expatriates to Pakistan. It has its human resources in place for response.

Secondly, there is a concerted effort, everybody's on the same page, everybody's working at the same goal. Yes, communication might be sticky, yes, the funding might be not what it should be, but there is coordinated effort going on.

And lastly, there is the potential here to underpin critical key civilian agencies within the Pakistani authorities like the National Disaster Management Authority, to make them much more effective and therefore broaden the resources that the civilian administration has to bring to bear in terms of resilience to disaster and response to disaster.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, Mike.

Indeed a sobering view of the reality facing humanitarian operations. We turn now to General Karamat, your observations, particularly on the impact on Pakistan over the longer term.

GENERAL KARAMAT: Thank you, Beth. In fact, I'd also like to thank Brookings and Beth for putting together this event which is enormously important for Pakistan, we want this to be understood, every negative and positive aspect of this to be projected and understood. So, I'm very grateful for this opportunity.

I'd also like to take this opportunity as a Pakistani, though I don't represent the government, to thank the United States and the people of the United States, for everything that is being done for Pakistan and Mark just outlined the enormous support that is going from the United States to Pakistan and I would like to thank you for that.

We are also getting, after a slow start, we are getting response from the world. They've all reached out one way or the other and a lot of support is coming into Pakistan, at least to go with the immediate impact of this disaster in terms of relief, rescue, and disease prevention.

So, that's helping a lot. People are helping. There is a long tradition in Pakistan of coming together in situations like this. There are a lot of organizations working within Pakistan from outside Pakistan, and I think it's -- generally the response to the disaster may have been slow to

kick off, but it's taken shape and it is there on the ground.

The magnitude of the disaster in terms of statistics is well known. I'm not going to go over all that in terms of area, one-fifth of the country under water, 20 million people affected, all that, so it's a colossal disaster, but the worst part is the infrastructure which has been wiped out in terms of railway tracks, roads, bridges, and parts of the country cut off. And without going into anymore details I'll just say that this disaster in Pakistan comes on top of an already fragile situation, fragile in the sense of internal security, conflicts within and just across our borders, which has just -- it's so badly timed that its impact is magnified many fold because of that previous situation. The country was already coping with a very serious economic situation and then to be hit with this is really serious.

There are -- the government has been under criticism in Pakistan, but if you look at disasters, whether it's Katrina or whether it's the tsunami, the government has to bear the brunt of criticism and it's always the government people who criticize for shortcomings of various kinds. The government is coping to the best of its ability and I think a lot has happened. What is making things extremely difficult is that the National Disaster Management Agency was never structured to cope with a disaster of this magnitude. I mean, it could take care of disasters in geographically restricted spaces like the earthquake in 2005 in the Kashmir area, or some other thing happening in a particular segment of the country, but the whole country becoming a disaster zone is something

beyond the National Disaster Management Agency's capacity and that capacity has to be built up.

The other is, and this, I think is very important, that in some of the -- most of the flooded areas, there is no government. The local government has been just wiped out. Besides the infrastructure, the local government has ceased to exist and that's magnified the problem enormously for disaster management agency, for the government, for the bureaucracy, so this effort to recreate structures and put them on the ground as soon as possible is being done on a priority basis and we should see results soon, and the National Disaster Management Agency is also being built up, has been built up, with military support, with civilian support, to take on a much bigger task than it was ever designed to undertake, and we are getting a lot of support.

This is especially true because the aid, material and money which is coming, has to be utilized correctly and has to be seen that it is being utilized correctly and that's why you need these things to come up on the ground.

The economic impact has been enormous. I've noticed here that there are two figures. One, let me first say that Pakistan is predicting something like 4.5 percent growth before the floods. Now the figures are from negative growth to zero to about 3 percent. Three percent is the most optimistic that I've seen, that it's eventually going to settle at about 3 percent.

Inflation, which was high, is going to go up further. Deficits, which we were trying to tackle, are going to go up again because of the loans that are being taken, because of the fall in exports, the increase in imports, especially food imports, and food inflation is going to be higher, which when you couple with the anger on the street and the difficulties which people are facing, could translate into social unrest, that's why it's important to get a handle on things on the ground as soon as possible which they are trying to do.

Rebuilding, rehabilitation, of course, will come later as Mark said and it's going to -- I think the cost is going to be in the billions, I'm not even going to hazard a guess because it's enormous amounts which are going to be involved for that.

I think besides the aid which is coming in from here, there inevitably will be a reordering of priorities as far as the Kerry-Lugar Bill money is concerned, where it's going, where it was going earlier, where it's going to go now. Some of that is going to happen.

The World Bank and the IMF, we have to -- they are already talking to them to restructure the arrangements with Pakistan and I think the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, possibly with the government, are going to do a damage needs assessment which will be sometime -- ready sometime mid-October, and that will sort of indicate a figure that Pakistan has to then acquire to deal with the situation.

The future, I mean, you look at all these things, it looks

bleak, especially from the economic point of view. We've had disasters before. There is enormous resilience there. There's a lot of work going on. So, I think as the waters recede and people get back, you will find things improving drastically on the ground and very quickly. We've never had a disaster like this before, that's for sure, so it is a new experience and we have to see how it works out.

