

Sent: Wed, 08 Jun 2011 07:26:23 -0400
From: indiausdialogue@yahoogroups.com
To: indiausdialogue@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [INDIA-US-DIALOGUE] Digest Number 646

INDIA-US-DIALOGUE

Messages In This Digest (1 Message)

1a.

[Re: From Abbottabad to Worse](#) From: Reggie Sinha

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

Message

1a.

[Re: From Abbottabad to Worse](#)

Posted by: "Reggie Sinha" [REDACTED]
Wed Jun 8, 2011 3:14 am (PDT)

P6/b(6)

A more apt title should be From Washington to Worse. Lest we forget...and written by a credible author within the few weeks after the Kunduz airlift. GOTUS/POTUS/CIA/Pentagon have been embedded with the terrorist state of Pakistan for a long, long time. Very likely, UBL was amongst the "Taliban leadership" Pakistanis evacuated in the Kunduz airlift. Shame on us! The Bush administration should be investigated by the U.S. Congress to determine level of complicity in the escape of UBL. These people bear full responsibility for the innocent American soldiers killed post-Kunduz ops.

Did Bush Let Taliban & Al-Qaeda Escape?

The Getaway - Questions Surround Secret Pakistan Airlift

By Seymour M. Hersh

The New Yorker Issue

1-28-02

Even before the siege ended, however, a puzzling series of reports appeared in the Times and in other publications, quoting Northern Alliance officials who claimed that Pakistani airplanes had flown into Kunduz to evacuate the Pakistanis there. American and Pakistani officials refused to confirm the reports. On November 16th, when journalists asked Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld about the reports of rescue aircraft, he was dismissive. "Well, if we see them, we shoot them down," he said. Five days later, Rumsfeld declared, "Any idea that those people should be let loose on any basis at all to leave that country and to go bring terror to other countries and destabilize other countries is unacceptable." At a Pentagon news conference on Monday, November 26th, the day after Kunduz fell, General Richard B. Myers, of the Air Force, who is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked about the reports. The General did not directly answer the question but stated, "The runway there is not usable. I mean, there are segments of it that are usable. They're too short for your standard transport aircraft. So we're not sure where the reports are coming from."

Pakistani officials also debunked the rescue reports, and continued to insist, as they had throughout the

Afghanistan war, that no Pakistani military personnel were in the country. Anwar Mehmood, the government spokesman, told newsmen at the time that reports of a Pakistani airlift were "total rubbish. Hogwash."

In interviews, however, American intelligence officials and high-ranking military officers said that Pakistanis were indeed flown to safety, in a series of nighttime airlifts that were approved by the Bush Administration. The Americans also said that what was supposed to be a limited evacuation apparently slipped out of control, and, as an unintended consequence, an unknown number of Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters managed to join in the exodus. "Dirt got through the screen," a senior intelligence official told me. Last week, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld did not respond to a request for comment.

Pakistan's leader, General Pervez Musharraf, who seized power in a 1999 coup, had risked his standing with the religious fundamentalists"and perhaps his life"by endorsing the American attack on Afghanistan and the American support of the Northern Alliance. At the time of Kunduz, his decision looked like an especially dangerous one. The initial American aim in Afghanistan had been not to eliminate the Taliban's presence there entirely but to undermine the regime and Al Qaeda while leaving intact so-called moderate Taliban elements that would play a role in a new postwar government. This would insure that Pakistan would not end up with a regime on its border dominated by the Northern Alliance. By mid-November, it was clear that the Northern Alliance would quickly sweep through Afghanistan. There were fears that once the Northern Alliance took Kunduz, there would be wholesale killings of the defeated fighters, especially the foreigners.

Musharraf won American support for the airlift by warning that the humiliation of losing hundreds"and perhaps thousands"of Pakistani Army men and intelligence operatives would jeopardize his political survival. "Clearly, there is a great willingness to help Musharraf," an American intelligence official told me. A C.I.A. analyst said that it was his understanding that the decision to permit the airlift was made by the White House and was indeed driven by a desire to protect the Pakistani leader. The airlift "made sense at the time," the C.I.A. analyst said. "Many of the people they spirited away were the Taliban leadership" who Pakistan hoped could play a role in a postwar Afghan government. According to this person, "Musharraf wanted to have these people to put another card on the table" in future political negotiations. "We were supposed to have access to them," he said, but "it didn't happen," and the rescued Taliban remain unavailable to American intelligence.

