

# Center for American Progress



## **SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

### **“TURMOIL IN PAKISTAN: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. SECURITY”**

#### **MODERATED BY:**

**LAWRENCE KORB, SENIOR FELLOW, CENTER  
FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

#### **FEATURED PANELISTS:**

**SENATOR TOM DASCHLE, DISTINGUISHED SENIOR  
FELLOW, CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

**ROBERT GRENIER, MANAGING DIRECTOR, KROLL INC.  
AND FORMER CIA CHIEF OF STATION, ISLAMABAD**

**ROBERT HATHAWAY, DIRECTOR, ASIA PROGRAM,  
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR  
SCHOLARS**

**9:00 AM – 10:30 AM  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2007**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY  
DC TRANSCRIPTION & MEDIA REPURPOSING**

MR. LAWRENCE KORB: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Larry Korb and on behalf of John Podesta, our president of the Center, I'd like to welcome you to this discussion about the implications of Pakistan and the current situation for U.S. security interests.

We really have an outstanding panel this morning, and what I will do is I will introduce each one before they speak, and then I'll raise a couple of questions after the presentations, and then we'll open it up to the audience. I would remind you, if you ask a question, we'd appreciate your identifying yourself, where you are from and who you are, and your organization, and wait until the microphone comes so we can hear you.

Our first speaker this morning in many ways needs no introduction, Senator Tom Daschle, who was a member of both the House and the Senate, who was a minority leader, the majority leader, the second-longest serving majority leader in the Democratic Party. And he has just recently returned from a trip to Pakistan. He got there right before the declaration of emergency rule. So I'll ask Senator Daschle to open the session by sharing his impressions of what happened on his trip to Pakistan.

Tom?

SEN. TOM DASCHLE: Well, Larry, thank you very much for your introduction and for all that you do here at the Center, and in so many ways your contributions are so important. I also want to acknowledge, even though I don't see her, Caroline Wadhams, who – there she is in the back – has done so much and she really should be in this panel as well. But it's a real pleasure for me to have the good fortune to work with people of the caliber of Larry and Caroline, and to be on a panel with the two Bobs, Bob Hathaway and Bob Grenier. They are the real experts.

I'm on the board of not only the Center for American Progress, but also the National Democratic Institute for National Affairs. As some of you may know, the NDI does a remarkable job around the country of monitoring democratic efforts and providing counsel to governments as to ways with which to improve their democratic institutions. And it was in that context that I led a delegation to Pakistan from the 15<sup>th</sup> of October through the 22<sup>nd</sup> of October.

It was a very interesting time of year, of course, as Larry noted. It was during that time that the violent return of Benazir Bhutto occurred. A hundred and forty people were killed in Karachi during that same week. But our goal was to assess the current political circumstances and make recommendations as to what should be done to improve the prospects for a transparent, free, and fair election. Our report, I think, is in the foyer in the back and you're welcome to look at it and refer to it as you consider the circumstances in Pakistan today.

We had made a similar mission to Pakistan in May and the circumstances between May and October actually had further declined virtually across the board. We sent people out to the Northwest Frontier Province to examine circumstances there and talk to people from other areas of the country. And our sense, as we examined circumstances during that week, was that there was more of a pervasive sense of fear than we had seen virtually at any other time since we had been there – fear of the media about the repression, the tremendous efforts to curtail their freedom of movement, their activities. There have been several deaths, several murders among the media there and that element of fear, that concern about their own circumstances, was very, very much in evidence.

There was also concern about the loss of judicial independence. The Supreme Court had really been one of the forces within society, within government that created some balance with the Musharraf government. That was becoming increasingly in jeopardy and that concern also led to fear among those with whom we talked.

We talked, of course, with all the political leaders, with civil leaders, with members of the media, with others, and our overall sense was that there was growing concern even then about the repressive nature of the political environment.

There was also concern, of course, with the Election Commission itself. The Election Commission had been established, but there was significant evidence of incompetence and lack of transparency. They hadn't filled the commission to the extent that it was required by law, and so the vacancies themselves caused real concern.

There was concern as well about the level of activity of the ISI, the main Pakistani intelligence agency, at the local level and its involvement in politics and perhaps even manipulation of elections themselves; concern about the lack of adequate voter rolls and the concern about whether or not voter identification was going to continue to be a problem before the elections took place in January. So the quality of the voter rolls themselves led a lot of people to be very concerned.

And then of course there was the question of security, especially in the outlying areas – a great deal of concern about the degree to which extremist elements were taking over and creating a real sense of insecurity among those who were hoping to participate in the political process itself. And then finally, security for women in particular – a great deal of concern about the degree to which women were able to move freely and participate actively in the political process.

Of course, since we left it's gotten much worse. A state of emergency was declared, thousands of people put under house arrest, political detention, a great deal of concern about the complete shutdown in the media, and of course the obliteration virtually, for all intents and purposes, of the Supreme Court. Since then, of course, within the last couple of days President Musharraf has announced his retirement from the position of chief of staff in the military. He's also indicated that he is going to lift this state of emergency and begin to release prisoners, but that remains to be seen.

I think the overall circumstances deteriorated quite substantially. My real concern is the degree to which the United States is associated with Musharraf, and that we are in many respects held responsible for what is happening, in part because of the very close association we've had with Musharraf in these past couple of years and statements that have been made since all this had begun.

I look forward to discussing more of this, Larry, in the Q&A part and am delighted to be part of the panel with the two Bobs.

Thank you.

MR. KORB: Thank you very much, Senator.

Our next speaker is Dr. Robert Hathaway, who currently is the director of the Asia Program at Woodrow Wilson Center. Before joining the center in 1999, he served 12 years on the professional staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Dr. Hathaway has also taught a number of universities, written a number of books and articles and three recent reports on the subject of Pakistan.

So, Bob, we look forward to your comments about the political developments in Pakistan since the imposition of the emergency rule and the U.S. policy toward Pakistan.

MR. BOB HATHAWAY: Well, thanks, Larry. I'm delighted to be here. I'm a little bit overwhelmed by the task of talking for only 10 minutes. It seems to be far easier if you would have given me 30 or so. I'm going to talk almost in shorthand. I hope that I will not be cryptic, but certainly, I would invite questions to further explain what I have in mind once we get beyond the opening statements.

