

Sent: Sat, 14 May 2011 07:51:13 -0400
From: indiausdialogue@yahoogroups.com
To: indiausdialogue@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [INDIA-US-DIALOGUE] Digest Number 621

INDIA-US-DIALOGUE

Messages In This Digest (5 Messages)

1a.

[Article on desirable US policy changes towards Pakistan after bin La](#) From: Kanwal Sibal

1b.

[Re: Article on desirable US policy changes towards Pakistan after bi](#) From: tp screenivasan

2.

[History Weeps at the Partition of India and Pakistan â€” by Michael](#) From: Anurag Srivastava

3.

[Dear China: Help Us Fix Pakistan: BY PATRICK C. DOHERTY |](#) From: n m

4.

[Asian power play, post-Osama](#) From: n m

[View All Topics](#) | [Create New Topic](#)

Messages

1a.

[Article on desirable US policy changes towards Pakistan after bin La](#)

Posted by: "Kanwal Sibal" [REDACTED]
Fri May 13, 2011 12:26 pm (PDT)

P6/b(6)

The attached article of mine that appeared in May 10 in Mail Today may be of interest.

K.Sibal

[Back to top](#)

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#)

[Messages in this topic \(2\)](#)

1b.

[Re: Article on desirable US policy changes towards Pakistan after bi](#)

Posted by: "tp screenivasan" [REDACTED]
Sat May 14, 2011 2:02 am (PDT)

P6/b(6)

Dear Kanwal,

Thank you. When I began reading the article, I thought that you were in a dream world of some kind. But the last paragraph confirmed that your feet are firmly on the earth.

Sincerely,
Sreeni

On Fri, May 13, 2011 at 10:57 PM, Kanwal Sibal [REDACTED] wrote:

>

>

> The attached article of mine that appeared in Mail Today may be
> of interest.

> K.Sibal

>

>

--

T.P. Sreenivasan, (IFS 1967)

Former Ambassador of India and Governor for India of the IAEA

Member, National Security Advisory Board,

Member, India-UK Roundtable,

Director General, Kerala International Centre, Thiruvananthapuram.

Cell (91) 9847721656

www.ananthapurimusings.blogspot.com

www.tpsreenivasan.com

twitter.com/sreeniv

J-3, Jawahar Nagar,

Trivandrum-695 003

"Videsha Vicharam" Live on Internet www.asianetglobal.com/asianetnews/

Wed 530 pm, Fri 330 pm and Sat 930 am

[Back to top](#)

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#)

[Messages in this topic](#) (2)

2.

History Weeps at the Partition of India and Pakistan " by Michael

Posted by: "Anurag Srivastava" [REDACTED]

Fri May 13, 2011 4:27 pm (PDT)

P6/b(6)

P6/b(6)

--- On Fri, 5/13/11, Anurag Srivastava [REDACTED] wrote:

It is amusing to see an American lamenting the partition of the motherland.

€ ¢Â

€ ¢Â

€ ¢Â

May 12, 2011 12:00 A.M.History Weeps at the Partition of India and Pakistan

Our best option for countering Pakistan's turpitude may be bolstering its South Asian rival.

When you get into discussions about the Middle East with certain people, you start hearing that the great mistake was the partition of Palestine and the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. If that had somehow just not happened, you hear, everything would be all right. That's not my view. I think the big mistake made in a British possession around that time was the partition of the Indian subcontinent into India and Pakistan in 1947.

The British thought that Pakistan under the leadership of the secular lawyer Muhammad Ali Jinnah would turn out to be an acceptable counterbalance to an India led by Jawaharlal Nehru's Congress party.

But Jinnah was suffering from cancer at the time and died in September 1948, 13 months after partition. And Pakistan ever since has been -- well, let's say it has been a problem. While India has had only one brief suspension of its democratic constitution since independence, Pakistan has been ruled by generals most of the time since 1948.

Pakistan was an American ally during the Cold War and helped expel the Soviets from Afghanistan. But in the years since the collapse of the Soviet Union, elements in Pakistan's military and its intelligence service, the ISI, have backed the Taliban in Afghanistan and supported terrorist attacks on India. They have sheltered A. Q. Khan, the nuclear scientist who developed Pakistan's nuclear bomb and conducted, as analyst Walter Russell Mead writes, the nuclear proliferation circus that helped countries like North Korea, Libya, Syria and Iran advance their nuclear ambitions.

After September 11, Pakistan's president, Pervez Musharraf, was pressured into announcing that Pakistan would support the U.S. against the Taliban. But it's widely known that Pakistanis have been giving aid and sanctuary to the Taliban and the Haqqani terrorists in recent years.

