

TERROR STRIKES MUMBAI: THE WORLD REACTS

**GLOBAL MEDIA RESPONSES TO
THE MUMBAI BLASTS:
EDITORIALS, OP-EDS, COMMENTARIES, AND
ARTICLES IN LEADING NEWSPAPERS
(AS ON DECEMBER 4, 2008)**



**COMPILED BY
S. SAMUEL C. RAJIV, RESEARCHER,
INSTITUTE FOR DEFENCE STUDIES AND ANALYSES,
1, DEVELOPMENT ENCLAVE, RAO TULA RAM MARG, NEW DELHI – 110010**

CONTENTS

GLOBAL MEDIA REACTION TO THE MUMBAI ATTACKS: 3-7
AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Arvind Gupta,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair, IDSA

I	United States	<i>A. The New York Times</i> <i>B. Washington Post</i>	8-30
II	Europe	<i>A. International Herald Tribune</i> <i>B. Der Spiegel</i> <i>C. The Economist</i> <i>D. The Guardian</i> <i>E. Russian Foreign Ministry Press Release</i>	31-54
III	West Asia	<i>A. The Jerusalem Post</i> <i>B. Haaretz</i> <i>C. Tehran Times</i>	55-73
IV	South Asia	<i>A. Dawn</i> <i>B. Daily Times</i> <i>C. Daily Star</i> <i>D. Nepalnews</i>	74-96
V	East Asia and Australia	<i>A. The Asahi Shimbun</i> <i>B. South China Morning Post</i> <i>C. China Daily</i> <i>D. Peoples Daily</i> <i>E. Bernama</i> <i>E. Sydney Morning Herald</i>	97-112

GLOBAL MEDIA REACTION TO THE MUMBAI TERRORIST ATTACKS: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Arvind Gupta

OVERVIEW

The Mumbai terrorist attack (November 26-29, 2008) has triggered media reaction across the world. The enclosed sample of 58 articles from newspapers in the US, Europe, West Asia, Pakistan, China, Japan and Australia bring out a number of interesting points about how the world views the Mumbai attacks. The reaction varies from region to region depending upon the vantage points of the editors and commentators.

The key themes discussed in the various articles can be summarized as follows.

What should India do?

The global sympathy is undoubtedly with India. However, most articles advise restraint on the part of India and call on New Delhi not to over-react as the US did in the past. Many commentators point out that India should avoid making the mistake which the US committed after 9/11. Washington lost global sympathy gained in the aftermath of the attack, when it launched the war on terror and used the military option. There is considerable concern in the writings over the possibility of deterioration in India-Pakistan relations. They note the damage escalating tensions between the two nuclear-armed neighbours will do to the US war on terrorism and the prospects of stability in Afghanistan. The commentators call on India to cooperate with Pakistan in dealing with the terrorist menace.

India-Pakistan Tensions

The majority of articles express concern at the possibility of a military conflict between India and Pakistan. Some articles caution that India's economy will be affected if it goes to war with Pakistan.

Who did it?

The Western media thinks that it was the LeT who did it. They are skeptical about Al-Qaeda's direct role. There is also skepticism about the involvement of the Pakistan establishment but a few articles do acknowledge that the "rogue elements" in the Pakistan establishment were encouraging the militants.

What was the Motive?

Several motives are mentioned. These include:

- To derail the India-Pakistan peace process and to provoke an India-Pakistan military conflict as this would eventually benefit the militant groups.
- To signal to the US that Pakistan would withdraw its army (and support to US “war on terror”) from the tribal areas unless the US refrains from attacking Pakistan’s tribal areas.
- To show who is in command in Pakistan – military or the civilian government?
- To cut down India to size as its political, economic and military influence has been growing.

Internal Problems in India

Some articles, though a minority, point to the internal problems in India as responsible for the attacks. These problems mentioned include rising communal tensions, the status of Muslims, and the rise of right-wing Hindu militancy. They link the attacks to these problems rather than with the Al-Qaeda.

COUNTRY-WISE ANALYSIS

The main points, region-wise, made in different media articles are as follows:

United States

- LeT is responsible for the attacks but there is no evidence that the Pakistan government has a hand in the planning of these attacks.
- It is not yet clear that Al - Qaeda is involved in the attacks.
- In the aftermath of the attacks, new tensions will arise between India and Pakistan.
- The most urgent task for the incoming administration under President Obama will be to urge the Indians and Pakistanis to step back from the brink.
- What can Obama do? He should help India and Pakistan resolve the Kashmir issue. He should convince the Indians that war with Pakistan is not an option as the Indian economy is faltering and India cannot turn into a ‘hard’ State without undermining its secular, multicultural democracy.
- The ordinary people in Pakistan should show courage and demonstrate against the attackers.
- Some articles link the attack to Hindu-Muslim tensions, Godhra and Babri Masjid.