First of all, the current situation in Pakistan: It's fair to say that everything has changed, and that there's no going back to where we were or where Pakistan was, in the beginning of the year. In retrospect, it clearly appears that Musharraf's decision last March to fire the Supreme Court chief justice was a turning point in recent Pakistani history. And then from Musharraf's standpoint it was clearly a monumental blunder. This is the point at which everything began to unravel for Musharraf.

Let's briefly look at each of the key players in Pakistan. Musharraf, as Senator Daschle has indicated, has now taken off the uniform, retired from the army. He's been sworn in as a civilian president. Some people have asked if this is going to make any difference. In the next 24 hours, probably not, but in the longer run, but not too long run, it could well make a difference. Musharraf has already been weakened considerably in recent months. Compare his inability, for instance, to block Nawaz Sharif's entry back to Pakistan last weekend compared to the very different results in September: Sharif came back and immediately was put back on the plane and shipped out again.

In retiring from the army, he loses his only base of power. I think, particularly now that Sharif is back in the country and there is a prospect of an active political process, I think it's inevitable that there will be defectors from the political party which

has grown up around Musharraf, which has no purpose other than to support Musharraf. And I would draw your attention particularly to the call earlier this week by a group of senior retired military officers – the call for Musharraf not only to step down from the army, but also from the presidency. If senior retired military officers are saying this publicly, you can bet that there are many currently on active duty who also feel this way.

Bhutto also has been badly weakened in recent weeks, in part because of a perception that she has been trying to do a deal with Musharraf, and as Musharraf has been discredited, this has also discredited her. She's also been weakened by the perception – a quite accurate perception – that she is Washington's preferred candidate. I believe it says something about the low esteem with which the United States is regarded in Pakistan that the notion that she's Washington candidate would really hurt her.

Now that Sharif is back in town, she can no longer claim to be the only prominent opposition politician in the country with a national following. She, as you know, has filed her papers to run in the January election. There's a lot of pressure on her not to run, but whether she runs or not remains to be seen. My hunch, if you forced me to bet right now, is that she will run because nothing I've seen in the last 15 or 20 years suggests that she'd willingly give up a chance to become prime minister again.

Sharif has clearly been strengthened and I think it's instructive to compare his new rising star position today; juxtapose this to the scorn that Pakistanis felt across the board for Nawaz Sharif at the time of his ouster from power by Musharraf. Progressive minded people, small-d democratic people were literally dancing in the streets when he was turned out back then. And yet he is the new darling of Pakistani political activists again.

He, of course, has also said that – as of last night, he said he will not run. I think that too remains to be seen. But clearly, he has a certain credibility that Benazir has lost. He, for instance, can argue and will argue that he is not Washington's candidate; indeed, he's been boasting this week that he defied the Americans back in 1998 by going forward with the nuclear test following India's tests. He also can claim that he defied Musharraf by coming back to Pakistan in defiance of Musharraf – unlike Benazir. So at least for the moment there's a sharp contrast to the status he held in 1999, and his star is clearly rising.

The new army chief – the chief of army staff, General Kayani, is described as a moderate, as someone who enjoyed his training here in Kansas, albeit some 30 years ago, someone who is sympathetic to the United States, someone who will actively take up the fight against the extremists in Pakistan. All of these things may be true, but I would also simply suggest that every time an American or an American newspaper says these things, it makes Kayani a bit nervous because the last thing he wants is to be seen in Pakistan as America's new guy. So for those of you who might be writing or talking about that, you might simply keep that in mind.

Kayani clearly has institutional concerns. The morale of the army is seriously eroded. The army no longer commands the respect that it up until very recently commanded in Pakistan. They're under siege. It's notable that there've been a number of

attacks by extremists against the military and intelligence personnel, installations. You've got these very embarrassing surrenders of army troops – in one instance several hundred at one time – to inferior forces.

And I think one thing for all of us to watch is, in the coming weeks and months, does Kayani come to the conclusion that the institutional interests of the army demand that the army break from Musharraf. That will be a key barometer to watch in the coming months.

Very quickly, where does all this leave the United States? Clearly, the Bush administration is on the defensive now. It has placed nearly all its eggs in Musharraf's basket for the last six years, and that basket is now badly leaking. The administration is clearly not excited about Nawaz Sharif's return to Pakistan and his new prominence there. It rightly remembers that is the same Nawaz Sharif who in the 1990s cozied up to the religious conservatives, supported parliamentary passage of a Sharia Law, moved against the media, against the judiciary, carried out the nuclear weapons tests in 1988. And generally, I think the administration believes that Nawaz would not vigorously carry the war against the extremists.

Benazir is still the preferred candidate and I think the preferred outcome as far as the administration's concerned is a deal between Musharraf and Benazir. The administration sees Benazir as far more secular, far more moderate, far more progressive, far more committed to going after the extremists. But nonetheless, I think the administration's efforts to broker a shotgun marriage between Musharraf and Bhutto, at least at this point, have run their course.

It seems to me the administration has not abandoned Musharraf. It still hopes that Musharraf can be part of the solution. I would refer you to the president's interview on ABC just last weekend, where he had very, very kind things to say about Musharraf.

One final point, this is in the way of a recommendation. I would urge that we be very modest in our expectations about how we can influence developments, particularly political developments, in Pakistan in the coming weeks. There's a lot of talk in this town and elsewhere about U.S. aid giving us leverage. Frankly, I think a lot of that is pretty silly talk. I don't think we have a great deal of leverage because of our aid.

Certainly, I don't think we have a great deal of leverage to force Pakistanis to do things that they otherwise would not do. On top of that, it's already been suggested that our popularity in Pakistan is at an all-time low. Pakistanis would be reluctant to be seen doing American bidding. And finally, Pakistani objectives and interests don't necessarily coincide with American objectives, which will make it more difficult to persuade them to move in directions that we wish them to go.

So what I'm simply saying is that, at least at this present moment, I doubt that there's a made-in-America solution for Pakistan. Clearly, we have an interest in what happens there, but I do think that we need to be pretty modest in our expectations -- and pretty adroit and not heavy-handed in our rhetoric, as well as our actions.

MR. KORB: Thank you very much, Bob.