And the fact that American forces found and killed Osama bin Laden in a \$1 million house less than a mile from Pakistan's military academy in Abbottabad makes it plain that some if not all Pakistani leaders were harboring America's No. 1 enemy.

Pakistan's current president, Asif Ali Zardari, took to the pages of the Washington Post to deny that Pakistan knew anything about bin Laden's hideout. And National Security Adviser Tom Donilon told Sunday talk-show viewers that he has not seen any evidence at least to date that the political, military, or intelligence leadership of Pakistan knew about it.

Now it must be conceded that Zardari represents democratic forces in Pakistan that rallied around his wife, Benazir Bhutto, before she was assassinated when she returned to the country in December 2007. Perhaps he was not let in on the information on bin Laden.

And Donilon has good reason not to want to see any evidence that Pakistani officials were harboring bin Laden. The uncomfortable truth is that we need at least the veneer of cooperation from Pakistan so long as we maintain the battle against the Taliban in Afghanistan.

But we shouldn't kid ourselves. Since bin Laden's death, Pakistani media have, for the second time in six months, divulged the identity of the CIA station chief in the country. People in the Pakistani military and/or the ISI are giving the United States a big middle finger.

How should we respond? We could list Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism, we could cut off the billions in aid we send to its government, and we could conduct additional operations like the Abbottabad raid. But those moves would risk an open rupture that would imperil our efforts in Afghanistan.

One card we could play would be to strengthen relations with India. In the Cold War, we backed Pakistan

against India. But after 1991, we moved closer to India, first under Bill Clinton and more so under George W. Bush with the U.S.-India nuclear-cooperation treaty. I've long felt that the India card was one reason Musharraf agreed to cooperate after September 11. Another possibility, suggested by Mead, is to persuade the Saudis to pressure Pakistan to break ties with terrorists. Bin Laden, after all, was their sworn enemy, too. Meanwhile, in our dealings with the Pakistanis, we need to keep our eyes open, as I hope our leaders are doing. In retrospect, the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan in 1947 was a terrific mistake. Unfortunately, we can't rewind history. Michael Barone is senior political analyst for the Washington Examiner.

[Back to top](#)

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#)

[Messages in this topic](#) (1)

3.

Dear China: Help Us Fix Pakistan: BY PATRICK C. DOHERTY |

Posted by: "n m"
Fri May 13, 2011 7:31 pm (PDT)

P6/b(6)

Nyayamurti comments: Dangerous Delusions or Fantastic non-sense!

Dear China: Help Us Fix Pakistan

The world's two superpowers must work together to fix the world's most broken country.

BY PATRICK C. DOHERTY |

MAY 9, 2011

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/05/09/dear_china_help_us_fix_pakistan

The war of words is officially on. The killing of Osama bin Laden has shone a harsh light on the fraught U.S.-Pakistan relationship.

In Washington, lawmakers from both sides of the aisle are angrily questioning how it's possible that Pakistan didn't know about the whereabouts of Osama bin Laden as he hid for years under their noses in Abbottabad, a military garrison town. In Islamabad, Prime Minister Yousuf Gilani lashed out at the United States, calling it "disingenuous" to believe that Pakistan could have been "in cahoots" with al Qaeda. Whatever the case, the U.S. strategic calculus in South Asia is now in flux. What is Washington's best opportunity to use this watershed moment to restore stability to Pakistan? Partner with China.

Unfortunately, the debate on Capitol Hill has quickly fallen into two polarized and short-sighted camps. In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings last week, both Democrats and Republicans used bin Laden's death to justify an accelerated withdrawal from Afghanistan. Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), the ranking member on the committee, argued, "It's exceedingly difficult to conclude that our vast expenditures in Afghanistan represent a rational [strategy]." Other lawmakers have called for renewed pressure on Islamabad to take direct action against anti-U.S. militant bases in Pakistan, such as the Quetta Shura and the Haqqani network.

Neither path is likely to work. Abandoning Afghanistan for a third time since 1989 is not going to get us there -- indeed, each time the United States neglects the country, it gets worse. And strong-arm tactics won't work either: A gambit to withhold military or civilian assistance is also not going to force Islamabad to change its strategic calculus, which is rooted in decades of deep mistrust of the United States. Furthermore, because of continued U.S. dependence on Pakistani supply routes into Afghanistan and Pakistani intelligence services' ability to unleash terrorist devastation such as the 2008 Mumbai attacks, calling Pakistan's bluff could be disastrous.

It's time to return to the fundamentals when it comes to U.S. interests in Pakistan. Ultimately, Washington desires a prosperous, sustainable, and secure South Asian region that does not remain a base for al Qaeda and its affiliates, or a likely flashpoint for a nuclear exchange.