On the security aspect, it is a serious aspect that we have to consider. We already had an insurgency in the west and a prolonged counter-insurgency operation going on in the western border areas, and of course there's the situation in Afghanistan which hasn't settled down yet. So, with that situation, there is also the situation with India, dialogue by fits and starts, Kashmir is in a serious state of turmoil and agitation which impacts on the situation in Pakistan. Those situations are there and internal security situation within Pakistan which, I said, was very fragile in terms of urban violence as a response to what the military is doing in terms of counter-insurgency, and those things continue. There is no let up on that and nothing can be taken for granted because as far as I can see, nobody is going to consider the floods as a situation in which they should not take an advantage. So, we do see a threat there.

Because of all the constraints that I've highlighted, troops have had to be involved. The military, actually, is the lead agency for disaster relief, management, and so on. Hopefully, it will not be involved in the rehabilitation and rebuilding which will take years, and other

agencies will take over once the crisis has been resolved, but aviation aspects, 60 to 70,000 troops diverted to this task will at some point have to come back.

As far as the impact of diverting these troops is concerned, yes, it's there, but I don't think the military is about to lose any of the gains that it has made in the western border area, they will never allow that to happen. There may be delays in some of the projected operations that were to be carried out in that area until capacity returns to the pre-flood level and we can undertake those operations again.

Here I've seen various concerns being highlighted of how the flood situation could play out. There are those nightmare scenarios of some kind of upheaval in Pakistan, systemic failure, political upheaval of some kind, a takeover by the Taliban or something. None of those really figure in the present situation. You can talk about them, consider them, but under the circumstances with the company largely functioning as far as government, security agencies, everything is concerned, there is no breakdown in the country as such and I don't see any signs of a failure of the type that could cause concern. In fact, with the support that we are getting with the financial institutions continuing to be committed in Pakistan, there is a lot of hope that things will recover and stabilize fairly quickly.

There are concerns about Pakistan's capacity to deal with this disaster. Those concerns, of course, are genuine. There are those

concerns in Pakistan also, but that capacity is, as I said, is being rapidly built up to cope with the situation that we face. There are concerns about extremist organizations making gains in remote areas which are cut off and making inroads into the local population in terms of gaining influence or recruiting people. We had those fears in the Kashmir earthquake, too, and they are there. Some of those organizations are doing localized relief work, but on a humanitarian basis. I don't see any such organization have the capacity to do even marginal work in a crisis of this magnitude. This has to be the government and the support that it's getting. I mean, 30 helicopters from the United States, plus our own aviation assets, plus others coming in, that is the kind of organization that you require, not what local people can do. They help, but it's not enough.

The one concern which we do have is that there is going to be no let up in pressure as far as the security situation is concerned. That has to be tackled in tandem with the disaster situation and they're trying to do that.

The military -- there's a lot of concern about the civil-military relationship and the military's up front role in this disaster. The military has been out of the political and civil situation for a long time and the civil-military relationship in Pakistan has stabilized to a large extent. There is no problem there. And in this particular situation the military is operating as an arm of the government, as a part of the political government, and it's delivering to support that government and I think a lot of work is going on

in that direction. So, while concerns and fears remain, just the very fact that we are aware of them and coping with them I think should be a great reassurance for everybody. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, General. We turn now to Tim Lenderking, State Department.

MR. LENDERKING: Well, thanks very much to the Asia -- to the Brookings Institute for hosting this event today and I think it's terrific to see so many people out here today to be interested in what's going on in Pakistan and, I think, to express our support because I think as our other speakers have noted, it is a defining moment for Pakistan and a situation like this presents a country like Pakistan with huge challenges and it has indeed, I think, traumatized the country to some extent, but in a situation like this, there are also many opportunities and I want to talk a little bit about those as we see them from a U.S. Government point of view.

One of the key challenges, of course, as our other speakers have noted, is we don't yet know the scope of this disaster. It is not like an earthquake, it is not like a tsunami. It is a slowly unfolding drama that is truly national in scope. It started in the northwest of the country, the floodwaters have surged, they're still moving toward the south. As Mark has noted, there may be additional rains. The weather has improved, but the surge is moving out toward the ocean. Only in the next few weeks will the international community and the Pakistanis really be able to assess the extent of the damage, so in that sense it's a huge challenge. It's not

localized; it's national. The death toll, as we've seen, is relatively small, but that's not the way that you measure a situation like this.

In order to respond to a catastrophe like this, it's really necessary for the United States, I think, to throw its entire weight behind providing support and I think we've done that. It's been very much an all government approach. We've had the President of the United States, you know, issuing a very strong statement in support of the Pakistani people and expressing condolences. Secretary Clinton and Foreign Minister Qureshi chaired a special UN plenary session on the floods in New York on August 19th which led to a, you know, strong spike in terms of financial commitments from the international community to Pakistan. The Defense Department has been absolutely essential in mobilizing military resources including borrowing, if you will, from our assets in Afghanistan. Helicopters have been an absolutely essential asset in this whole response. We've been the most vigorous in terms of providing helicopter support to deliver relief supplies, to rescue stranded Pakistanis, and to ferry journalists and others who need to cover the story and get the information out.