Of course, one of the big concerns the United States has in our relationship with Pakistan is their role in what the president calls the global war on terror, the situation in Afghanistan, and so we'd like to turn to our next panelist to discuss the counterterrorism, counterinsurgency efforts and the larger terrorist threat in Pakistan, and we couldn't have asked for a person more qualified to do that than Robert Grenier.

Right now he's the managing director of Kroll, Inc., but he had a 27-year career in the CIA. Fourteen of those years he was in foreign assignments, as chief of station or chief of base as part of the CIA's clandestine service. Prior to retiring, he was the director of the CIA's counterterrorism sector. And not most relevant, but very relevant to what we're talking about today, he was the CIA chief of station in Islamabad, Pakistan, from '99 to 2002.

So, Bob, we look forward to your comments.

MR. GRENIER: Thank you very much, Larry. I'm going to try to mirror the discipline of my colleagues here on the panel and keep my remarks as short as possible.

Being asked to speak about counterterrorism in South Asia and Pakistan and Afghanistan, I would personally point out that I believe that counterterrorism and the global war on terrorism is our overriding national security concern in both Pakistan and Afghanistan that takes precedence over other legitimate interests that we have there. Before you make judgments, however, as to where I'm going with that, I'd like to park that there and circle back to that at the end.

With regard to Pakistani policy and practice in the counterterrorism arena, it is clear that the Pakistanis are much maligned for their performance in the global war on terror, and I think often unfairly so. That said, even someone who takes as positive a view of Pakistani efforts as I do would have to admit that the picture is very mixed, so I'll take a few minutes just to try to deconstruct that a little bit.

With regard to Pakistani performance against al Qaeda, as narrowly defined foreign fighters in the settled areas of Pakistan, I think that their assistance to us in the global war on terror has been everything that we could possibly ask of them. It was a 180-degree turnaround immediately after 9/11. In the early days in particular, there was a lot of low-hanging fruit. We had a lot of foreign fighters who were streaming out of Afghanistan and we were literally picking them up by the tens and the dozens, and were piling up the C-17s and flying them out.

And today, they provide us a large proportion of the population at Guantanamo, which is another whole story, but at the time it seemed like a good idea. The sooner you get them off the street in Pakistan.

With regard to their performance against senior al Qaeda cadres, again I think that the historical record speaks for itself. We could go through a whole laundry list: Abu Zabaida, Khalid Sheik Mohammed, Ramzi bin al-Shib, Abu Faraj al-Libbi – a great many senior al Qaeda cadres were taken off of the street in Pakistan. It's all come as a result of very, very close intelligence cooperation between the Pakistanis and the Americans, and the Pakistanis have taken some considerable risks in doing so.

When we look at their performance in the tribal areas, however, it's far more problematic, and I think the reasons for that are really quite clear. It's a whole lot harder in the tribal areas and the risks to the Pakistanis in operating in the tribal areas are considerable. The target in the tribal areas is not limited to the foreign fighters, al Qaeda as narrowly defined, but also includes what are loosely referred to as the Pakistani Taliban – Pakistani Pashtuns for the most part who were religious extremists and were actively engaged in cross-border operations in Afghanistan.

The reason that the Pakistanis have been less than successful in that area is because it is a fundamentally hostile area. These people are fundamentally hostile to the Pakistani army, to the Pakistani government. And the tools available to the Pakistanis, either to conduct a broad counterinsurgency in that area or to conduct the narrow, if you will, rifle-shot operations that are necessary to take out small groups of foreign terrorists who are holed up someplace in this very hostile area, are ill-suited to the task.

Pakistanis are terribly afraid to use the special forces elements that they have available to them because what they fear is that these people will go in; they'll – conduct a successful operation, find themselves nearly surrounded by howling tribesmen and they'll suffer tremendous losses in trying to get them back out. When they've been forced into that position, as they often have in the past, they've suffered considerable losses. Since 2004 in particular, they've literally suffered hundreds of military and paramilitary casualties out in the tribal areas. And the situation that we see there right now, we can see the fulfillment of precisely the fears that the Pakistanis have had all along.

North Waziristan is largely in open revolt at the moment. That insurgency, if you will, has spread into the Swat Valley and elsewhere in the NWFP, but actually, in – it's said to be in a settled area of Pakistan. They have a very, very difficult situation there.

That said, they have been very tolerant of U.S. efforts in that period. There are a number of senior al Qaeda cadres who have disappeared under somewhat mysterious circumstances – often a puff of smoke and the Pakistanis didn't complain very much about that. But that said, they are loathe to take serious risks in conducting what we would consider to be an effective either counterterrorism or counterinsurgency effort in that area.

If we turn to the Pakistani attitude and performance toward the Afghan Taliban, that is far more problematic still, and I think it is fair to say that the Pakistani attitude toward the Afghan Taliban is at best enigmatic. I don't believe that they are providing active military support to the Taliban, but they're clearly, in my view at least, have been

turning a blind eye, particularly to the actions – the cross-border activities of the Taliban leadership.

I think the reasons for that are really quite clear. They see the Karzai-led government in Kabul as fundamentally hostile. They are not at all sure of U.S. staying power. In Afghanistan, they've seen us come into the area and they've seen us leave again. And they are loathe, I believe, to in their view gratuitously and unilaterally throw away one of the potentially effective tool of influence that they have in Afghanistan for the long-term future. I just don't think that they're going do it under current circumstances, and unless we can effect some important changes within Afghanistan itself.

Looking to the future, I think that if we are to turn the situation around, what we really need to do, what we and the Pakistanis really need to do is to pacify the tribal areas, and that's going to require a sustained counterinsurgency effort of the sort that we have not seen to date. I'm encouraged by the fact that the U.S. government at least is thinking more systematically in those terms. We have not to date. And just recently, however, \$350 million has been allocated to the development portion of a counterinsurgency effort in the tribal areas. I think that that's also good.

I've seen recently in the press where the U.S. military was talking seriously about providing counterinsurgency-related training and assistance to the Pakistanis. But I would caution people against unrealistic thinking, and I've also been seeing in the press where there were some in the U.S. government who were saying, "Well, listen, we need to take the lessons learned in Anbar Province in Iraq and then translate those into the tribal areas in Pakistan." And I can tell you, it's not nearly that simple.

