



Dedicated to Democratic Ideals, a progressive and politically stable Pakistan, and strong US-Pakistan relations.

www.induspk.org

INDUS Meets With Pakistani Academic Partners in Islamabad



INDUS – Mobilizing People’s Power met with senior members of key Pakistani academic institutions and think tanks in January. During a series of meetings in Islamabad organized by Nasir Hafeez, Policy Analyst & Associate of INDUS in Islamabad, Shezad Habib, Chairman INDUS Board of Trustees, and Amber Jamil, INDUS Director of Communications and Outreach, explored opportunities for collaboration with **National Defense University (NDU)**; **Institute for Strategic Studies Research and Analysis (ISSRA)**; **National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)**; **Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)**; and **Centre for Pakistan and Gulf Studies (CPGS)**.

Participants identified the need for broadening policy dialogue in US-Pakistan relations through

increased visibility for scholars from Pakistan's academic community. Institutional partners identified a pipeline of scholars and doctoral and policy publications in need of a platform to increase diversity and policy innovation. INDUS noted its policy events, publications, exchange program, and Peer to Peer Dialogues as possible mechanisms for promoting greater academic vigor and policy dialogue and agreed to reconvene discussions in the near future.

American aid cuts to Pakistan won't change its policy toward terrorism

[Michael Kugelman](#)

On Thursday, the State Department [announced](#) a freeze on most of Washington's security aid to Pakistan. The decision won't torpedo the U.S.-Pakistan relationship, as a rupture in relations would more likely result from a more drastic measure, such as designating Pakistan as a state sponsor of terror.

Still, a fragile partnership already on tenterhooks will now grow ever more tenuous, especially because cutting aid to the Pakistanis is unlikely to compel them to crack down on the terrorists that target American troops in Afghanistan. In other words, Pakistan won't do what America wants it to do. That's because Pakistan's links to the Afghan Taliban and Haqqani network, groups based in Pakistan that stage attacks in Afghanistan, serve longstanding national interests that are all but immutable.

Consider that these groups push back against the presence of Pakistan's archenemy, India, in Afghanistan. The Taliban and Haqqani network may be fighting Afghan and American troops, but they're also virulently anti-Indian and have attacked Indian targets in Afghanistan. Pakistan views India as an existential threat, and as the less powerful of the two, it must rely on asymmetric means to push back against India. Using non-state militant actors against its fearsome foe serves that purpose.

Additionally, Pakistan rightly believes U.S. forces will eventually leave Afghanistan. Amid the large-scale destabilization, including civil war, that may ensue, Pakistan wants to ensure it retains influence with and ties to the Taliban, arguably the most powerful non-state actor in Afghanistan. So the very terrorists that America wants Pakistan to eliminate are embraced by Pakistan as assets to be deployed against India, and as hedges against an eventual U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan.

For Pakistan, ties to terrorists amount to a strategic imperative. Being deprived of aid, even hundreds of millions of dollars of it, won't change this calculus. It's not as if the aid suspension will deliver a devastating blow to Pakistan. It can compensate by tapping into its deep security partnerships with Saudi Arabia and China. Pakistan [weathered](#) previous U.S. aid suspensions, and this time around should be no different.

It's hard to say what can be done to change Pakistan's policy toward terrorists. The Trump administration has [suggested](#) it may resort to punitive actions that go beyond aid cuts. The implication is that draconian measures could eventually bring Pakistan to its knees and cause it to capitulate to U.S. demands.

These tough steps may include expanding drone strikes, revoking Pakistan's non-NATO ally status, sanctioning Pakistani military officers with ties to terror, and designating Pakistan as a sponsor of terror. They could also entail non-security punitive measures such as getting the

International Monetary Fund, where Washington enjoys strong influence, to stop providing lifelines, in the form of loans and bailout packages, to Pakistan's fragile economy.

Yet, if provoked by these draconian policies, an outraged Pakistan may be inclined to tighten rather than ease its embrace of militants. It could help the Taliban and Haqqani Network intensify violence in Afghanistan. Indeed, for Washington, taking a harder line on Pakistan is risky business and could exacerbate the already-immense challenges of its warfighting efforts in Afghanistan.