There's been no signal photograph to demonstrate, you know, the drama of this. There's no single, sort of, incident that captures it. Again, it's a situation that unfolds that makes it very difficult to pinpoint and to respond to.

What we have also done, I think, is try to leverage as much

international support as we can. We've talked to our Asian and Middle Eastern friends through the networks that we have, friends of Democratic Pakistan, Ambassador Holbrook, the special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, has worked this issue extremely aggressively and we've seen results.

I think if you take the United States out of the picture you have a much more dire situation than you do right now.

Japan has stepped up with helicopters. The UAE, other Asian friends have stepped in with offers of support. The UN has issued an appeal for $460 million in terms of flood response. We're a little over half the way there in terms of meeting that response. Secretary Clinton has launched a special fund. She has personally, you know, pulled out her cell phone and texted certain numbers that you can text to generate -- to make a donation of $10 through your cell phone. We've seen a great spike in that. We organized a large event at the Asia Society in New York in August. We helped the Pakistanis rally international support during this UN plenary.

We have a whole series of events also coming down the pike which I'd just like to mention briefly. September 19th in New York, Secretary Clinton and Foreign Minister Qureshi will again be rallying international support in New York. We are talking to the Pakistani Diaspora community, it plays a huge role here. Pakistani Americans are very eager to help, have a lot of great resources to bring to the fight, we're

in regular contact with them and also our American NGO partners through twice-a-week conference calls coordinating our efforts, making sure that the kind of relief that we're putting into Pakistan is not getting in the way.

As noted earlier, what Pakistan needs is cash and vital supplies such as food and shelter. Those are the key things. While it's great to send doctors and others who want to help, that can often, as we know from other disasters, actually detract from the situation. There's more people on the ground to manage, resources are limited, areas are difficult to access.

So, we have this event on September 19th. We're looking at trying to bring in some international celebrities who might help publicize the situation there. We're leading into a Friends of Democratic Pakistan meeting in Brussels in the middle of October which will give us another opportunity. And then we have a strategic dialogue with Pakistan which predates the floods, but is also a very important mechanism through which the United States and Pakistan are working to resolve and move forward a host of strategic issues in very technical areas. We're working with the Pakistanis on agriculture, law enforcement, economic issues. This particular mechanism can be used and harnessed to provide additional support to Pakistan on the floods.

And then the Pakistanis will host a Pakistan Development Forum meeting in Islamabad in November. We don't have the precise dates.

But all of this is an essential way in which we can help Pakistan face this challenge. As noted earlier, you know, a situation like this puts enormous stress on a host government, and never in any disaster do we usually -- including in the United States -- is the host government lauded for its relief efforts. We've seen the challenges that were presented to us in Katrina and the difficulties that we had meeting those. You can imagine, you know, a country of -- a developing country like Pakistan with preexisting economic challenges, with stresses on the host government, reeling already, recovering from previous disasters, but this also provides an opportunity for Pakistan to kind of reassess its own internal coordination mechanisms for Pakistan to take a fresh look at civilian and military relationships and for Pakistan to try to take the lead with our help and other friends in terms of rallying international support.

So, I think that the situation, while it is very dire, Pakistan has been able to rely on very strong international support.

Now, in order for Pakistan to be able to continue to do that, it needs to demonstrate credibility and transparency and we were very happy to see that Pakistan has proposed the creation or the establishment of an oversight committee in Pakistan. We're encouraging them to put that group together, but that's the kind of thing that Pakistan needs to do to demonstrate to the international community that all of this money that the international community is pledging is going to be used effectively, used in the right way. You know, Pakistanis themselves have a lot of

doubts about the way that the aid money is being used. The Pakistani-American community that we've talked to also has expressed concerns. We want to help, but are you sure that the Pakistani government and those agencies over there are going to use the money the way that we want it to be used?

USAID has very strict oversight guidelines for the way that its aid is used. I'm very proud that the American NGO Network has been in Pakistan for a long time. Organizations like IRC, Mercy Corps, Save the Children, they are they, they're on the ground, their expertise is being used every single day to make a difference in the lives of Pakistanis. Yes, there have been many reports about the way that Islamic charities in Pakistan have stepped into the fight. I mean, first of all, there are some very important and very credible Pakistani and Islamic organizations that are there. There are some organizations that are tied to what we consider terrorist groups. We don't think that they have the best interest of the Pakistani people in mind. More importantly they don't have the resources to compete with organizations like the UN and like international NGOs who have been there, who are respected, who have developed ties over the decades with their Pakistani partners.

So, while we look at reports like this, we note them, we think that they are exaggerated. We don't see that so called extremist groups can compete in any way with the apparatus that is there.

So, I will close with that, but also want to leave you with the

impression that those of you who are American citizens, I think, should feel very proud at the response that your government has made to support the Pakistanis. We were there first and we've done the most. We're not content to rely on that. We see that the international community has a major role to play. It's incumbent upon the Pakistanis to take leadership and to demonstrate that they have the resources and the transparency to absorb and use effectively the kind of aid that is going into Pakistan.