The reason that we've had the success that we had in Anbar is because the traditional tribal sheiks and the population there have become fed up with the oppression and intimidation of al Qaeda. It's not the situation currently in the tribal areas of Pakistan. It's a fundamentally radicalized population. Pashtuns on the Pakistan side of the border are far more radical than their counterparts on the Afghan side, and so I think getting a purchase there is going to be very, very difficult. It's literally going to be a generational process.

I think that the Pakistani government is going to have to be willing in a sustained manner to reach over the heads both of the traditional tribal mullahs and of the radical clerics to appeal to the people there. This will require political development, military development, and also sustained economic development.

I think that as the Pakistanis focus on that, as I hope that they will, I believe that General Kayani will be at least marginally more willing to accept U.S. support, particularly in the military and paramilitary area, but that will only be relative.

I know General Kayani. I've dealt with him and a couple of different guises. I knew him when he was the director general of military operations. I also knew him when he was the head of the ISI. And he's a fundamentally cautious individual. I think that he

will understand more the upside of U.S. support and therefore, may be willing, at least marginally, to take more risks associated with cooperation in this area, but he's going to be very, very cautious. He's not going to want to take great risks of tripping off a general tribal warfare in the northwest frontier.

So to turn back to where I started on the overriding importance of counterterrorism policy, I think that to look at counterterrorism in Pakistan in a narrow way is a big mistake, and I think that this has been done largely to date. I see the problem of terrorism, counterterrorism in Pakistan as being a subset of a much larger issue, and that is the struggle within Pakistani society between more moderate elements and the religious extremists.

And I don't believe that over the long term the Pakistanis can do what they have to do, which is to marshal the vast majority of the people, isolating the Islamic extremists under conditions where they are being ruled by a repressive dictator. I think that for purposes of counterterrorism, as for other purposes, democracy over the long term is the answer in Pakistan.

MR. KORB: Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank all three panelists for not only giving us tremendous insights, but for also sticking within the time restrictions. We do appreciate it.

Let me begin by throwing a question out on the table. I think they've all talked about how the U.S. has to be modest and some of the constraints, but right now, the Congress and the administration are facing the situation of foreign aid, military assistance. What would you recommend, if you were back in your former post as majority leader, Senator Daschle, if the president said, "Well, what about aid? Where do we do from here?" Restrictions, up, down, sideways? What should we do?

SEN. DASCHLE: I think it's a very tough call, Larry. I guess my immediate sense is that we ought to continue to provide assistance, but with conditions. I think there has to be a far greater degree of assurance on the part of the Musharraf government that they're going to be moving to fulfill the promises that Musharraf had made in the last couple of days and to open up the political process. We're very – I'm pessimistic about the fairness and the openness and the ability to carry off these elections in January to a satisfactory degree, but I think we have to put pressure on them.

And I think it is important for us to disassociate ourselves to a certain extent from the Musharraf government. But I do believe as well that we need to send the right messages for the reasons my colleagues on the panel have said: there are huge stakes here, counterterrorism stakes, nuclear weapons stakes. The political stakes are as great there as they've ever been in that country, so I think we need to be concerned about finding the right balance. To me, the right balance would be aid, but with great restrictions and caveats on how the Musharraf government conducts itself.

MR. KORB: Bob, I think you sort of gave a very bleak picture – Bob Hathaway – of the choices we have, the three leaders there. What should we do if General Kayani should do what Musharraf did, in fact, in 1999? What should be our position then?

MR. HATHAWAY: Well, I don't know that we want to talk about that possibility because inevitably the Pakistani press is going to say that the United States is floating it. Actually, though, and here I would defer to Bob, but I doubt that's very likely. I think the army has been badly tarnished and bruised by the experience of trying to run the country over the last eight years. I think the professional military officers understand and worry about the fact that being distracted by trying to run all the parts of government which are normally run by civilians has really degraded their ability to carry out a professional military's first responsibility, and that is to ensure the security of the country.

Moreover, I think most senior army officers today understand that after eight years, the vast majority of Pakistani people are getting tired of the army playing such a prominent, upfront role. So I would be very surprised if we had a repeat of 1999 – and maybe that's a more optimistic scenario.

MR. KORB: Let me ask Bob Grenier a question. We hear that the enlisted people in the Pakistani military are much more fundamentalist than the officer corps, and they really do not want to engage in this struggle on the borders. Is that true and is there anything that we can do about that if basically they're sympathetic to the Taliban and al Qaeda?

MR. GRENIER: Well, it's – the Pakistan military, as with most militaries, we probably know least about the attitudes among the rank and file than the senior leadership. And I think that it is, however, fair to say that among the rank and file in the Pakistani military, they represent the broad distribution of beliefs within Pakistani society more broadly.

So I think that there are many who are simply sympathetic to the Islamic extremists, whom they would consider to be simply good Muslims and who are probably very much prey to what the extremists themselves say, which is that they are really not doing anything exceptional but that it's the government which is turning against them because they are being pushed to do so by the Americans. So I suspect that that view has a fair amount of currency in the lower ranks of the military.

That said, the Pakistani military is a highly disciplined force. They have not always been terribly effective in some of the recent operations in the Swat Valley, where – (unintelligible) – way. But there is no history, nor have we seen recently, any indications of revolt within the Pakistani military and except in a situation very much in extremis, I wouldn't expect to see that in the future. What I think is extremely important for the Pakistan government is to demonstrate in a very, very consistent way that its operations to try to bring order to the country are being done in the interests of Pakistan.

I think that General Musharraf in a famous speech that he gave back in January of 2002 laid out what was his core program for the country, and that was to bring Pakistan into the modern world as an enlightened, democratic, but a Muslim society, and that Islamic extremists had no role to play in that. Unfortunately, I don't think that he has been able to carry that sentiment forward in a very consistent way. I think that's going to be the great challenge for what we hope for in a secular, democratic government in Pakistan. I think that a democratic government will be far better placed if it has a clear majority of the people behind it to make that and to make it stick.

MR. KORB: Thank you very much.

The floor is now open for questions. According to our custom, we allow the members of the media to go first. Is there anybody from the media that would like to ask the first question? If not – yes, we have one there.

Q: Miles Harper from Arms Control Today. First, a slight advertisement and then a question. We're running an article in the next issue on the security of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, including some people who've been in the Pakistani military. I'd like your assessment on how secure you feel the Pakistani arsenal is and what the United States should be doing about that in this period right now.