- Amitav Ghose, writing in New York Times, asserts that troop build-up by India will serve no point. India should react dispassionately but with a determined resolve.
- Some commentators felt that Zardari's position is weak. He has little control over the military and the militants. The incoming US administration should provide financial aid to Pakistan but through multilateral organizations and NGOs.
- The attacks have put a focus on the links between the Pakistan military and the Lashkar

Europe

- Mumbai attacks raise a question whether the world is witnessing an indiscriminate war between civilizations.
- There is great concern in the world today that India may retaliate against Pakistan even though there is no conclusive proof of official Pakistani responsibility.
- While India is pointing a finger towards Pakistan, the fact is that it is the "unhealed wound of Kashmir" that is spreading its "gangrenous grievance" yet again.
- India faces the danger of becoming a "war zone" with constant bombings and terrorist outrages, some of them traceable to Pakistan.
- The danger is that spectacular incidents like the Mumbai attack can trigger an over-reaction that will create even more terrorists. Hopefully, India, unlike the US, will prove the "wiser".
- Dealing with the growing tension between India and Pakistan will be the first foreign policy test for Obama.
- India has become the most important target of the international Jihad. However, India has to realize that a fight against cross-border terrorism can only be won with Pakistan's assistance. The Pakistani government has indicated that unlike in the past, it wishes to cooperate this time. If India does not act with a cool head now, it will only endanger its identity as a multi-ethnic and multi-religious state.
- The attacks were not about global jihad - its roots are far closer to home (some articles)
- India has in the past, routinely blamed the attacks on foreigners. However, India should look at itself. Muslims in India feel marginalized. They are pushed to the fringes of society. If Al Qaida manages to exploit the marginalization of the Muslims, the implications for global struggle against terrorism would be catastrophic (some articles).

Israel

- The commentaries focused mostly on the Chabad House operations and the death of Israeli citizens.
- The Indian security forces were not professional. The loss of life could have been avoided.
- Some newspapers like *Haaretz* cautioned the Israeli media not to be over-critical of India and instead learn from the Indian handling of the operations in which hundreds of people were rescued from several hotels.

Iran

- The Iranian Mazlis speaker Ali Larijani cautioned India and Pakistan not to “stumble into the trap” of countries which seek adventure in the region.
- The terrorist attacks in Mumbai will have serious repercussions for NATO efforts to stabilize Afghanistan and defeat the Taliban. The attacks will delay a quick launch of a regional initiative towards Afghanistan. There is a possibility of a full-blown proxy war between the two countries.
- The Iranian media gave a factual account of the attacks.

Pakistan

- Most sections of society within Pakistan are in a state of denial regarding the allegations made by the Indian authorities as they do not accept even a remote possibility of any connection between Pakistan and the terrorist attacks.
- The attack could be a tactic to divert attention from the real war going on in the tribal areas between the terrorists and the Pakistani army.
- Indians are always in a haste to blame Pakistan even when subsequent investigations by Indian authorities found the culprits were from their own fold.
- The evidence produced by the Indian media within hours is flimsy.
- India and Pakistan should cooperate with each other in fighting terrorism.
- India should realize that a dysfunctional and dismembered Pakistan would afford serious security concern for India.
- The PPP government has become isolated in the wake of the Mumbai attack.
- If Pakistan mobilizes in response to Indian mobilization, the Western border will be totally exposed. This will embolden the militants.

- Indian deployment could provoke American attacks from Afghanistan against “the non-state actors.” The PPP government should continue with its policy of cooperation with India.
- The media in India is being reckless and jingoistic.
- The PPP has warned India against attacking Pakistan and assured that it will fight along with the armed forces.
- India needs to face the reality of home-grown radicalism and realize the futility of blaming Pakistan.
- Al Qaida and LeT do not appear to be directly involved but there could be some radical outfits that are inspired by these groups.
- Both India and Pakistan must stop their proxy war in Afghanistan.
- Will India use this opportunity to build the kind of broad consensus against terrorism that America failed to do?

China

- Ensuring stability is central to India’s continued development. India should show restraint to avoid communal backlash.
- There is no evidence that Al-Qaeda has anything to do with the attacks, nor does it seem likely.
- The response of the Bush administration to the 9/11 attack provides a “horrible example of the cost of over-reaction”
- For a rising economic power like India, the worst possible thing that could happen is another war.
- This is not the time to blame a person, a group or a country. The Indian leadership should ensure that they do not fall prey to the “marauding band of jingoists.”
- The attacks are another blow to PM Manmohan Singh’s government, which has been under pressure due to rising inflation and the global financial crisis.

Japan

- The situation in India is becoming increasingly complex. However, at the root of the problem is religious antagonism within the country.
- India should do everything in its power to settle its problems.