Full article here <http://www.rense.com/general19/al.htm>

Reggie Sinha

To: indiausdialogue@yahoogroups.com

From: [REDACTED] - - P6/b(6)

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 2011 10:28:41 -0500

Subject: [INDIA-US-DIALOGUE] From Abbottabad to Worse

Not posted lately, but here's Chris Hitchens tearing apart our indulgence of Pakistan. As I have always said, it is not Pakistan which is the problem, it is US! GOTUS/POTUS/State Dept./CIA/Stink tanks have all

been embedded with the terrorist state of Pakistan for a long, long time, so much so that our Stink Tanks suggest that a messy marriage is better than an acrimonious divorce. Until we Americans unequivocally and irrevocably turn course 180 degrees - and it doesn't look like we are about to do so - we will continue to suffer.

Pakistanis can take justifiable pride in defeating two major superpowers in the last two centuries: a military defeat of the Soviet Union in the 20th century, and the economic defeat of the USA at the beginning of the 21st century. If Bush had actually implemented you are with us or against us policy, or carried out his threat of bombing Pakistan back into the stone age, Pakistan would have coughed up UBL in Dec. 2001 itself, saving Americans approx. 3 trillion dollars which experts suggest has gone funding into this "war on terror" farce. Of course, our embedded government (Zinni, Powell, CIA chiefs and their Pakistani counterparts) welcomed Pakistan as an ally (al-lie) showering them with billions upon billions of dollars at the expense of our economic survival here at home.

If, in the early 2000's, as I had then suggested to the editorial board of the local newspaper, we had waterboarded and held accountable Musharraf, Karmat, Kiyani, Mahmood Ahmed etc. on UBL and other terror suspects, this war would have been over a long time ago. Instead, taking the cue from our "embedded" government sources, the editorial board considered me the radical, biased person who held anti-Pakistani views just because of my Indian-American background. Scores of my letters, substantiated on facts provided by the GOTUS no less, on Pakistan were never published depriving Americans of the truth. Of course, it is now open season on Pakistan only because the GOTUS/CIA/State Dept. is currently miffed with Pakistan. In that, I hold many of the so called journalists equally culpable in shielding Pakistan's terrorism for many of them knew EXACTLY about Pakistan's perfidy. Very few had the journalistic integrity to write against the stated policy of the GOTUS back then. Should the situation vis-a-vis Pakistan become normal once again, these very journalists will start parroting the GOTUS's views on South Asia, facts and truth be damned!

It will be the day when articles such as one reproduced below can be read in mainstream newspapers.

Although, I must admit, it has a far greater impact on average Americans like myself when it appears in magazines like the Vanity Fair. Slowly, but surely, the average American is getting it when it comes to Pakistan.

Reggie Sinha

<http://www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2011/07/osama-bin-laden-201107>

From Abbottabad to Worse

Hating the United States—which funds Islamabad's army and nuclear program to the humiliating tune of \$3 billion a year—Pakistan takes its twisted, cowardly revenge by harboring the likes of the late Osama bin Laden. But the hypocrisy is mutual, and the shame should be shared.

By Christopher Hitchens•

Illustration by Barry Blitt

July 2011

Salman Rushdie's upsettingly brilliant psycho-profile of Pakistan, in his 1983 novel, *Shame*, rightly laid emphasis on the crucial part played by sexual repression in the Islamic republic. And that was before the Talibanization of Afghanistan, and of much of Pakistan, too. Let me try to summarize and update the situation like this: Here is a society where rape is not a crime. It is a punishment. Women can be sentenced to be raped, by tribal and religious kangaroo courts, if even a rumor of their immodesty brings shame on their menfolk. In such an obscenely distorted context, the counterpart term to shame—which is the noble word “honor”—becomes most commonly associated with the word “killing.” Moral courage consists of the willingness to butcher your own daughter.

If the most elemental of human instincts becomes warped in this bizarre manner, other morbid symptoms will disclose themselves as well. Thus, President Asif Ali Zardari cringes daily in front of the forces who openly murdered his wife, Benazir Bhutto, and who then contemptuously ordered the crime scene cleansed with fire hoses, as if to spit even on the pretense of an investigation. A man so lacking in pride—indeed lacking in manliness—will seek desperately to compensate in other ways. Swelling his puny chest even more, he promises to resist the mighty United States, and to defend Pakistan's holy “sovereignty.” This puffery and posing might perhaps possess a rag of credibility if he and his fellow middlemen were not avidly ingesting \$3 billion worth of American subsidies every year.

There's absolutely no mystery to the “Why do they hate us?” question, at least as it arises in Pakistan. They hate us because they owe us, and are dependent upon us. The two main symbols of Pakistan's pride—its army and its nuclear program—are wholly parasitic on American indulgence and patronage. But, as I wrote for *Vanity Fair* in late 2001, in a long report from this degraded country, that army and those nukes are intended to be reserved for war against the neighboring democracy of India. Our bought-and-paid-for pretense that they have any other true purpose has led to a rancid, resentful official hypocrisy, and to a state policy of revenge, large and petty, on the big, rich, dumb Americans who foot the bill. If Pakistan were a character, it would resemble the one described by Alexander Pope in his *Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot*:

Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike.
Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike:
Alike reserved to blame, or to commend,
A timorous foe, and a suspicious friend ...
So well-bred Spaniels civilly delight
In mumbling of the game they dare not bite.