MR. KORB: Any volunteers? (Laughter.)

MR. HATHAWAY: Obviously, this is a very sensitive subject and it's a legitimate cause for worry and concern. I think that much of what one sees in the press, however, is highly unrealistic. Certainly, as far as I know the nuclear weapons in Pakistan are very firmly within the control of the Pakistani military. I'm sure that our knowledge of the specific security procedures that are in place is probably imperfect. That said, I think that we have reason to believe that they do have fairly adequate controls over those weapons. Again, they're very firmly in the hands of the military. So the people concerned about al Qaeda sweeping down out of the mountains and somehow seizing control of a nuclear weapon – that's not something that tends to make me wake up at 3:00 in the morning.

Q: (Unintelligible) – Brookings Institution. Thank you for a great panel. For Senator Daschle, you mentioned that we need to move away from Musharraf, and I presume that means away from the personality to institutions, and I was wondering if you could suggest one way the United States could do that.

For Mr. Hathaway, I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about the – (unintelligible) – job and – (unintelligible) – who is the chief minister of the – (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) – the players, yes or no.

And for Mr. Grenier, I was wondering if you could briefly comment about the separatist elements in the tribal areas in North Baluchistan and how they play in with this very complex issue.

MR. KORB: Thank you. It's high praise when Brookings says we're doing a good job, so we appreciate that.

SEN. DASCHLE: I think that with regard to my question, there are a number of things that have to be done. I've sort of outlined them a little bit in our NDI report that goes more specifically to some of the issues that I think the United States needs to consider.

First and foremost, I think we really ought to insist on fair, free elections, and make a make a real point and put his credibility out there with regard to the insistence that these elections be fair and free and that there be full participation. And that we work to ensure that the voter rolls are appropriately maintained and provided. They were supposed to have been put up on an electronic system in the last few weeks. As I understand it, that has not yet happened and so it's going to be even harder with remaining weeks now to do that adequately. So I'm real concerned about whether we can even have the kind of elections that would allow a real democracy to function, so that's number one.

Restoration of the Supreme Court, the authority there, is just in my view – one of the worst of all the developments, politically and institutionally, was the minimization, the virtual abolition of the role of the Supreme Court and the puppet regime that they put in place.

Third, I think it's important for us to express a profound neutrality and strong belief in not picking winners and losers in this campaign leading up to the election. We've been unwilling to do that and I think that's a mistake as well.

I could go on, but those are the three most important things we could do.

MR. HATHAWAY: Are the Chaudhrys players in the future? No. Haider, you go back to Pakistan far more often than I. I should probably be asking you the question. Everybody I talk to tells me that they have been utterly discredited. They have no power base other than their connections to a recently retired general. I don't anticipate they would be major players.

MR. GRENIER: With regard to the question of the separatist element, the question of nationalist element in Pakistan, as you know, that has been a feature in the Pashtun areas since time immemorial. I think more recently, it's the Islamic radicalism in that area in which has been a far greater influence on the events in that part of Pakistan, but in talking as we did before about what I would regard as the need for Pakistan to launch a very broad and sustained counterinsurgency effort in the tribal areas, what they will in effect be saying, whether overtly or tacitly, is that their national aim is to incorporate the Pashtun-dominated tribal areas into Pakistan proper in a way that they never have been in the past.

If in fact the Pakistanis do go forward in that regard, as I hope they will, I think that will give us an indication. We'll find out just how strong Pashtun nationalism still is

because I think that that sentiment will be readily engaged, but I don't see it as being as strong a force as people like, say, Hamid Karzai would indicate that it is.

With regard to the situation in the North Baluchistan, that actually is what – (inaudible). There is a strong sentiment of Baluchi nationalist sentiment, but that too, I think, is one which can be relatively easily co-opted if the Pakistanis pursue a broad thinking, progressive policy in that area, as I think they ought to. Really, at the end of the day I think what the Baluchis want is a bigger piece of pie. They see wealth being generated in that area. They don't see that wealth staying there in Baluchistan. I think they just want a better deal and I think if they had it, that some of the current difficulties that we see in the Baluchi counterinsurgency would largely help.

Q: Hi, I'm Aaron – (unintelligible). I'm a lawyer with Human Rights First in D.C. I appreciate all of you coming out to talk. It's such an interesting panel. I think you've got a good group of panelists. My question relates – and it's sort of a multi-tiered question – relates to the restoration of the judiciary, which Senator Daschle just referred to.

First of all, Senator Daschle, you mentioned that that's one of the three things you would urge the United States government to come out in favor of. My first question is whether you think that restoration of the dismissed judiciary is a necessary prerequisite to a free and fair election, and also why you think it is – and this question may also be answered by Mr. Hathaway – why is it that the United States government has not explicitly called for a reinstatement of the judiciary. In fact, I've heard that they're actively avoiding calling for reinstatement of the judiciary.

Negroponete was asked the question during his visit and he totally evaded the question, and whether the failure of the United States to call for reinstatement of the judiciary – of the Supreme Court in particular has been a factor in what you referred to as – and Mr. Hathaway referred to as – the negative perception right now that Pakistanis have of the United States.

And then, finally, for Mr. Hathaway and Senator Daschle, whether the restoration of the Supreme Court should be a factor in conditions on aid.

And then the last question pertaining to the restoration of the Supreme Court is for Mr. Grenier. You mentioned that in the longer term it's going to be about democracy building for fighting counterinsurgency or for our counterinsurgency efforts there and for Pakistan's counterinsurgency efforts and the battle between the moderates and the extremists. I just wonder if one of the specifics under democracy building for you is, again, the restoration of the current dismissed judiciary. I assume it's a strong Supreme Court and a strong judiciary, but I'm wondering specifically about the current justices who were just dismissed.

SEN. DASCHLE: Well, that was a basket of good questions and I'll try to remember. I think the main thing is, should the United States – (inaudible) – correct, the restoration of the judiciary, and the answer to me is emphatically yes. The widespread

perception is that the Supreme Court was fired because Musharraf was tipped off that he would be declared ineligible. I happen to believe that that's probably an accurate perception, but it's probably (inarguable?) that that's the only reason, but whatever the reason for any president to take the actions that he has just undermines dramatically the standing, the credibility of democratic institutions of government.