Understood this way, U.S. interests are broadly shared by China, Pakistan's primary ally and a major investor in the country's economic success. That's a point President Barack Obama should drive home to Chinese officials this week, as Washington hosts the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue. Indeed, the late Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan Richard Holbrooke made a similar case to the Chinese in Beijing.

To date, China's relationship with Pakistan -- with which it has shared military technology and invested in major infrastructure projects -- has only enabled that South Asian nation's unstable status quo. When it comes to military hardware, China has shared ballistic missiles such as the short-range DF-11, is jointly producing the JF-17 advanced fighter with Pakistan, and has provided its ally with anti-ship

cruise missiles, among other weapons. China also built the massive multimodal port in the southern city of Gwadar, along with a highway and rail link connecting it to China. Indeed, the relationship is so strong that, at the request of Beijing, the Pakistani military stormed Islamabad's Red Mosque in 2007 to liberate 10 Chinese nationals, a move that crystallized the Pakistani Taliban as an anti-government movement.

Nevertheless,
there are two important points of convergence between Beijing's
long-term
interests and Washington's. First, China is concerned with preventing
Islamist
terrorism from disrupting its Central Asian energy routes and its
restive western region, Xinjiang, which borders Pakistan. China is
actively securing natural
gas and oil reserves as far as Turkmenistan on the Caspian, rebuilding
the old
Soviet-era pipelines to feed its western frontier and crossing territory
that
hosts a majority Muslim population.

Secondly,
China has a stake in promoting sustainable, pan-Asian prosperity in the
medium-to-long term to fuel its torrid economic growth. China -- and
neighboring India -- are undertaking a monumental frenzy of urbanization.
A study prepared by McKinsey estimates that approximately 375
million Chinese and 250
million Indians will move from villages to cities over the next 20
years. This growth will require a substantial productivity increase across all economic
sectors -- but along the China-India periphery, the question of whether this
massive urbanization will be sustainable hinges on higher levels of food
production.

This is
where Chinese, U.S., and Pakistani interests powerfully intersect. China needs a
marked increase in Pakistani agricultural productivity, while America needs
Pakistan to build a prosperous economy and a moderate political order that sees
its neighbors to the northwest and east as economic opportunities -- rather
than threats. Land reform is key to creating a win-win situation for all three
countries.

Farm
productivity in Pakistan is stuck between 17 and 50 percent of its potential, according
to research from the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics. Improved

agriculture requires better-educated farmers who own their own land and are incentivized to make use of sustainable methods that also boost their production. Even Cuba figured this one out.

Political

moderation requires the rise of a phenomenon that does not yet exist in Pakistan -- a competent and legitimate political party with a reform mandate. Pakistan's patronage pyramids -- run by powerful family dynasties -- are today inseparable from the civilian political parties they control. They are equally responsible for the status quo: economic failure and the government's sheltering of Islamist militant groups, despite billions of dollars in U.S. foreign assistance. At the root of that corruption is Pakistan's system of semi-feudal land ownership, which, ironically, the Chinese Communist Party is more than happy to prop up.

There is

little time to waste: Commodity prices are nearing record highs, the fighting drags on in Afghanistan, and the people of Pakistan are hurting. In 2009, the year before the devastating monsoon floods that displaced some 20 million people, the United Nations judged that half of the Pakistani population was food insecure. Two-thirds of Pakistanis are living in rural areas and relying directly or indirectly on agriculture, with at least 24 percent of Pakistanis living on less than \$2 a day.

A green

revolution in the Pakistani agricultural belt could forge an independent farming class in the countryside that could remake Pakistan both politically and economically. With a simultaneous effort to formalize property rights in urban areas, a moderate and stable middle-class would have the best chance to peacefully reassert the civilian government's full authority. In short, prosperity and self-reliance will lay the foundation for a government that is willing to embrace the Asian economic growth narrative and free itself of the need to bind the nation together using a narrative of perpetual external threats.

But without

deep reforms in Pakistan, China will not get what it needs out of its dysfunctional ally -- and neither Beijing nor Washington will be able to convince Islamabad to end its dangerous dalliance with South and Central Asian terrorist groups. Together, however, these two superpowers can succeed where, individually, each would fail.

[Back to top](#)

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#)

[Messages in this topic \(1\)](#)

4.

Asian power play, post-Osama

Posted by: "n m" [REDACTED]
Sat May 14, 2011 2:06 am (PDT)

P6/b(6)

Asian power play, post-OsamaNayan Chanda | May 14, 2011, 01.08am IST

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/opinion/edit-page/Asian-power-play-post-Osama/articleshow/8300887.cms>

The early morning American raid on Abbottabad on May 2 that killed Osama bin Laden may also herald the rise of China as a South-West Asian power. With US-Pakistan relations on a knife's edge and Afghanistan facing the impending withdrawal of US forces, doors have opened for a rich and powerful China to step up its presence as a regional hegemon. The latest developments follow a historical pattern in Asia, in which rising tensions between the West and an Asian nation offer China new opportunities to advance its influence.