Pakistan may contend it would be more willing to address U.S. concerns about terror if America helped advance Pakistan's interests, such as by actively pursuing a solution to the Kashmir dispute, or by cutting back on its rapidly growing ties with India. In reality, because of its own interests, these are non-starters for Washington.

But this all amounts to putting the cart before the horse. For now, the Trump administration has restricted itself to suspending security assistance. In the coming days, expect angry [statements](#) from the Pakistani government, but perhaps not much else. Some analysts have [suggested](#) Pakistan may retaliate by shutting down the supply routes on its soil used by NATO vehicles to access Afghanistan. That is certainly possible.

However, Pakistan may also opt to hold its fire, preferring to keep its prime tool of leverage in reserve as a deterrent to forestall the possibility of Washington resorting to more draconian moves. For now, Pakistan may instead retaliate with softer measures, such as issuing fewer visas to Americans.

There are lessons in all of this, and particularly for members of Congress, including most recently Sen. [Rand Paul](#) (R-Ky.), who plans to [introduce](#) legislation to end aid to Pakistan. Aid cuts to Pakistan can convey strong messages of unhappiness about Pakistan's policy toward terrorism, but they can't be expected to induce changes in Pakistan's behavior. In the context of U.S.-Pakistan relations, the core impacts of aid cuts are symbolic more than substantive.

So the best way to pitch a bill to Americans about ending aid to Pakistan is to emphasize the benefit not for U.S. foreign policy, but for the U.S. economy: It puts money back in the hands of the American taxpayer.

Michael Kugelman is the deputy director of the Asia Program and senior associate for South Asia at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC. He is a member of the INDUS Academic Council. He can be reached at michael.kugelman@wilsoncenter.org and on Twitter @michaelkugelman. The article was originally published in [The Hill](#).

Pak-US Ties -- bravado is no substitute for diplomacy

Raza Rumi

**China has strong economic ties with the US as well as India.
Economics triumphs grandiose notions of power and security;
something we are yet to learn from our favorite neighbor**

Pakistan's relationship with the United States has hit a new low. Judging by the mistrust and anger on both sides, it will take considerable effort to repair it. This festering acrimony can have serious consequences. Public messaging has overtaken bilateral engagement and bravado has trumped diplomacy.

Earlier this week, Pakistan was placed on a special watch list of countries that violate religious

freedom. Heather Nauert, the US State Department spokeswoman, announced suspension of most security assistance — roughly \$1.1 billion including Coalition Support Funds — to Pakistan until Islamabad “takes decisive action” against militant groups. This suspension was in addition to the \$255 million in military aid already withheld by the US. In any case, security aid to Pakistan has been dwindling. It has fallen from \$1.6 billion in 2003, to \$319.7 million by 2017.

President Donald Trump’s tweet on January 1 sparked an array of furious reactions in Pakistan while in American policy circles the old trope of Pakistan’s perfidy returned with a vengeance. For Pakistan’s establishment to think that its support for Afghan Taliban will somehow be overshadowed by selective counterterrorism measures is ‘self deception’ in the words of former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. And for the US officials and experts there is little introspection as to what went wrong in Afghanistan beyond Pakistan’s ‘deception’. In an asymmetric relationship, the more powerful sets the narrative. The American view is therefore global barring exceptions like China.

President Trump had already indicated what was coming in his August 2017 speech. Did Pakistan’s military headquarters, the foreign office and the cabinet prepare themselves for this rupture?

The foreign minister and the military spokesperson in Pakistan have reacted with misplaced aggression. The minister has even declared perhaps a little too early that the alliance is over. The military has reiterated that Pakistan’s army is a capable force even without US assistance. Other than placating the domestic constituencies where anti-Americanism has been a long standing trend, this was also broader global public messaging. Foreign policy seems in this day and age to have become a collation of whimsical tweets, press conferences and hard-hitting public statements.