You asked the question, can there be fair and free elections? I don't think so. I think that's so fundamental to the establishment of those institutions of democracy that it has undermined the perception of any kind of fairness or free, open election process without the reinstatement of the Supreme Court. They were a political force in addition to being a legal force, in some ways sort of the counterbalance of the Musharraf government that is no longer there. And so as a result they play, I think, an important political role in addition to a constitutional and institutional role that is no longer standing. And so for me, the reinstatement and the importance of our emphasis; that is, the United States emphasis that this be done can't be underemphasized.

Q: (Off mike.)

SEN. DASCHLE: I suspect that you'd have to talk to the administration. I suspect that it hasn't because we have not wanted to be publicly at crossways with Musharraf. We have made it our policy to either be at an arm's length or directly support most of what he's done, and say good things about him in the last couple of weeks. President Bush couldn't have been more clear about his support for Musharraf just a week ago. So if you're going to support Musharraf, you're not going to oppose such actions as the ones he's taken to further establish his position in the political process.

MR. HATHAWAY: Since you're running a prominent human rights organization, let me just say one of the most egregious things, in my judgment, that's transpired post-November 3, when Musharraf imposed the emergency rule, was the arrest, within 24 hours of imposing that rule, of most of the members of the Pakistan Human Rights Commission, including its very prominent and highly respected chairwoman. Musharraf justified the imposition of the emergency rule primarily as being required in order to fight extremism.

But it was very clear in the first 24–48 hours after the declaration of the emergency rule that the real targets of emergency rule were not the extremists, but were civil society and others, including these human rights activists. And I wish that we in Washington had been more forceful from the very beginning, particularly on this issue.

Why has the United States not called for the reinstatement of the fired judges? I agree with Senator Daschle. I would also note that this is probably the one thing that Musharraf cannot do. I expect Musharraf feels that were the sacked judges to be reinstated, this would represent the single largest threat to his ability to remain president. So I expect there's some sense here in Washington that you don't call for something that you know is not going to happen.

Should U.S. assistance be conditioned upon the restoration of judges, and not just the Supreme Court justices? As you know, of course, other judges have also been fired. There's a time disconnect in a sense, particularly if you're talking about legislative action because Congress does not move particularly promptly, and I think in some ways that train has already left the station.

What I would certainly like to see is administration statements and statements from congressional leaders underscoring the importance of an independent judiciary, which would certainly suggest that those who were fired because they displayed an independence should be reinstated. This gets to something that Senator Daschle mentioned earlier. Suppose the U.S. government stance between now and January 8<sup>th</sup> is primarily restricted to calling for free and fair elections without specifying what that means, since I think very few Pakistanis, and probably very few outsiders anticipate that these elections are going to be free and fair.

Where does that leave us on the 9<sup>th</sup> of January if they have some sort of electoral process? If on election day itself at least superficially they're reasonably free, are we locking ourselves into supporting the government which, in fact, will have very little legitimacy and very little credibility? If that's a possibility, should we be doing something beyond simply calling for free and fair elections? Perhaps more specificity in what we mean by that, including maybe the restoration of the fired judges. I don't know exactly what we should be doing, but I'm worried that simply calling for free and fair elections – end of story – is probably not going to be sufficient.

MR. KORB: What about aid? Would you condition any of the aid on that, assuming that Congress gets around to dealing with it?

MR. HATHAWAY: Condition aid on what, Larry? On free and fair elections?

MR. KORB: On the judiciary.

MR. HATHAWAY: Yes. I think it would be very helpful. As I said, I don't know – because of a timing disconnect, I don't think the Congress is likely to be able to move quickly enough between now and the end of the year, but the president certainly has the ability to say, to hint – I don't think threaten is perhaps the right tone – but suggest that the U.S. taxpayers' willingness to continue to give Pakistan huge sums of money will certainly be influenced by their perception – the taxpayers' perception of what happens between now and January 8<sup>th</sup>.

MR. KORB: Bob. Bob, number two.

MR. GRENIER: I'm going to strike a somewhat contrarian tone here. I would tend to disagree with Senator Daschle on this. Now, make no mistake, I think that the ultimate restoration of the judiciary is important and that the broad principle of an independent judiciary is absolutely critical for the democratic future of Pakistan and everything that in turn rides with that.

But I think that we would be far wiser to do this in stages. I'm pleased that General Musharraf has at least announced a lifting of the state of emergency and that what we hope will be free and fair elections will go forward. I think that the past votes have been clearly manipulated. I think that the ISI has been employed in – (unintelligible) – in order to do that. I don't think that it would be possible to do that under the current circumstances where General Musharraf is no longer the chief of army staff, so I am more hopeful than some perhaps that the elections will be – more closely approximate fully free and fair elections than certainly they have in the past.

I think that it's going to be important, in order to bring about the ultimate restoration of the judicial independence, that we have a popularly elected parliament and prime minister. I think that after the passage of a certain amount of time, where the military feels comfortable with a responsible prime minister in a way that it clearly will not be at the outset – remember, there's a lot of history here and I think that there's legitimate concerns within the military and elsewhere about the effectiveness and the honesty of Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif and other political leaders.

I think that if we allow the process to go forward, and that if a certain amount of trust is built up between the military and a new civilian leadership, I think it may be possible in the future to take effective action at restoring an independent judiciary. I think that if we hold out and demand everything all at once and condition both a – particularly U.S. aid and support and U.S. influence in support of elections to an initial restoration of the judiciary, (a), I don't think that it's going to happen. I think that it will be a case of the perfect is the enemy of the good.

MR. KORB: All right. I think you got to move up here.

Q: (Off mike.) Just really quickly – (off mike) – regarding Musharraf's perception that – (off mike) – in part his perception that – (off mike) – accurate or inaccurate?

MR. : Was accurate.

Q: Accurate, okay.

Q: Viola Gienger from Bloomberg News. Regarding the question of an independent judiciary and demanding restoration of the Supreme Court, wouldn't that totally turn things upside down at this point because not only would you be faced with trying to elect a new prime minister, a parliament, in January, but we'd also be faced with trying to replace – potentially trying to replace a president. And isn't that probably the logic behind not calling for total restoration of the previous judges and judiciary? That's one question.