Australia

- Now is the time to stand shoulder to shoulder with India.
 - Australia must show solidarity with India’s cause.
-

I. UNITED STATES

A. THE NEW YORK TIMES

1. Alan Cowell and Souad Mekhennet, "Sophisticated Attacks, but by Whom?" November 28, 2008, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/28/world/asia/28group.html?bl&ex=1228021200&en=276ae1b71db73654&ei=5087%0A>

PARIS — A day after the terror attacks in Mumbai that killed over 100 people, one question remained as impenetrable as the smoke that still billowed from two of the city's landmark hotels: who carried out the attacks?

The Indian authorities say they captured some of the attackers, so some answers may emerge soon. But for now, their identities remain a mystery. Surviving witnesses recalled the gunmen as masked young men in unremarkable T-shirts and jeans, some heavily armed, wearing backpacks filled with weapons. The only claim of responsibility came from a group that may not even exist.

The assaults represented a marked departure in scope and ambition from other recent terrorist attacks in India, which have singled out local people rather than foreigners and hit single rather than multiple targets.

The Mumbai assault, by contrast, was seemed directed at foreigners, involved hostage taking and was aimed at multiple and highly symbolic targets.

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh of India said the attacks probably had "external linkages," reflecting calculations among Indian officials that the level of planning, preparation and coordination could not have been achieved without help from experienced terrorists. But some security experts insisted the style of the attacks and the targets in Mumbai suggested the militants were likely to be Indian Muslims, with a domestic agenda.

The e-mail message taking responsibility that was sent to Indian media outlets on Wednesday night said the attackers were from a group called Deccan Mujahedeen. Deccan is a neighborhood of the Indian city of Hyderabad. The word also describes the middle and south of India, which is dominated by the Deccan Plateau. Mujahedeen is the commonly used Arabic word for holy fighters.

But security experts drew a blank on any such organization. Sajjan Gohel, a security expert in London, called it a "front name" and said the group was "nonexistent."

An Indian security official who spoke on condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to be identified said the name suggested ties to a group called Indian Mujahedeen, which has been implicated in a string of bombing attacks in India killing about 200 people this year alone.

On Sept. 15, an e-mail message published in Indian newspapers and said to have been sent by representatives of Indian Mujahedeen threatened potential “deadly attacks” in Mumbai. The message warned counterterrorism officials in the city that “you are already on our hit-list and this time very, very seriously.”

Several high-ranking law enforcement officials, including the chief of the antiterrorism squad and a commissioner of police, were, indeed, reported killed in the attacks in Mumbai.

With relations long strained between India and Pakistan, particularly over the disputed territory of Kashmir, suspicions turned toward Al Qaeda or Pakistani militants. The Indian security official said the attackers likely had ties to Lashkar-e-Taiba, a guerrilla group run by Pakistani intelligence in the conflict with India in the disputed territory of Kashmir. On Thursday, the group denied involvement in the Mumbai attacks. India also blamed Lashkar-e-Taiba for a suicide assault on its Parliament by gunmen in December 2001 that led to a perilous military standoff with Pakistan.

The Indian official also suggested the foot-soldiers in the attack might have emerged from an outlawed militant group of Islamic students. Photographs from security cameras showed some youthful attackers carrying assault rifles and smiling as they began the operation.

Christine Fair, senior political scientist and a South Asia expert at the RAND Corporation, was careful to say that the identity of the terrorists could not yet be known. But she pointed to India’s domestic problems, and long tensions between Hindus, who make up about 80 percent of India’s population of 1.13 billion, and Muslims, who make up 13.4 percent.

“There are a lot of very, very angry Muslims in India,” Ms. Fair said. “The economic disparities are startling and India has been very slow to publicly embrace its rising Muslim problem. You cannot put lipstick on this pig. This is a major domestic political challenge for India.

“The public political face of India says, ‘Our Muslims have not been radicalized,’ she said. “But the Indian intelligence apparatus knows that’s not true. India’s Muslim communities are being sucked into the global landscape of Islamist jihad.”

“Indians will have a strong incentive to link this to Al Qaeda,” she said. “But this is a domestic issue. This is not India’s 9/11.”

Alan Cowell reported from Paris, and Souad Mekhennet from Frankfurt. Mark McDonald contributed reporting from Hong Kong, and Salman Masood from Islamabad, Pakistan.

2. Mark Mazzetti and Salman Masood, “U.S. Intelligence Focuses on Pakistani Group,” *The New York Times*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/29/world/asia/29intel.html?ref=todayspaper>

WASHINGTON – American intelligence and counterterrorism officials said Friday that there was mounting evidence that a Pakistani militant group based in Kashmir, most likely Lashkar-e-Taiba, was responsible for this week’s deadly attacks in Mumbai.

The officials cautioned that they had reached no firm conclusions about who was responsible for the attacks, or how they were planned and carried out. Nevertheless, they said that evidence gathered in the past two days pointed to a role for Lashkar-e-Taiba or possibly another group based in Kashmir, Jaish-e-Muhammad, which also has a track record of attacks against India.