This tragedy is going to be with us for a long time. Next year we will still be dealing with the impact of the Pakistani floods. It's going to take a lot of response and indeed a lot of patience from the American people and from the Pakistanis to get through it, but it is a sign of our commitment to Pakistan that we are very much taking a leadership role. We're very comfortable with it. We think it is a demonstration of Pakistani-American partnership and indeed, you know, our priority is not to win hearts and minds. Obviously that is an important thing to happen, but our priority is bringing aid to destitute Pakistanis and then helping manage the transition from relief to recovery which is coming down the road.

There is the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, damage needs assessment that will come out soon. That will be the focal point for us all to rally behind to look at what we're going to need to do in the future to help Pakistan get back on its feet.

Thank you very much.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, Tim. We turn now to

Steve Cohen here at Brookings on South Asia.

MR. COHEN: Thank you, Beth. Thank you for the opportunity to return to two interests of mine, one is Pakistan, of course, and the other is the response to natural and manmade disasters and there's actually not that much difference between them in some ways. Also I'm pleased that General Karamat could join us. This is his second tour of duty at Brookings and we hope you come back for a third if you don't mind, in the future. And we're sorry that this kind of event has brought you to the Brookings podium.

If you can imagine an area the size of Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Delaware, Rhode Island, Maryland, and the District of Columbia underwater, you'll have some idea of what's happened in Pakistan. It's unprecedented in Pakistan, may be unprecedented except for the cases of China in the past, in the amount of area flooded. But it's not unprecedented in terms of human casualties and I measure disasters not simply by the amount of property damage, but also the amount of human damage, that is, lives lost. And in this case, Pakistan is one of -- not a record holder, but in the 1970 cyclone, almost a quarter of a million Pakistanis were drowned in a matter of hours. And in the earthquake in 2005, something like 80,000 people were killed almost instantly.

So, on that scale, by that scale, this is not a serious disaster. It's serious, but in terms of human life, it's not of that scale. In Ban Ki-

moon's statement, this is the worst disaster he'd ever seen. It illustrates, I think, that he hasn't seen many disasters because a thousand people killed is a tragedy, obviously, but it's quite different from 250,000 or a million or something of this sort, the numbers of some disasters we've seen in the past, and we will see in the future.

The critical question in all natural disasters is the degree to which they are manmade. Everything you need to know about how to deal with a natural disaster, so-called natural disaster, is on the web. I taught a course in Singapore a couple of years ago and we researched this. While it's impossible to have a methodology that predicts manmade disasters -- genocides, wars, and so forth -- it's easy to acquire the methodology to anticipate, predict, and deal with natural disasters. It's all there. Every country in the world has a website devoted to this. So, in that sense the degree of loss of property and life in Pakistan, which is due to manmade incompetence or incapacity, or looking the other way, simply not being prepared, could be measured, this being a good project to undertake. You know, what's the gap between what did happen, what had to happen, and what could have happened had a country been well prepared.

You've heard the example of Katrina. That was a case of bad management, but in most other cases, America's managed its disasters pretty well. A country I know also, I wrote a book about a disaster there in India, they learned how to deal with disasters and are

actually pretty good at managing and coping with these things.

That's not the case of Pakistan. One of the causes of this disaster, this event, is really decades of neglect by the Pakistan government of the Pakistan people, of its own environment, and an inability to control water, develop water management plans, and so forth, so in a sense there's a degree of human involvement, human causation, in this disaster. And I would say that the Pakistan government has been, on an international scale, not the worst, but certainly not the best government in terms of understanding and dealing with these things.

Years ago George Shaller wrote a book about snow leopards and he is -- one of the countries he looked at when looking at the disappearance of snow leopards was Pakistan and they were disappearing because of the movement of people into the snow leopard's environment and also neglect of the forest environment where snow leopards live. And that's related to what's happened in this case. Now, clearly, there would have been a catastrophe no matter -- whether people were prepared or not, but the neglect of Pakistan's infrastructure by decades of Pakistani governments is an important contributing factor.

I think that one of the causes of this neglect was the fact that Pakistan's been governed mostly by the military and from the Pakistan Army's perspective, the number one threat is India, the number two threat is India, the number three threat is India, maybe the number four threat is the new Islamist extremists arising in Pakistan's northwest, and way down

on the list has been in the past managing water resources and population growth. You know, armies are not designed to govern countries. In a sense Pakistan is a state that's been hopping along on one strong leg, which is the army leg. It's a fine army in that sense, but it doesn't know how to actually run a country, and I think that one of the things we hope to come out of this will be realization by the Pakistan military, as well as civilians, that there has to be an increase in civilian competence because right now you see the competence of the Pakistani state in a downward slide, whether it's education, environmental management, a whole range of issues. The Pakistani state is probably less competent now than it was 15 or 20 years ago.

Now, what are the regional implications? I think the interesting thing is what has not happened, that India has not responded to this in any significant way except, I think, to give $5 million to the UN. I've been traveling a lot in exotic foreign countries such as Norway and Salt Lake City, but that's my latest information. So, really, the one country that has the capacity to help immediately, and the one country that understands the problem of what's going on, has done very little if anything.