And Bob Hathaway also mentioned that General Kayani may be needing to make a decision in the coming months on whether to distance himself from Musharraf, and if he were to decide to do that, what form would that take?

SEN. DASCHLE: I don't completely disagree at all with what Bob Grenier said with regard to how this ought to play itself out. There's a spectrum, of course, of options that one has available – that the U.S. has available. I suspect right now, we haven't even said privately to Musharraf that he'd better do something to start rebuilding, restoring the credibility and standing of the Supreme Court. It may be too much to ask that in a month's time he would somehow restore everything the way it was September, early October.

That may be an impossibility, especially if we say we're going to withdraw all aid – whether or not we do – in that period of time, but there are gradations. There is a way to step up the pressure and to make it more a visible goal and to try to make sure that Musharraf understands we do not support these actions. And then ultimately, whether it's now or two months from now or three months from now, the government needs to reestablish the credibility, the standing, the independence, the integrity of the Supreme Court. That's what I think has to be done.

MR. HATHAWAY: Let me just jump in on a slightly different subject prompted by Senator Daschle's phrase "all aid." I'm not aware of anybody – and I'm not suggesting you were thinking this – who would like to suspend, withdraw, or even place conditions on all U.S. assistance. To the contrary, I think there's a widespread consensus, and one that I endorse, that it's terribly important for the United States to send a message to the Pakistani people, to Pakistan, that you can count on us in the long run and particularly on that portion of U.S. assistance which goes to meet basic human needs, healthcare, education, et cetera, et cetera. Moreover, I think it would probably be shooting ourselves in the foot for us to disrupt aid which could be directly linked to counterterrorism operations.

Now, the catch, of course, is that the administration for the last six years has described all of its assistance as related to counterterrorism. I don't think that's particularly credible. I think there are large portions of the U.S. aid package which might well be taken another look at. Certainly, I think it's entirely proper, and I hope Congress will move forward on this at a minimum, to demand far more accountability, far more transparency on large transfers of cash, which they just dump in the lap of the Pakistani military.

Yes, it might be inconvenient to reconstitute the fired judges, but we've been following for a long time the convenient path by not speaking out, by not voicing our reservations, our concerns, by going along, by not raising the contentious issues because it might get in the way of our principal objective of counterterrorism. And at some point – it's always easy to argue that we need to follow a convenient path – because certain problems are too urgent, we have to put everything else on the backburner. But at some point you've got to raise these other issues.

MR. : (Off mike.)

MR. GRENIER: Yes, I would very much agree with Bob Hathaway in that it's very important that we be seen by Pakistan in general, and particularly by the Pakistani military, as being committed to a long-term strategic partnership with them. That doesn't mean that all elements of our aid program should be completely unconditional – not at all. I think that, as Senator Daschle has said, we should be willing to – at least selectively be willing to withhold some elements of that aid, particularly when we're talking about large scale aid and large weapons programs – that sort of the thing – to the military.

If and when we decide that we cannot fully support and subscribe to destructive policies that are being pursued – and I suspect there will be points in the future when that happens, as it has in the past – then I think we do need to be willing to withhold elements of our aid package, but I think that we should not do it precipitously. We should make it clear that we're doing it more in sorrow than in anger.

I think that in past it has been very clear to Pakistanis that we've only been willing to partner with them and to give them substantial aid when it suited our tactical interests at the time. Obviously, we had a strategic partnership with them during the days of the anti-Soviet jihad and that all disappeared as soon as the Soviets left. We have found excuses not to sanction Pakistan under the Pressler Amendment, and suddenly when the excuses disappeared, so did our aid.

I think that was enormously disruptive. My personal view is that it was highly unrealistic because the Pakistanis had what they felt was a strong and compelling national interest in matching the nuclear capabilities of India. I don't think there was any way that we were going to roll that back, certainly not dealing with Pakistan in isolation. So I think that that is a textbook case of what we should avoid doing in the future.

MR. : (Off mike) – and you know General Kayani – (unintelligible). Could you refresh my memory?

Q: Thank you. Yes, I was just wondering if General Kayani does decide in the coming months to somehow distance himself from Musharraf, what form might that take?

MR. HATHAWAY: Yes, well, I think that probably the strongest, perhaps most extreme form that it could take would be tacit military support for an effort, once we had gone through several stages, to bring about a reinstatement of the judiciary. And I think that if the military came in strongly behind a civilian prime minister, then it would be very, very difficult for General Musharraf, whose power and influence in the presidency I think will inevitably erode over time, to resist that.

And reinstatement of the judiciary in effect would mean the end of Musharraf as president of Pakistan. I think to restore the judiciary will bring about that and I think it would probably be a good thing. But it's not going to happen until there is a great deal more confidence than exists right now between the army and a future civilian prime minister.

Q: Good morning. I'm Patricia (Wrightson ?) from the National Academies and I just want to reiterate that these comments in no way reflect the National Academies'. I want to underscore something that Bob Hathaway said quite a while ago, although I'm going to say it in a somewhat different way, which is if there is one thing that almost all Pakistani's agree with, it is a deep distrust, if not outright antipathy, of the United States. And therefore, we seem to have united them on at least one thing.

My concern and many, although certainly not all, of the comments today is there's an assumption that American policy can actually achieve something right now in Pakistan, and my concern is that we have gotten Pakistan so wrong for so long – and I mean this in a completely bipartisan way – that in fact, we have nearly tied our own hands terribly in how much influence we can have.

So I guess I want to ask you, if you had your druthers – I guess first, if you think that is completely off the wall, I'd like to know. But if you think that in fact the sad truth is that by and large we have tied our own hands in terms of what we can effect in Pakistan, what is really the best way for us to go? To make any demands now on anything actually I think prevents us from achieving our larger goals, which is for one thing a safe and secure Pakistan, and one that is ultimately, if not immediately, democratic. It's an incredibly lively culture there and the truth is, they're probably going to take care of a lot of this themselves. What can we do to let that happen?

SEN. DASCHLE: I guess I would start by saying that I don't think we ought to take all the credit or all the blame for everything that's happened in Pakistan, and I don't – you're not suggesting that, but I think one could infer that. I think the problem, by not doing anything, is simply that the stakes are too high there. I mean, the stakes in the region are too for us simply to remain totally quiet. I think our inaction or our complete uninvolvedness would make a statement, too. There is – involvement has certain implications, but non-involvement and non-intervention –

Q: (Off mike.)