The officials requested anonymity in describing their current thinking and declined to discuss specifics of the intelligence that they said pointed to Kashmiri militants. In the past, the American and Indian intelligence services have used communications intercepts to tie Kashmiri militants to terrorist strikes. Indian officials may also be gleaning information from at least one captured gunman who participated in the Mumbai attacks.

According to one Indian intelligence official, during the siege the militants have been using non-Indian cellphones and receiving calls from outside the country, evidence that in part led Indian officials to speak publicly about the militants’ external ties.

Lashkar-e-Taiba denied any responsibility on Thursday for the terrorist strikes. American intelligence agencies have said that the group has received some training and logistical support in the past from Pakistan’s powerful spy service, the Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence, or I.S.I., and that Pakistan’s government has long turned a blind eye to Lashkar-e-Taiba camps in the Kashmir region, a disputed territory over which India and Pakistan have fought two wars.

Officials in Washington said Friday that there was no evidence that the Pakistani government had any role in the attacks. But if evidence were to emerge that the operation had been planned and directed from within Pakistan, that would certainly further escalate tensions between India and Pakistan, bitter, nuclear-armed rivals. It could also provoke an Indian military response, even strikes against militants' training camps...

An American counterterrorism official said there was strong evidence that Lashkar-e-Taiba had a "maritime capability" and would have been able to mount the sophisticated operation in Mumbai.

Senior Bush administration officials sought to keep the tensions from boiling over on Friday by maintaining steady contact with Indian officials. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice spoke by phone with Pranab Mukherjee, India's foreign minister, and one of Ms. Rice's deputies spoke with the Indian foreign secretary.

In what was seen as a sign of Pakistan's concern about a possible Indian response, Pakistani officials announced Friday that the head of the I.S.I. would go to India to help the Indian government with its investigation. On Friday evening, however, Pakistani officials indicated that a lower-level I.S.I. representative might make the trip.

American and Indian officials have for years blamed Lashkar-e-Taiba for a campaign of violence against high-profile targets throughout India, including the December 2001 attack on the Indian Parliament building in New Delhi and an August 2007 strike at an amusement park in Hyderabad. At times, Indian officials have also said Jaish-e-Muhammad was responsible for the attack on Parliament.

That attack prompted the Bush administration to try to freeze Lashkar-e-Taiba's assets and press Gen. Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan's president at the time, to crack down on the group's training operations in Pakistan.

A State Department report released this year called Lashkar-e-Taiba "one of the largest and most proficient of the Kashmiri-focused militant groups" ...

Recently, some of the group's operations have shifted from Kashmir to Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas and even to Afghanistan to attack American troops. ... "Afghanistan is an operating war zone, so they can get active training as the Kashmir front has slowed down a bit," said Seth Jones, a terrorism expert at the RAND Corporation.

The group is believed by experts to have at least a loose affiliation with Al Qaeda. In March 2002, a Qaeda lieutenant, Abu Zubaydah, was captured in a Lashkar-e-Taiba safe house in Faisalabad, Pakistan, according to the State Department report.

Lashkar-e-Taiba is not known to have singled out Westerners in past terrorist attacks, as the gunmen in Mumbai seem to have done. But one counterterrorism official said Friday that the group “has not pursued an exclusively Kashmiri agenda” and that it might certainly go after Westerners to advance broader goals...

3. Editorial, “The Horror in Mumbai,” *The New York Times*, November 30, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/01/opinion/01mon1.html?ref=todayspaper>

We share the horror, the pain and the disbelief that Indians are feeling as they absorb the appalling details of the terrorist attacks in Mumbai that left nearly 200 dead. We also recognize and understand the questions Indians are asking themselves, and the anger they are feeling, about what some are calling their own 9/11.

How can their government have ignored the warning signs? A 2007 report to Parliament warned that the country’s shores were poorly protected – and some or all of the attackers arrived by boat. Why weren’t the police and the army better prepared to respond? Sharpshooters outside the Taj Mahal Palace & Tower Hotel did not have telescopic sights, so they could not get off a shot for fear of killing hostages rather than the terrorists.

Most of all, who is to blame and who should pay the price for such cruelty?

Deccan Mujahedeen, the group that claimed responsibility – the term itself is so chillingly flawed – is unknown. But Indian and American intelligence officials saw signs pointing to Lashkar-e-Taiba, an Islamist group from the disputed region of Kashmir that is increasingly collaborating with the Taliban and Al Qaeda. What makes that especially frightening is that the group received training and support from Pakistan’s intelligence services, before it was officially banned in 2002.

We fear that whoever was behind it, the carnage will unleash dangerous new furies between nuclear-armed India and Pakistan. And we fear it will divert even more of Pakistan’s attention and troops away from fighting extremists on its western border with Afghanistan.

India's prime minister, Manmohan Singh, has so far shown extraordinary forbearance. But there are already strong calls for him to retaliate — with or without proof of who was behind the attack. We urge him to carefully consider the consequences.

India's leaders must be very careful not to ignite a religious war inside their own borders. Any military confrontation with Pakistan would be hugely costly in human life. And even the threat of war would be hugely damaging to India's extraordinary economic progress.