There's an old cliché in client-state relations, about the tail wagging the dog, but have we really considered what it means when we actually are the tail, and the dog is our goddam lapdog? The lapdog's surreptitious revenge has consisted in the provision of kennels for attack dogs. Everybody knew that the Taliban was originally an instrument for Pakistani colonization of Afghanistan. Everybody knew that al-Qaeda forces were being sheltered in the Pakistani frontier town of Quetta, and that Khalid Sheikh Muhammed was found hiding in Rawalpindi, the headquarters of the Pakistani Army. Bernard-Henri

Lévy once even produced a damning time line showing that every Pakistani “capture” of a wanted jihadist had occurred the week immediately preceding a vote in Congress on subventions to the government in Islamabad. But not even I was cynical enough to believe that Osama bin Laden himself would be given a villa in a Pakistani garrison town on Islamabad’s periphery. I quote below from a letter written by my Pakistani friend Irfan Khawaja, a teacher of philosophy at Felician College, in New Jersey. He sent it to me in anguish just after bin Laden, who claimed to love death more than life, had met his presumably desired rendezvous:

I find, however, that I can’t quite share in the sense of jubilation. I never believed that bin Laden was living in some hideaway “in the tribal areas.” But to learn that he was living in Abbottabad, after Khalid Sheikh Muhammed was discovered in Rawalpindi, is really too much for me. I don’t feel jubilation. I feel a personal, ineradicable sense of betrayal. For ten years, I’ve watched members of my own family taking to the streets, protesting the US military presence in northern Pakistan and the drone strikes etc. They stood there and prattled on and on about “Pakistan’s sovereignty,” and the supposed invasion of it by US forces.

Well, what fucking sovereignty? What fucking sovereignty were these people “protecting”? It’s bad enough that the Pakistani army lacks sovereignty over the tribal area and can’t control it when the country’s own life depends upon it. But that bin Laden was living in the Pakistani equivalent of Annapolis, MD ...

You will notice that Irfan is here registering genuine shame, in the sense of proper outrage and personal embarrassment, and not some vicarious parody of emotion where it is always others—usually powerless women—who are supposedly bringing the shame on you.

If the Pakistani authorities had admitted what they were doing, and claimed the right to offer safe haven to al-Qaeda and the Taliban on their own soil, then the boast of “sovereignty” might at least have had some grotesque validity to it. But they were too cowardly and duplicitous for that. And they also wanted to be paid, lavishly and regularly, for pretending to fight against those very forces. Has any state ever been, in the strict sense of the term, more shameless? Over the years, I have written many pages about the sick relationship between the United States and various Third World client regimes, many of which turned out to be false friends as well as highly discreditable ones. General Pinochet, of Chile, had the unbelievable nerve to explode a car bomb in rush-hour traffic in Washington, D.C., in 1976, murdering a political rival and his American colleague. The South Vietnamese military junta made a private deal to sabotage the Paris peace talks in 1968, in order to benefit the electoral chances of Richard Nixon. Dirty money from the Shah of Iran and the Greek dictatorship made its way at different times into our electoral process. Israeli religious extremists demand American protection and then denounce us for “interference” if we demur politely about colonization of the West Bank. But our blatant manipulation by Pakistan is the most diseased and rotten thing in which the United States has ever involved itself. And it is also, in the grossest way, a violation of our sovereignty. Pakistan routinely—by the dispatch of barely deniable death squads across its borders, to such locations as the Taj Hotel in Mumbai—injures the sovereignty of India as well as Afghanistan. But you might call that a traditional form of violation. In our case, Pakistan ingratiatingly and silkily invites young Americans to one of the vilest and most dangerous regions on earth, there to fight and die as its allies, all the while sharpening a blade for their backs. “The smiler with the knife under the cloak,” as Chaucer phrased it so frigidly. (At our feet, and at

our throat: Perfectly symbolic of the underhanded duality between the mercenary and the sycophant was the decision of the Pakistani intelligence services, in revenge for the Abbottabad raid, to disclose the name of the C.I.A. station chief in Islamabad.)