While some angry voices in the West are calling for a suspension of US aid to Pakistan, the first - and so far only - public support for Islamabad has come from Beijing. After first expressing satisfaction at bin Laden's demise, China pivoted swiftly to laud Pakistan for its "vigorous" efforts to fight terrorism - as if Osama's seven years' presence just outside Islamabad was inconsequential.

In a striking formulation, the Chinese foreign ministry even praised Pakistan's ambiguous record of fighting some and fostering other terrorist groups. China hailed Pakistan's anti-terror strategies "based on its own domestic situation". Translation: it is understandable if Islamabad turns a blind eye or even supports anti-India militant groups for domestic political reasons. (Although unstated, China also appreciates how discriminating Pakistan has been in its support for foreign jihadis flocked to Pakistan for training and Islamic education. In the 1990s, Pakistan ruthlessly suppressed dissident Uighurs of China's troubled Xinjiang province, who enrolled for training by the Taliban.)

As the clamour rises in Washington to punish Islamabad for its seeming act of betrayal, Pakistani leaders are getting ready to visit China, where they are sure to receive unqualified support. Pakistan's prime minister, who has called China an inspiration for his country, has

extolled China's friendship as being "taller than the Himalayas and deeper than the oceans". The Pakistani visit repeats a past pattern in which China has played the role of a steadfast big brother to a younger brother in distress.

With nearly \$3 trillion in foreign exchange reserves and a burgeoning armed forces, China presents a reliable counterweight to the intensified pressure from an angry US. Even if Washington papers over the current rift, which seems likely, the latest episode will surely deepen China's presence and influence in the region as the US starts to draw down from Afghanistan in 2012.

Indeed, two weeks before the bin Laden raid, Pakistani leaders visited Kabul to give Afghan President Hamid Karzai advice on the coming new era. Abandon the untrustworthy Americans, they said, urging Afghanistan to embrace China as the economic powerhouse and reliable regional military power. Afghan officials told New Delhi how stunned they were by this unsolicited advice. Whether Karzai, who was recently given a lavish reception in Beijing, heeds Pakistan's suggestion remains to be seen. But the deep chasm with the US created by the killing of Osama on Pakistani soil opens up a new chapter of Sino-Pakistani relations.

China's rise in Asia has in fact faithfully tracked the eruption of tensions between the US (and even the Soviet Union) and its erstwhile partners. China has long claimed islands of the South China Sea, but only launched its first attack to capture the Paracels from South Vietnam in 1974 when Washington signalled its disinterest in defending its ally. The next attack on the communist Vietnam-occupied Spratly Islands came when a weak Soviet Union was unwilling to come to its treaty ally's defence.

The violent suppression of pro-democracy forces in Burma in 1988 and the subsequent isolation of the country opened the door for China to emerge as the junta's most influential backer. China made further advances in the South China Sea when it took over the Philippines-claimed Mischief Reef in 1995 - three years after Manila stopped hosting US military bases in the country. The 1997 coup in Phnom Penh, which brought condemnation of the Hun Sen regime, saw China once again step in with economic and military aid. As a result, it now counts Cambodia as a close ally.

The growing rift between Pakistan and the US appears to mark the latest in a succession of zero-sum Asian power plays, in which China gains influence when the West loses interest.

[Back to top](#)

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#)

[Messages in this topic](#) (1)

RECENT ACTIVITY

[Visit Your Group](#)

Yahoo! News

[Odd News](#)

You won't believe
it, but it's true

Yahoo! Groups

[Do More For Dogs Group](#)

Join a group of dog owners
who do more.

Ads on Yahoo!

[Learn more now.](#)

Reach customers
searching for you.

Need to Reply?

Click one of the "Reply" links to respond to a specific message in the Daily Digest.

[Create New Topic](#) | [Visit Your Group on the Web](#)

[Messages](#) | [Links](#) | [Calendar](#)

WE PROMOTE FRANK, OPEN AND CANDID DIALOGUE AMONG THE CITIZENS OF THESE TWO SOVEREIGN,
INDEPENDENT AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONS AS EQUAL PARTNERS.

MARKETPLACE

[Find useful articles and helpful tips on living with Fibromyalgia. Visit the Fibromyalgia Zone today!](#)

[Stay on top of your group activity without leaving the page you're on - Get the Yahoo! Toolbar now.](#)



[Change settings via the Web](#) (Yahoo! ID required)

Change settings via email: [Switch delivery to Individual](#) | [Switch format to Traditional](#)

[Visit Your Group](#) | [Yahoo! Groups Terms of Use](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)