The Bush administration must use all of its influence to ensure that India's leaders recognize these dangers. And it must assure the Indians that it will bring all of the pressure it can on Pakistan to cooperate fully with the investigation — no matter where it leads.

We were heartened when Pakistan's civilian government immediately agreed to send the new chief of the country's powerful intelligence agency, the ISI, to India. We hoped that meant the government was confident that the ISI played no role in the attack. Or that it was finally prepared to purge its ranks of all those who have aided and abetted extremists.

Unfortunately, the offer was quickly withdrawn after the Pakistani Army and opposition parties objected. The government then announced that a lower-level intelligence official would go at some point. By Saturday, Pakistani officials were blustering as if they were the victims. Despite all of the recent horrors Pakistan has suffered, its military and intelligence services still do not understand that the terrorists pose a mortal threat to their own country.

In coming days India will have to look inward to see where and how its government failed to protect its citizens. The United States is still learning the lessons of its own failures before 9/11, but it can help in the process.

Washington's most important role will be to urge the Indians and Pakistanis to step back from the brink. The next administration will then have to move quickly to encourage serious negotiations over the future of Kashmir and genuine cooperation to defeat extremists.

4. Pankaj Mishra, "Fresh Blood from an Old Wound," *The New York Times*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/02/opinion/02mishra.html?ref=todayspaper>

MIDWAY through last week's murderous rampage in Mumbai, one of the suspected gunmen at the besieged Jewish center called a popular Indian TV channel. Speaking in Urdu (the primary language of Pakistan and many Indian Muslims), he ranted against the recent visit of an Israeli general to the Indian-ruled section of the Kashmir Valley. Referring to the Pakistan-backed insurgency in the valley, and the Indian military response to it, he asked, "Are you aware how many people have been killed in Kashmir?"

In a separate phone call, another gunman invoked the oppression of Muslims by Hindu nationalists and the destruction of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya in 1992. Such calls were the only occasions on which the militants, whom initial reports have tied to the Pakistani jihadist group Lashkar-e-Taiba, offered a likely motive for their indiscriminate slaughter. Their rhetoric seems all too familiar. Nevertheless, it shows how older political conflicts in South Asia have been rendered more noxious by the fallout from the "war on terror" and the rise of international jihadism.

Pakistan, a nation-state founded on Islam, has long claimed Muslim-majority Kashmir, and has fought three wars with India over it since 1947. In the early 1990s, as an anti-India insurgency in Kashmir intensified, groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba became the Pakistani government's proxies in its war of attrition with its neighbor.

American pressure after 9/11 forced Pakistan's president, Pervez Musharraf, to ban Lashkar-e-Taiba, which had developed links with the Taliban and Al Qaeda. With General Musharraf's departure from office in September, it would be no surprise if this turned out to be the Muslim group's first major atrocity since 2001.

Pakistan's new civilian government is too weak to control either the extremist groups within the country or the various rogue elements within its military and intelligence. ... The sense of humiliation and impotence that this loss of sovereignty creates in Pakistan, a country with a strong tradition of populist nationalism, cannot be underestimated. ...

Meanwhile, Indian intelligence experts and others suspect that jihadists and disaffected members of Pakistan's armed forces and intelligence agencies have forged closer links and, as the string of recent bomb attacks on Indian cities reveals, are rapidly making new allies among the 13 percent of Indians who are Muslim.

It is very likely that Barack Obama will take a different tack from the Bush administration in antiterrorism efforts in South Asia. ... The idea that the road to

stability in South Asia goes through Kashmir is as persuasive as the notion that the path to peace in the Middle East goes through Jerusalem. It is also equally hard to realize. Mr. Obama could act quickly to stem growing extremism in Pakistan and strengthen civilian authority by ending American missile attacks within its borders and shifting the allied strategy in Afghanistan away from military force and toward political nation-building and economic reconstruction.

... the outrage in Mumbai is the latest and clearest sign that the price of India's uncompromising stance on Kashmir has become too high ... As the economy falters (Mumbai's stock market has lost nearly 60 percent of its value this year), India can barely cope with homegrown violent movements like the Maoist insurgency in its central states, which Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has described as the biggest internal security threat to India since independence.

... While these attacks may lead to calls for more tough measures, Indians cannot lose sight of the peril that 150 million Muslims would lose their faith in India's political and legal system. And it is obviously dangerous to threaten Pakistan, a nuclear-armed state, with war.

... it is President-elect Obama who has the opportunity to create deeper and more enduring alliances for the United States in South Asia – and he should start with Kashmir.

Pankaj Mishra is the author of "Temptations of the West: How to Be Modern in India, Pakistan, Tibet and Beyond."