Now, the Indians have not made things worse for the Pakistanis, but you would expect in Europe or Latin America or most other parts of the world where a neighbor's house is burning down, you help put out the fire even if you don't like the neighbor. In this case the Indians are

frozen, they don't know what to do. Some of them are gloating over Pakistan's troubles, which not only include the water related issues, but the corruption scandal with the cricket which has received -- in Pakistani cricket which has received as much headlines in India and elsewhere as the floods.

But the Indians are paralyzed because they don't know how to respond to this disaster. They understand well, as I think the U.S. Government finally understands, that the integrity of the Pakistani state is declining. In a state with 175 to 180 million people, nuclear weapons, a center for training of international terrorism, cannot be allowed to sort of disappear and collapse. But the Indians are paralyzed, they don't know what to do with it, they don't know whether to push Pakistan over the edge which would have an effect on them, or else help Pakistan.

So, I think this event in Pakistan has sort of frozen the Indians. They're trying to figure out what the outcome will be, and they can't figure out whether this is going to lead to a rise to an Islamist government in Pakistan, the coming to power of the jihadists, I agree with General Karamat, that's highly unlikely, almost impossible for the short term. Whether it's going to lead to the military coming back to power, again, I think that's unlikely. Whether the civilian government will reform and gain coherence, which is happening slowly, but very, very slowly.

So, the Indians aren't quite sure what's going to happen to Pakistan in the future, so they're holding back.

We just completed a study here of the future of Pakistan. It's called "Pakistan 2011 to 2017," and I wish I could tell you that we came to a conclusion ourselves of what the future would be, but I think we're as confused about this future as the Indians are. When it does happen I'll stand up here and explain why the future was inevitable. When Pakistan does become this, this, or this, I'll tell you exactly why it was inevitable, there was no other course for Pakistan, but I think right now we're all guessing as to the implication of this event plus a lot of other events on Pakistan and as long as that happens -- as long as that's the case we have to be modest in our statements about whether this is a good thing or a bad thing for the future Pakistan.

It could be a negative black swan event. It could be a positive black swan event. That is a major unpredicted event which has important consequences, but at this point I'd be foolish if I stood up here and said either one. And I think, you know, I have hopes. But I used to work for George Schultz who said, "Hope is not a policy," so we've got to do the best we can. And I do think the U.S. Government finally understands it. It's not simply Pakistan's role in Afghanistan that's important, but it's the integrity of the Pakistani state that's important -- of vital importance for us. In fact, I would say that Pakistan is far more important than Afghanistan in terms of longer and larger American interests.

Okay, let me stop there, because I've made all the points

and give you -- I think I've used up my allotted time.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, Steve, and thanks to all of our panelists for really presenting a complementary view of diverse perspectives on a complex situation.

We have time now for questions. We have microphones that will come. If you could be brief and introduce yourself. We'll start it here.

SPEAKER: Yes, I am Dr. (inaudible) with Pakistan-American League. General Jehangir Karamat mentioned that whenever there is a disaster of this magnitude a government faces the brunt. In the case of Pakistan the people are looking for the government. Where is the government, that's what they are asking? So, they don't have to face the brunt.

My question is that even Steve has pointed out the conditions of the people who are affected and the (inaudible) what we see on the television is really painful to see that certainly the governments of Pakistan in the past have not been able to deliver to ordinary people. They virtually remain irrelevant in the country and their interests remain irrelevant. And this is not only a challenge for the international community, it's also a challenge for the Pakistani government to demonstrate leadership and come up with true leadership in the future.

My question is this is a disaster of a biblical magnitude, virtually biblical magnitude, and all the help which USA has given is a lot of help, like when Pakistan army takes an action in Waziristan, U.S. says it

is good, but more needs to be done. In the same way, in case of USA, I would say they would be coming up shortly in future and more needs to be done and even including the international community.

My question is also that China is another strategic partner and a friend of Pakistan. Can anybody reflect the magnitude of help or what has been offered or given by China? I don't know exactly what kind of help they have given.

So, that's my question. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: If it's okay with the panelists, I think we'll take three or four questions, that way we can get a few more in. Let's have one here.

MS. PLEWIS: Hi, my name is Kim Plewis. I'm actually a student at American University. And I was -- a very quick question -- just curious to your thoughts as to why the donor dollars, especially from individuals in North America, has been so small compared to the outpouring of support from the earthquake in Haiti or the tsunami in 2004?

SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Ali at Georgetown University. My question is directed to the two gentlemen representing the U.S. Government today. I've seen at least one report in the Pakistani press and if the report is to be believed they're accusing the U.S. Government of asking the Pakistanis for greater coverage of U.S. help. If this is true -- I'll repeat it, sorry. My question is that I've seen at least one report in the Pakistani press and if that report is to be believed, they're

accusing the U.S. Government of asking for better coverage of U.S. help from the ISPR, which is the public relations wing of the military. Is this true? And do you think it's good policy to sort of ask for this sort of overt recognition of -- given that this is a chance to change hearts and minds?

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. And last question in this round right here.

MS. MORAT: My name is Deana Morat from Save the Children. I actually think this is a question focused to Tim Lenderking. I was wondering if you could explain --

MS. FERRIS: Speak up just a little.