This is well beyond humiliation. It makes us a prisoner of the shame, and co-responsible for it. The United States was shamed when it became the Cold War armorer of the Ayub Khan dictatorship in the 1950s and 1960s. It was shamed even more when it supported General Yahya Khan's mass murder in Bangladesh in 1971: a Muslim-on-Muslim genocide that crashingly demonstrated the utter failure of a state based on a single religion. We were then played for suckers by yet another military boss in the form of General Zia-ul-Haq, who leveraged anti-Communism in Afghanistan into a free pass for the acquisition of nuclear weapons and the open mockery of the nonproliferation treaty. By the start of the millennium, Pakistan had become home to a Walmart of fissile material, traded as far away as Libya and North Korea by the state-subsidized nuclear entrepreneur A. Q. Khan, the country's nearest approach (which in itself tells you something) to a national hero. Among the scientists working on the project were three named sympathizers of the Taliban. And that gigantic betrayal, too, was uncovered only by chance.

Again to quote myself from 2001, if Pakistan were a person, he (and it would have to be a he) would have to be completely humorless, paranoid, insecure, eager to take offense, and suffering from self-righteousness, self-pity, and self-hatred. That last triptych of vices is intimately connected. The self-righteousness comes from the claim to represent a religion: the very name "Pakistan" is an acronym of Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, and so forth, the resulting word in the Urdu language meaning "Land of the Pure." The self-pity derives from the sad fact that the country has almost nothing else to be proud of: virtually barren of achievements and historically based on the amputation and mutilation of India in 1947 and its own self-mutilation in Bangladesh. The self-hatred is the consequence of being pathetically, permanently mendicant: an abject begging-bowl country that is nonetheless run by a super-rich and hyper-corrupt Punjabi elite. As for paranoia: This not so hypothetical Pakistani would also be a hardened anti-Semite, moaning with pleasure at the butchery of Daniel Pearl and addicted to blaming his self-inflicted woes on the all-powerful Jews.

This dreary story actually does have some bearing on the "sovereignty" issue. In the beginning, all that the Muslim League demanded from the British was "a state for Muslims." Pakistan's founder and first president, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, was a relatively secular man whose younger sister went around unveiled and whose second wife did not practice Islam at all. But there's a world of difference between a state for Muslims and a full-on Muslim state. Under the rule of General Zia there began to be imposition of Shari'a and increased persecution of non-Muslims as well as of Muslim minorities such as the Shiites, Ismailis, and Ahmadis. In recent years these theocratic tendencies have intensified with appalling speed, to the point where the state contains not one but two secret statelets within itself: the first an impenetrable enclave of covert nuclear command and control and the second a private nexus of power at the disposal of the military intelligence services and—until recently—Osama bin Laden himself. It's the sovereignty of these possessions that exercises General Ashfaq Kayani, head of the Pakistani Army, who five days after Abbottabad made the arrogant demand that the number of American forces in the country be reduced "to the minimum essential." He even said that any similar American action ought to warrant a "review" of the whole relationship between the two countries. How pitiful it is that a Pakistani and not an American should have been the first (and so far the only) leader to say those necessary

things.

If we ever ceased to swallow our pride, so I am incessantly told in Washington, then the Pakistani oligarchy might behave even more abysmally than it already does, and the situation deteriorate even further. This stale and superficial argument ignores the awful historical fact that, each time the Pakistani leadership did get worse, or behave worse, it was handsomely rewarded by the United States. We have been the enablers of every stage of that wretched state's counter-evolution, to the point where it is a serious regional menace and an undisguised ally of our worst enemy, as well as the sworn enemy of some of our best allies. How could it be "worse" if we shifted our alliance and instead embraced India, our only rival in scale as a multi-ethnic and multi-religious democracy, and a nation that contains nearly as many Muslims as Pakistan? How could it be "worse" if we listened to the brave Afghans, like their former intelligence chief Amrullah Saleh, who have been telling us for years that we are fighting the war in the wrong country?

If we continue to deny or avoid this inescapable fact, then we really are dishonoring, as well as further endangering, our exemplary young volunteers. Why was the raid on Abbottabad so rightly called "daring"? Because it had to be conducted under the radar of the Pakistani Air Force, which "scrambled" its jets and would have brought the Black Hawks down if it could. That this is true is bad enough in all conscience. That we should still be submitting ourselves to lectures and admonitions from General Kayani is beyond shameful.

Read More <http://www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2011/07/osama-bin-laden-201107?printable=true#ixzz1OVQEgHn4>

[Back to top](#)

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

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

RECENT ACTIVITY

[Visit Your Group](#)

Yahoo! Groups

[Do More For Dogs Group](#)

Connect and share with
dog owners like you

Yahoo! News

[Fashion News](#)

What's the word on
fashion and style?

Search Ads

[Get new customers.](#)

List your web site
in Yahoo! Search.

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

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

Find useful articles and helpful tips on living with Fibromyalgia. Visit the Fibromyalgia Zone today!



[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](#)