5. Thomas Friedman, "Calling All Pakistanis," *The New York Times*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/03/opinion/03friedman.html?ref=todayspaper>

On Feb. 6, 2006, three Pakistanis died in Peshawar and Lahore during violent street protests against Danish cartoons that had satirized the Prophet Muhammad. More such mass protests followed weeks later. When Pakistanis and other Muslims are willing to take to the streets, even suffer death, to protest an insulting cartoon published in Denmark, is it fair to ask: Who in the Muslim world, who in Pakistan, is ready to take to the streets to protest the mass murders of real people, not cartoon characters, right next door in Mumbai?

After all, if 10 young Indians from a splinter wing of the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party traveled by boat to Pakistan, shot up two hotels in Karachi and the central train station, killed at least 173 people, and then, for good measure, murdered the imam and his wife at a Saudi-financed mosque while they were cradling their 2-year-old son – purely because they were Sunni

Muslims — where would we be today? The entire Muslim world would be aflame and in the streets.

So what can we expect from Pakistan and the wider Muslim world after Mumbai? India says its interrogation of the surviving terrorist indicates that all 10 men come from the Pakistani port of Karachi, and at least one, if not all 10, were Pakistani nationals.

First of all, it seems to me that the Pakistani government, which is extremely weak to begin with, has been taking this mass murder very seriously, and, for now, no official connection between the terrorists and elements of the Pakistani security services has been uncovered.

At the same time, any reading of the Pakistani English-language press reveals Pakistani voices expressing real anguish and horror over this incident. Take for instance the Inter Press Service news agency article of Nov. 29 from Karachi: “ ‘I feel a great fear that [the Mumbai violence] will adversely affect Pakistan and India relations,’ the prominent Karachi-based feminist poet and writer Attiya Dawood told I.P.S. ‘I can’t say whether Pakistan is involved or not, but whoever is involved, it is not the ordinary people of Pakistan, like myself, or my daughters. We are with our Indian brothers and sisters in their pain and sorrow.’ ”

But while the Pakistani government’s sober response is important, and the sincere expressions of outrage by individual Pakistanis are critical, I am still hoping for more. I am still hoping — just once — for that mass demonstration of “ordinary people” against the Mumbai bombers, not for my sake, not for India’s sake, but for Pakistan’s sake.

Why? Because it takes a village. The best defense against this kind of murderous violence is to limit the pool of recruits, and the only way to do that is for the home society to isolate, condemn and denounce publicly and repeatedly the murderers — and not amplify, ignore, glorify, justify or “explain” their activities.

Sure, better intelligence is important. And, yes, better SWAT teams are critical to defeating the perpetrators quickly before they can do much damage. But at the end of the day, terrorists often are just acting on what they sense the majority really wants but doesn’t dare do or say. That is why the most powerful deterrent to their behavior is when the community as a whole says: “No more. What you have done in murdering defenseless men, women and children has brought shame on us and on you.”

Why should Pakistanis do that? Because you can't have a healthy society that tolerates in any way its own sons going into a modern city, anywhere, and just murdering everyone in sight – including some 40 other Muslims – in a suicide-murder operation, without even bothering to leave a note. Because the act was their note, and destroying just to destroy was their goal. If you do that with enemies abroad, you will do that with enemies at home and destroy your own society in the process.

“I often make the comparison to Catholics during the pedophile priest scandal,” a Muslim woman friend wrote me. “Those Catholics that left the church or spoke out against the church were not trying to prove to anyone that they are anti-pedophile. Nor were they apologizing for Catholics, or trying to make the point that this is not Catholicism to the non-Catholic world. They spoke out because they wanted to influence the church. They wanted to fix a terrible problem” in their own religious community.

We know from the Danish cartoons affair that Pakistanis and other Muslims know how to mobilize quickly to express their heartfelt feelings, not just as individuals, but as a powerful collective. That is what is needed here.

Because, I repeat, this kind of murderous violence only stops when the village – all the good people in Pakistan, including the community elders and spiritual leaders who want a decent future for their country – declares, as a collective, that those who carry out such murders are shameful unbelievers who will not dance with virgins in heaven but burn in hell. And they do it with the same vehemence with which they denounce Danish cartoons.

6. Eric Schmitt, Somini Sengupta and Jane Perlez, “US and India See Link to Militants in Pakistan,” *The New York Times*, December 2, 2008, at http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/03/world/asia/03mumbai.html?_r=1&ref=todayspaper

WASHINGTON – American and Indian authorities said Tuesday that there was now little doubt that militants inside Pakistan had directed the terrorist attacks in Mumbai. Indian officials said they had identified three or four masterminds of the deadly assault, stepping up pressure on Pakistan to act against the perpetrators of one of the worst terrorist attacks in India's history.

The emerging consensus came as the Bush administration increased its diplomatic efforts to defuse tensions between India and Pakistan over the attacks ... [US] officials are expected to issue stern warnings to the government of Pakistan to crack down on militant groups in Pakistan near its borders with Indian-administered Kashmir and with Afghanistan, top American aides said.