MR. KORB (?): Okay. We'll get to it. We've got your question now, okay?

MR. : We spent the better part of an hour talking a lot of things that we should do, and I follow – again, I would say the things that we should do are the things that we've been talking about, which is to call for fair and free elections, to call for transparency, to call for institutional restoration, to say that we're neutral in the election process. Those are all things that – you know, there may be a lot of disagreement in the room about the propriety of doing those things, but that's – if I had any influence in this process, that would be what I would recommend. That's basically what NDI has suggested that the international community do, but obviously it's open to disagreement.

MR. HATHAWAY: Obviously, I didn't make myself clear in my opening remarks because I tried at the very end to suggest our influence in Pakistan is in fact quite limited and we should be very modest as to what we think we can do.

Nonetheless, notwithstanding the polls suggesting we are extremely unpopular – and I should add that that unpopularity stems in part, but only in part, from the actions of the Bush administration. The seeds of that unpopularity certainly predate the inauguration of this particular administration. But nonetheless, there’s a terrific – I believe, and every time I go to Pakistan, I’m reinforced in this belief that there’s a great reservoir of good will toward the United States.

This is, after all, where many Pakistanis send their children to school. This is where many Pakistanis choose to relocate if they leave the country. And we should not sell that short. I think many Pakistanis feel betrayed by the United States, partly for reasons that Bob has suggested having to do with the Pressler Amendment and other types of things, but I think also and perhaps more importantly in the current context, because they feel that we have not supported our own values and our ideals.

We have not been a force for democracy in Pakistan. We have not supported our natural allies in Pakistan: the activists, the human rights workers, civil society. Senator Daschle’s exactly right: our influence is so great around the world, including in Pakistan, that inaction is not an option. If we are silent, that is clearly read to indicate an American preference just as much as if we scream from the rooftops.

So I’m entirely sympathetic to what I believe the questioner meant when she suggested that at the end of the day the Pakistanis have to solve their problems for themselves – absolutely right. We cannot do it. But I think we have no choice but also to let it be known what our position is, and particularly I think we need to support not personalities, not individuals, but a process. And the shorthand for that process is genuinely free elections.

MR. KORB: Okay.

Q: My question is probably answered.

MR. KORB: Wait for the microphone to come to you, sir. And if you think it’s been answered and you want to waive the mike, that’ll be okay too.

Q: I’m Al (Richland?), former State Department – (inaudible) – analysis. I wanted to ask Mr. Grenier about – well, Pakistan – you know, a very large survey by Pew came out, one of the lowest – one of the worst attitudes towards the U.S. and most permissive for Iran to have nuclear weapons. I wonder whether Mr. Grenier could also answer the question, how did – and it’s been not just emergency rule. As you’ve mentioned, it’s been for several years we’re at the bottom of – (unintelligible) – among the Muslim countries in their attitude towards us.

MR. GRENIER: I certainly agree with the situation as you described and I’m not sure I understand your question.

MR. KORB: I guess he would like to know what’s the reason for it?

MR. GRENIER: Oh, the reason for it? Well, I think there are a number of reasons which, I think, probably vary depending on what county you're specifically talking about, but very broadly, I think that because of the pervasive influence which the United States seems to have throughout the world, the U.S. tends to be blamed for the unfortunate circumstances in which people see themselves. And in the broad Muslim community, they tended to see what I refer to as the war on terrorism as a war on Muslims. They see Muslim populations around the world which are – (unintelligible) – to see as being oppressed either by the West or powers supported by the West, very much to include some of the repressive governments and in the Muslim world themselves.

This is something which al Qaeda has very cleverly played upon. They have seized on the U.S. as the enemy of all the Muslims because that is one common denominator that resonates very much among Muslims, whether they're concerned with the situation in Kashmir, whether they're concerned with the situation in Palestine, Bosnia, Chechnya, or much more broadly with what they see as the U.S. support for repressive governments, whether we're talking about Jordan or Saudi Arabia or any one of others.

Now they tend to misperceive the extent of U.S. support. They tend to believe that were it not for U.S. support, those regimes would collapse, which I don't think is true. But nonetheless, this conspiratorial view of U.S. influence in the world plays very negatively against us and our interests.

MR. KORB: We have time for one final question.

Q: I'm Diane (Reddick?) with Congressional Research Service. If the U.S. has such a bad reputation, who are the other players? Who are the other state actors that maybe we could conduct diplomacy by proxy or rely on as allies? Who else can step up?

MR. KORB: Any suggestions?

MR. HATHAWAY: Well, clearly, Pakistan's best friend internationally for decades has been China. I'm not convinced that China is going to be a strong force on behalf of democracy or free and fair elections, but China clearly does have an influence in Pakistan. China is also very concerned about the general direction that Pakistan has taken in recent years. Chinese nationals have themselves been killed – attacked and been killed, particularly in Baluchistan. China is worried that Muslim extremists from Pakistan, from Afghanistan, from Southwest Asia, are going back into China's own Muslim areas and creating problems there. So, though China certainly would not articulate a message exactly like we would, it makes sense for us to talk more with the Chinese about these kinds of issues.

SEN. DASCHLE: I agree with Bob. I think they're going to continue to have an influence on the region. It'll probably grow, so why not make the effort at least to try to find common ground and some sort of an agenda having to do with Pakistan? It may not be precisely as we would have it, but there's a lot more to be gained than lost in making that effort.

MR. GRENIER: I really don't know more than – I think Pakistan also cares to some extent about world opinion, particularly in – among other things, they were – (unintelligible) – because the Commonwealth had once again suspended their membership. So despite the bravado – (unintelligible) – they do care what the outside world thinks about Pakistan. And they – other Commonwealth members, perhaps not white European members, but other members of the Commonwealth are also potential interlocutors here.

MR. KORB: Any concluding comments, things we've missed or messages you'd like to leave us with?

Hearing none, please join me in thanking our panel very, very much here.

(Applause.)

And also I would like to thank, as Senator Daschle mentioned, Caroline Wadhams for putting this together. You'll see a report that she and I just co-authored out there that has some discussion of Pakistan, and also thank Suzi Emmerling and Marlene Vasilic for helping arrange this. Thank you very much.

(END)