But there is more to Pakistan’s strong reaction than just appeasing the domestic constituencies. Unlike the previous low-points in Pak-US relations, Pakistan has some advantages this time. First, Chinese alliance is growing and deepening and the country is part, albeit small, of the Chinese long-term vision for global economic dominance. Secondly, Pakistan’s establishment knows that for logistics, the route through Pakistan is least expensive and may not be abandoned anytime soon. Thirdly, the future settlement in Afghanistan at least for now is not possible without Pakistan’s assent and close involvement. Fourthly, the US administration’s anathema to Iran helps Pakistan [secure](#) a better collaboration in the future.

Fifthly, Russia has already emerged as a defence partner and its interest in what happens in Afghanistan is at variance with the US. Pakistan views itself as part of the future Sino-Russian axis emerging as a counter-weight to US-India strategic alliance in Asia. Lastly, President Trump’s interest in foreign wars, which he vociferously shunned during his electoral campaign, is driven more by the national security apparatus than his conviction. And the assessment that informed Pakistan’s strategic circles — and continues to do so — was that sooner or later, the US will disengage from Afghanistan.

However, if the relationship nosedives further and the US choose to use alternative supply [routes](#) as it did after the Salala incident, then we have a wholly different scenario ahead. The Indo-US duo on eastern and western borders will enable the worst of conspiracy theories come true. In that case will China come in aid of Pakistan? To the extent of securing its investments and reducing the tensions, China will play a role but to expect the latter to directly intervene for Pakistan, as drummed into public narratives, is a miscalculation at best. China has strong economic ties with the US as well as India. Economics triumphs grandiose notions of power and security; something we are yet to learn from our favourite neighbor.

--

Raza Rumi is editor, Daily Times. He can be reached at razarumi@gmail.com and tweets [@razarumi](https://twitter.com/razarumi). The article was originally published in [Daily Times](#).



Follow **INDUS** on Twitter

OUR FOCUS

Youth Leadership Development

Creating campus-based, strictly nonpolitical Student Government Associations that offer Executive, Legislative & Judiciary functions experience within the campus environment. Elected student representatives, as Members of Parliament, Senators and judges manage all aspects of student affairs, in conjunction with campus administration.

Pakistan Civil Liberties Union

Civil liberties are personal guarantees and freedoms that the government cannot abridge, either by law or by judicial interpretation. However in today's Pakistan, rising violence, intolerance, weak rule of law, endemic corruption, lack of social and economic justice, and religious freedom, social exclusion of the vulnerable and the marginalized are a common phenomenon that the people of Pakistan face on a daily basis. Pakistan Civil Liberties Union – PCLU is a watchdog organization intended to combat all the above issues at every cross section of our society.

Community Integration & Civic Promotion

When successful, the processes of community integration and civic promotion begin with the individual and, alongside support from Federal, State, and municipal programs, advance collectively, often through socialization with informal groups and professional and cultural associations. However, due to regional, organizational, and programmatic differences, the catalytic potential of civil society organizations is underutilized. Partnerships with local, regional, and national civil society organizations will advance community integration, promote the concept of citizenship, and highlight pathways to achieve the "American Dream."

Policy Research – As It Happens

Campus-based political and social sciences research. Graduate Student and Faculty focusing on policy issues for possible social, cultural, and political reform, followed by advocacy action and awareness creation by the same researchers for the purposes of legislative reform as appropriate.

Cultivating Early Awareness

Aimed at increasing youngsters' awareness of rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and building a national bond at a very impressionable age, leading to real benefits to the nation in evolving future leadership.

MEDIA REVIEW

Pakistan US diplomats clash in UNSC meeting over Afghanistan

US Deputy Secretary of State John Sullivan said the US cannot work with Pakistan if it continues to give sanctuary to terrorist organizations. Pakistan Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi said the safe havens are inside Afghanistan. Sullivan said a political solution must be sought in Afghanistan, but the Taliban have not come to the negotiating table. [[The Nation](#)]

The Devastating Paradox of Pakistan

Mark Mazzetti

The NYT reporter and author reviews Steve Coll's "Directorate S," Coll's follow up to his 2004 Pulitzer Prize winner "Ghost Wars," and says that the stakes in Pakistan have been considered too high to break ties with Islamabad or take other steps that would risk destabilizing the country. Coll sums up the war as a "humbling case study in the limits of American power." [[The Atlantic](#)]

Resolve Palestine, Kashmir issues or risk losing credibility: Maleeha

Pakistan Ambassador to the UN Maleeha Lodhi said people would lose faith in the world body if it did not implement its resolutions on Kashmir and Palestine, saying, "When principles are trumped by self-serving interests, rationality and reason are invariably supplanted by threat and intimidation." [[Express Tribune](#)]

India & Israel: A marriage made in Heaven?