Two senior American officials said Tuesday that the United States had warned India in mid-October of possible terrorist attacks against “touristy areas frequented by Westerners” in Mumbai, but that the information was not specific. Nonetheless, the officials said, the warning echoed other general alerts this year by India’s intelligence agency, raising questions about the adequacy of India’s counterterrorism measures.

Details of the attack planners also became clearer on Tuesday. The only gunman captured by the police told his interrogators that one of the main plotters was a fugitive known to Indian authorities: Yusuf Muzammil, a leader of the Pakistani militant group Lashkar-e-Taiba, according to a senior Indian police official and a Western official.

The group, though officially banned and once focused primarily on Indian claims to disputed Kashmir, maintains its leadership in Pakistan and is believed to have moved its militant networks to Pakistan’s tribal areas.

Mr. Muzammil, who is the right-hand man to Zaki-ur-Rehman Lakvhi, the operational commander of the group, talked by satellite phone to the attackers from Pakistan when the gunmen were in the Taj and Oberoi hotels, the Western official said.

The attackers also used the cellphones of people they killed to call back to Mr. Muzammil somewhere in Pakistan, the official said.

The mounting evidence increased the pressure on the United States to find a way to resolve the tensions between Pakistan and India, two nuclear-armed neighbors. The officials said there was still no evidence that Pakistan’s government had a hand in the operation, although investigators were still searching for clues of outside support for the terrorists.

... The Indian foreign minister, Pranab Mukherjee, said he could not comment on military options available to his government, except to say that “every sovereign country has its right to protect its territorial integrity.”

Senior Bush administration officials sought to tamp down tensions. “It’s important for there to be restraint on both sides and – but it’s also important to find out who was responsible,” Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates told reporters at the Pentagon.

.... On Monday, the Indian Foreign Ministry summoned Pakistan’s high commissioner and handed him a list of some 20 suspects wanted in connection

with terrorist attacks and pending criminal cases. The Pakistani information minister, Sherry Rehman, said the government would “have to look at it formally.”

... Among those on the list of 20, Indian and American officials said, is an organized-crime boss, Dawood Ibrahim, who was implicated in serial bombings in Mumbai in 1993. Another is Masood Azhar, head of the banned Jaish-e-Muhammad, a Pakistan-based militant group, who was freed in 1999 in exchange for hostages on a hijacked Indian Airlines plane in Kandahar. Yet another, the Pakistani news media reported, was Haffiz Mohammed Saeed, the leader of Lashkar-e-Taiba. Mr. Saeed lives in Lahore. After Lashkar-e-Taiba was banned by President Pervez Musharraf in 2002, it formed again under a new name, Jamaat-ud-Dawa, led by Mr. Saeed.

In an interview with Geo television on Tuesday, Mr. Saeed denied that he had been involved in the Mumbai attacks or that he had given approval for them. “India has always accused me without any evidence,” he said.

The new group, Jamaat-ud-Dawa, is organized as a charity and Mr. Saeed is now recognized as the “acceptable face of fundamentalism” in Pakistan, according to Ahmed Rashid, an expert on Pakistani Islamic groups and author of a recent book on Pakistan, “Descent Into Chaos.”

At a meeting at Pakistan’s Foreign Ministry, foreign diplomats urged Pakistani officials on Tuesday to take firm action against terrorism suspects, according to two diplomats who were there.

The diplomats also emphasized that the Mumbai attacks were not just a Pakistan-India matter but were of international proportions and involved the deaths of a number of foreigners, one diplomat said.

The Pakistani foreign minister, Shah Mehmood Qureshi, made a short televised statement on Tuesday saying that Pakistan was offering to establish a “joint investigating mechanism and joint commission” with India. ...

7. Amitav Ghosh, “India’s 9/11? Not Exactly,” *The New York Times*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/03/opinion/03ghosh.html?ref=todayspaper>

SINCE the terrorist assaults began in Mumbai last week, the metaphor of the World Trade Center attacks has been repeatedly invoked. From New Delhi to New York, pundits and TV commentators have insisted that “this is India’s

9/11" and should be treated as such. Nearly every newspaper in India has put "9/11" into its post-massacre headlines. The secretary general of the Bharatiya Janata Party, the leading Hindu nationalist political faction, has not only likened the Mumbai attack to those on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, but has insisted that "our response must be close to what the American response was." There can be no doubt that there are certain clear analogies between the two attacks: in both cases the terrorists were clearly at great pains to single out urban landmarks, especially those that serve as symbolic points of reference in this increasingly interconnected world. There are similarities, too, in the unexpectedness of the attacks, the meticulousness of their planning, their shock value and the utter unpreparedness of the security services. But this is where the similarities end. Not only were the casualties far greater on Sept. 11, 2001, but the shock of the attack was also greatly magnified by having no real precedent in America's history.

India's experience of terrorist attacks, on the other hand, far predates 2001. Although this year has been one of the worst in recent history, 1984 was arguably worse still. That year an insurgency in the Punjab culminated in the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi by her Sikh bodyguards. This in turn led to riots that took the lives of some 2,000 Sikhs.