MS. MORAT: -- the mechanisms of the Pakistani Relief Fund a little bit more? Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Okay, would our panelists like to respond? We have questions on China, (inaudible) donors, requests, apparently, of the U.S. to pay more of the charges. Steve, do you want to start?

MR. COHEN: I'd like to speak to the press issue because I think it's important and I've been following the Pakistani press as closely as I can, at least the English language.

I did an op-ed -- I did a blog, although it was in Bergen, Norway -- that's what the world comes to -- on this, and the original title was "Puppy Dogs and Snow Leopards." And the snow leopards I made a brief reference to that Pakistan has neglected its environment and snow leopards are disappearing. But the puppy dogs refer to the U.S.

Government, that we were behaving like a puppy dog that wanted to be liked. I think we should not be worried about whether the Pakistanis like us or not. Our major concern should be whether the Pakistanis are competent or not in dealing with their own problems. So, getting press coverage is one thing, not getting it is another thing.

I can see that it's the job of bureaucrats to get as much press coverage as they can, but I'm more concerned about the degradation of Pakistani civil administration and the fact that we never pushed the Pakistanis, America never pushed the Pakistanis, for decades to improve its civil administration. We focused on the military. There were good reasons to do that, but we neglected the Pakistani state. Pakistan has lost a lot of its state-ness. So, I think that's the issue we should be focusing on and not worrying about whether we're getting enough press coverage in Pakistan.

I have noticed also that, in fact, there's not much reference to the United States. It's reference to international donors, but I think Pakistanis understand exactly who's helping them in this crisis and that we are helping them.

MS. FERRIS: Other responses?

MR. WARD: Maybe I could say a little bit about why we think private giving is down, and I think Tim touched on this. This flood has been a slowly building disaster. I'm the head of the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance. This BlackBerry -- ask my wife -- it goes off

all night. I hear about every volcano, every flood, every tropical storm. It drives me bats. I didn't hear about this for several days.

It's monsoon season, it always rains, it always floods some. Slowly this got up to the biblical proportions that you're all talking about. And I think because it was what we would call sort of a slowly building disaster rather than an earthquake that strikes quickly on a Saturday morning in October in 2005, it just didn't capture our attention. It certainly didn't capture the attention of the major media for a while. I think that has been a contributor.

We believe the American people are going to come through. The always do, and they will, we just have to keep the need, the long-term need, out there so that the American people don't say -- don't conclude, well, that's taken care of, I don't need to help. We do need your help for a very long time.

MR. LENDERKING: I could comment on a couple of those questions. The gentleman who asked about the greater coverage of U.S. help, I'm not aware of any such request that we have made. I mean, it is a challenge for us to -- and this ties into the question of why more donor dollars haven't gone in -- it is a real challenge to get media focus on this when there's so much else, you know, out there. There have been other disasters, there may be disaster fatigue out there, but we've been extremely aggressive in talking both to our embassy in Islamabad and through visiting officials.

I mean, John Kerry was out there two weeks ago, did a tour of the floods. He's issued an appeal through his network. Rajiv Shah, the administrator of USAID, has been out there. We are very much trying to get this situation into the international mindset, you know, competing with everything else, our pull out from Iraq, economic problems at home, you know, Glenn Beck and everything else that's going on in domestic politics. So that is a huge challenge, but we're confident, I think, that through ordinary mechanisms, through our press network, through the Pakistani media, and through contact -- our very robust use of the western press, that we will continue to get this story out and that will manifest itself in more tangible support for Pakistan.

Somebody had asked about -- Dr. Choudry asked about what the Chinese are doing. You know, Pakistan and China also have quite a close relationship. We'd like to see the Chinese do more. We've been in touch with the Chinese about that. Chinese have particularly strategic interest in northern Pakistan. They helped build the Karakoram Highway that links Gilgit with Kashgar. The Chinese, I'm quite confident, will continue to do road building in northern Pakistan.

That area, a lot of that area, is underwater. The roadways are destroyed. The bridges have been destroyed. There will be a substantial amount of infrastructure development that will be necessary for northern Pakistan which as many of you know is already relatively distant and remote from the centers of power in Pakistan. So, I think the Chinese

will play an important role there.

The young lady asked about the Pakistan Relief Fund which Secretary Clinton announced about a week ago. There's not a lot I can tell you right now because we're working to put all the -- sort of the operational components in place, but I would be happy to be in touch with you or anybody else who wants to know more about that. We will be beginning to showcase that particular relief fund as a special American contribution to the relief efforts and there will be more information coming out in the next couple of days on that.

MS. FERRIS: Okay, thank you very much. Let's take another round. Let's see if we can have -- maybe these two gentlemen in the back and the woman in the very back.

MR. BODAKOWSKI: My name is Michael Bodakowski from the World Faiths Development Dialogue --

MS. FERRIS: Would you mind standing up?

SPEAKER: Sorry. We've heard a lot of stories about extremist groups or religious actors using the flood to advance their own interests, but can you please speak from your experiences about some of the positive roles that faith-inspired actors have played both in the disaster response and particularly in the post-disaster recovery areas with limited government presence. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you, good question. And right -- yes.