Irfan Husain

Senate Chairman Raza Rabbani, speaking recently in Tehran about Israeli Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu's four-day visit to India, "warned the Muslim world about the emerging nexus between the United States, Israel and India is a major threat to the ummah." The author also includes Saudi Arabia in the group and writes that faith in Pakistan's close links with Saudi Arabia need to be rethought: "The kingdom's openly pro-Israel, pro-US position will bring it closer to India. In Pakistani planners' zero-sum game...this would be a disaster." He argues that the sooner Pakistan forms a sane foreign policy – "we have created our own isolation through rigid, unimaginative policies that are out of touch with the real world" – the better off the country will be. [[Dawn](#)]

India: Smoldering Fires in Balochistan

Tushar Ranjan Mohanty

After a detailed account of violence in Balochistan, the author asserts that, "Continued extra-judicial killings by the Pakistani security establishment has made Baloch insurgent groups more violent towards non-Baloch people in the Province, with the result that a series of attacks have targeted Punjabi and other non-Baloch settlers in Balochistan." And, while terrorism-related violence in Balochistan has dropped to a seven-year low, ethnic Baloch discontent toward the Federal Government continues to rise because "the dynamics that propelled it are well in place and is increasingly compounded by the activities of Islamist and sectarian extremist formations," long active in the North and progressively prevalent in southern areas as well. [[Eurasia Review](#)]

We Can't Win in Afghanistan Because We Don't Know Why We're There

Steve Coll

America's contradictory and illusory war aims in Afghanistan are exploited by Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence. President Trump is the first to begin applying serious pressure on Pakistan, but the strategy is unlikely to work because, "to keep Pakistan stable and its nuclear arms under control, there is a limit to how much pressure can be brought to bear on the country. [...] There are alternatives to accepting the status quo. If sanctions against the ISI or Pakistan's military were combined with serious diplomacy to engage China...as well as other regional powers, there might be a path to improvement," which includes a political settlement and a decision to "work closely with allies, prioritize high-level diplomacy, be smart in pressuring the ISI and accept that in Afghanistan, a starting point for any international policy is humility." [[New York Times](#)]

Khamenei's ruling unlikely to loosen IRGC's grip on Iran's economy

Ahmad Majidiyar

Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei's order that the country's powerful Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC) curtail its growing business empire and divest commercial assets is only a symbolic gesture to placate domestic anger and international pressure. "The IRGC has only expanded its economic activities in Iran as well as in neighboring countries in the last year," because Tehran expects additional US sanctions, and possibly the reinstatement of nuclear sanctions, and is therefore "taking preemptive measures to minimize the impact of US sanctions that are increasingly targeting the IRGC and its affiliation institutions. But no real and significant transfer of IRGC investment holdings to the private sector is likely to happen – at least anytime soon." [[Middle East Institute](#)]

How do you handle life challenges?

Abdul Qadir Jilani

When tried, a servant of God first seeks resolution in his own self, he does not turn towards the people; and so long as he finds a resolution in the people, he does not turn towards the Creator. When he turns toward God, "God the Great and Mighty tires him out in his prayer and does not accept it until he is completely disappointed in all the means of the world... At this stage he sees nothing but the work of God, the Great and Mighty, and becomes, of necessity, a believer in the unity of God (Tawhid). [...] To Him he listens and from Him he learns and then for all the blessings he offers thanks and praise and turns to prayer." [[IslamiCity](#)]

The One Per Center Next Door

A new analysis of how the world's wealth is distributed that counts household assets instead of income reveals that, if one had \$71,560 in wealth, they would be in the top 10% of the world. "Some of those railing against the global elite probably do not know that they belong to it." [[The Economist](#)]



Registration and tax-deductible donations can be made through our website: www.induspk.org

Copyright © 2018 INDUS - Mobilizing People's Power, All rights reserved.

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

MailChimp