MR. LESINA: Derrick Lesina, student at George

Washington University. I just want to talk briefly about -- and hear your thoughts, General, specifically, in reference to the trust deficit between our two countries. I think this was highlighted in the Washington Post article this morning, specifically talking about a group of general officers flying from Islamabad to Tampa that were detained here in Washington just a couple days ago specifically because apparently one made a comment of maybe stating that I hope this is my last flight; the specific words were not exactly in the article itself. But bottom line, they're going to U.S. Central Command, from my understanding, where they're going to be planning engagement activities for the next fiscal year. Also a great opportunity to highlight the current needs and requirements in the country today.

So, bottom line, I'm curious, what can we learn from this? Because it seems like truly that was an opportunity that was missed because they decided, I think based on the governments' input, to go ahead and return to Islamabad without even going to Tampa.

So, thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. And the woman in the back?

MS. KINDER: Hi, my name is Molly Kinder from the Center for Global Development. And my first question builds on the statement made that the U.S. was the first with the most on the humanitarian relief and we haven't yet seen the commitments for the rebuilding, the long-term recovery. The World Bank and the ADB have already announced $900 million and $2 billion and the U.S. has only announced $50 million. So my

question is, what are the thoughts at this stage about how much will be either redirected from the Kerry-Lugar funds or new money?

And my second question just takes money off the table and addresses two other policies. What are the prospects for reducing tariffs on textile imports for the U.S.? And the second is, is there any talk now about the U.S. contributing in some way to debt relief?

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Who would like to start in terms of response?

MR. LEDNERKING: I can start on the incident at Dulles Airport, a regrettable incident indeed. A senior military -- Pakistan military delegation headed to Tampa for a conference, perfectly legitimate, some misunderstandings on board, apparently some time spent, you know, talking to airport officials about what had happened and the delegation has turned around and gone back to Pakistan.

That kind of thing is totally avoidable. It is the kind of irritant which gets blown out of proportion. There are lots of issues like this that happen between countries. We have very vigorous and justifiable procedures at all our airports to protect American citizens and the United States and people who travel here from the threat of terrorists. But this is a situation that appears to have been completely avoidable.

The broader question that you ask, though, is about the trust deficit and that's something which we understand. You know, Pakistan has not always felt that we are and have been a reliable partner. At times

we have come and gone from Pakistan as a friend. We are trying to reverse that course. This administration puts a lot of effort and emphasis on its relationship with Pakistan, the strategic dialogue is a reflection of that. Secretary Clinton's travels there and her personal engagement with Pakistan is a reflection of that.

We think, slowly but surely, we are beginning to erode that trust deficit, if you will. We think, slowly but surely, that we will do that because over time I think we will demonstrate to Pakistan our longstanding commitment and partnership to Pakistan.

In terms of Kerry-Lugar-Berman and new money and how we address reconstruction, I would just urge caution on figures at this point. There are a lot of figures sort of filtering into the media about what we will obligate, what we will pledge. We have pledge $200 million, as Mark said, for the immediate relief needs, but that doesn't even capture the -- sort of, the monetization, if you will, the overall assistance that the United States provides through our military resources and assets. But that is money specifically pledged.

Down the road when we have the ADB's assessment, we will be able to work off of that. We know it's going to be quite high because we know -- we're beginning to understand the enormity of what lies before us and Pakistan in terms of recovery, reconstruction. Again, it's a national problem. You've got, you know, a number of cities in Sindh where hundreds of thousands of people have evacuated their homes.

What are they going to return to? Are they going to be able to plant their fields? Are any of their livestock going to be there? Is it all washed down the river?

Again, you know, this ties in with why we don't see more international support. The scope of the thing is just not -- we don't have our arms around that. We will know, and then we'll be able to look at how we reprogram Kerry-Luger-Burman funds, which is a pot of money at $7.5 billion, an extremely important manifestation of our support to Pakistan. We'll be able to see how we might reprogram some of that money and how we leverage additional international resources to look at the reconstruction.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks. Yes, please? Mark?

MR. WARD: Well, maybe I'll say -- I'll probably regret this -- talk about the faith-based organizations. It's a difficult situation during a natural disaster. We saw it to a certain extent after the earthquake. The United States Government is very clear. Whether we're dealing with a Christian organization, an Islamic organization, a Jewish organization, when you are receiving funds from the United States government, from the American people, you don't proselytize, period. And if we find out that you are, you have a stern discussion awaiting you and potentially the termination of your activities.

But there is private money that's going in as well to some of these organizations and that can complicate behavior on the ground. I

remember some instances with General Nadeem, who's now the head of the National Disaster Management Agency, when he was running the show -- the military response after the earthquake, finding some activities, some organizations, up in the earthquake affected area that were proselytizing and we had to look into that and sort it out.

We love the faith-based organizations. We could not do our job without them, of all faiths, but it's very important that if you're receiving U.S. taxpayer funds to carry out that work, that it be very respectful of this line that, you know, we do not proselytize while we are responding in a humanitarian crisis.

We cannot, obviously, speak for organizations that don't receive our funding, but this is a very, very firm rule that we have with U.S. Government funding.

MS. FERRIS: Okay, any other response from the panel? Steve and then General.

MR. COHEN: Go ahead, General.

GENERAL KARAMAT: Several things came up. Steve talked of the competence level in Pakistan, the capacity to deal with the situation, and the many shortcomings which exist in terms of coping with disasters and preventing disasters. He's absolutely right, but we tend to focus too much on the past and not look at the present.

For a long time now, ever since the elected government has been there and perhaps earlier, Pakistan's been totally focused on its

economy because it's the economy which is going to pull this country together. It's the economy which is going to raise its head, it's image in the world, and improve bilateral relations. And with the economy center stage, Pakistan has been focusing on a threat reduction strategy all around. So, whatever may have been policies in the past, this is what Pakistan's been doing.

And things are going to take time to work out in terms of other institutions reaching the level of development which the military has reached because it came up under a threat situation. It's had an inordinate share of resources. It's run the country for a long time. So those are the difficulties which Pakistan is working through and hopefully ironing out as it moves into the future. And we'll see more and more of that happening.

As far as China is concerned, there is a website, we could give you the exact website, which is updated every day in terms of every dollar that's coming into Pakistan from any part of the world, and China is listed there. It has come in strongly. In fact, in the relationship with China it is usually a very quick communication for them to determine what we need and deliver it and there is not much fanfare about that because that's the way they like to operate.

This particular incident in Tampa, I'm not -- I'm sorry, I'm not updated on it, but let me say that whatever you -- somebody says or remark he passes, under U.S. immigration procedures pressure is not the

final word, because it can be a difficult experience coming to the U.S. on a Pakistan passport, you do get -- you have to go through certain procedures. You have to be patient, it takes time. And official delegations usually expect that they will have support -- official support -- to move them through.

So, as has been said, it's a regrettable incident and it's not in any way indicative of the trust deficit or anything like that. Those are things which are being worked on at the strategic level in the relationship between Pakistan and the U.S.

MS. FERRIS: Steve?

MR. COHEN: Just a brief comment. I don't think the issue is religious proselytization so much. That might apply to some Christian charities although I doubt if they're very active. I think the issue is whether groups that are aiding in disaster relief, both in the earthquake and now in the floods, have political proselytization, that is, Islamic groups who are really radically anti-American or anti-west. It's not a question of converting Muslims to Islam, but converting them to a more radical political ideology and there there's been some ambiguity. Even the Pakistan government has supported some of these groups. They're very effective, I've been told by an American Navy Officer, that the most effective emergency hospital in the earthquake zone was one that was supported by the extreme Islamists. And we couldn't send people there, we had to send them someplace else. So, I think the issue is political radicalization not

religious proselytization.

MS. FERRIS: Mike, I wonder if you would like to comment on the relationship between faith-based and secular organizations and the humanitarian level? Not to put you on the spot.

MR. YOUNG: Just in terms of the gentleman's question, yes, I mean, there are a whole kind of range of Islamic organizations, charitable organizations out there and active, from moderate Islamic organizations to -- through conservative ones to ones that adhere to a somewhat extreme ideology and package a political message along with the aid. They are there, they're active, and they were in the earthquake response, they are now. Are they doing that to a massive scale? No, they're not. Do people necessarily take notice of the political message that comes along with the aid? I doubt it.

Pakistanis are very sensible people, largely moderate, and, you know, I've been to many very conservative areas where a lot of these extremist groups have a lot of grass roots support, and even there I've been at events where, for instance, U.S. branding was used, USAID branding. And I've been up the side of a mountain (inaudible) in the earthquake zone watching events in which, you know, the American flag is present. People talk openly about U.S. aid. And these people (inaudible) adherence of extreme political parties, extreme Islamist (inaudible), it's not a kind of monolithic picture. And their actual cumulative effect, I doubt it's actually very strong in terms of the political effect.

Just another quick point in terms of what's going to be the money for early recovery and reconstruction. Yes, it's important to know what the price tag is, yes, it's important to know how much money will be in the pot. It's also extremely important to know how will we spend that money, how will the Pakistani government spend that money? How will national actors work with the government to deliver reconstruction as effectively as possible? And there I think that right now there is no strategy and that's understandable given the scale of immediate need, but we need to get there soon.

And secondly, we can look to an example within Pakistan that, you know, already was effective and that was the earthquake response. Yes, aspects of that response were flawed, but by and large it was a success in which the Pakistani government sets the policy framework, it coordinates through special authorities and then national actors, a diversity of actors, work to deliver reconstruction support through that policy framework. It worked. This is an altogether different scale, but the fundamentals are the same.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. A word on India from Tim?

MR. LENDERKING: Just wanted to make a quick word on India. Just in the last day or two India has increased its support for Pakistan flood relief by $5 million up to $25 million. And kind of in the scheme of things we see that as a very, very credible and very helpful and important contribution to the flood effort, so we were very appreciative to

see that from India.

MS. FERRIS: Great. Thank you. Thanks to our panelists and thanks to all of you and please keep watching for further news of early recovery after the flooding. Thank you.

* * * * *

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 in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012