I was living in Delhi then and I recall vividly the sense of besetting crisis, of extreme fragility, of being pushed to the edge of an abyss: it was the only time I can recall when the very project of the Indian republic seemed to be seriously endangered. Yet for all its horror, the portents of 1984 were by no means fulfilled: in the following years, there was a slow turnaround; the Punjab insurgency gradually quieted down; and although the victims of the massacres may never receive justice in full measure, there has been some judicial retribution.

This has been another terrible year: even before the invasion of Mumbai, several hundred people had been killed and injured in terrorist assaults. Yet the attacks on Jaipur, Ahmedabad, New Delhi, Guwahati and elsewhere did not set off chains of retaliatory violence of the sort that would almost certainly have resulted 10 or 15 years ago. Nor did the violence create a sense of existential crisis for the nation, as in 1984. Thus, despite all loss of life, this year could well be counted as a victory not for terrorism but for India's citizenry.

The question now is this: Will the November invasion of Mumbai change this? Although there is no way of knowing the answer, it is certain that if the precedent of 9/11 is taken seriously the outcome will be profoundly counterproductive. As a metaphor "9/11" is invested not just with the memory of what happened in Manhattan and at the Pentagon in 2001, but also with the

penumbra of emotions that surround the events: the feeling that “the world will never be the same,” the notion that this was “the day the world woke up” and so on. In this sense 9/11 refers not just to the attacks but also to its aftermath, in particular to an utterly misconceived military and judicial response, one that has had disastrous consequences around the world.

When commentators repeat the metaphor of 9/11 they are in effect pushing the Indian government to mount a comparable response. If India takes a hard line modeled on the actions of the Bush administration, the consequences are sure to be equally disastrous. The very power of the 9/11 metaphor blinds us to the possibility that there might be other, more productive analogies for the invasion of Mumbai: one is the Madrid train bombings of March 11, 2004, which led to a comparable number of casualties and created a similar sense of shock and grief.

If 9/11 is a metaphor for one kind of reaction to terrorism, then 11-M (as it is known in Spanish) should serve as shorthand for a different kind of response: one that emphasizes vigilance, patience and careful police work in coordination with neighboring countries. This is exactly the kind of response India needs now, and fortunately this seems to be the course that the government, led by the Congress Party, has decided to follow. Government spokesmen have been at some pains to specify that India does not intend to respond with a troop buildup along the border with Pakistan, as the Bharatiya Janata-led government did after the attack by Muslim extremists on India’s Parliament in 2001.

A buildup would indeed serve no point at all, since this is not the kind of war that can be fought along a border, by conventional armies. The Indian government would do better to focus on an international effort to eliminate the terrorists’ hide-outs and safe houses, some of them deep inside Pakistan. India will also need to cooperate with those in the Pakistani government who have come around to a belated recognition of the dangers of terrorism.

The choice of targets in Mumbai clearly owes something to the September bombing of the Islamabad Marriott, another high-profile site sure to include foreign casualties. Here already there is common ground between the two countries – for if this has been a bad year for India in regard to terrorism, then for Pakistan it has been still worse.

It is clear now that Pakistan’s establishment is so deeply divided that it no longer makes sense to treat it as a single entity. Sometimes a crisis is also an opportunity: this is a moment when India can forge strategic alliances with those sections of the Pakistani government, military and society who understand that they, too, are under fire.

Much will depend, in the coming days, on Mumbai's reaction to the invasion. That the city was not stricken by turmoil in the immediate aftermath of the attack is undoubtedly a positive sign. That the terrorists concentrated their assault on the most upscale parts of the city had the odd consequence of limiting the disruption in the everyday lives of most Mumbai residents. Chhatrapati Shivaji station, for instance, was open just a few hours after the terrorists there were cleared out. In the northern suburbs, the home of Bollywood's studios, actors were summoned to rehearsal even while the battles were being fought.

But with each succeeding day, tensions are rising and the natural anxieties of the inhabitants are being played upon. Still, this is not a moment for precipitate action: if India can react with dispassionate but determined resolve, then 2008 may yet be remembered as a moment when the tide turned in a long, long battle. For if there is any one lesson to be learned from the wave of terrorist attacks that has convulsed the globe over the last decade it is this: Defeat or victory is not determined by the success of the strike itself; it is determined by the response.

Amitav Ghosh is the author, most recently, of the novel "Sea of Poppies."

B. THE WASHINGTON POST

1. Jim Hoagland, "Fallout from Mumbai," *Washington Post*, November 30, 2008, at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/28/AR2008112802368.html>

"This cannot be," Henry Kissinger once muttered in exasperation when an unexpectedly positive development occurred during a Democratic administration. "The wrong people are doing the right thing."

I have thought of the Kissinger anomaly in recent weeks while watching Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari confound the low expectations he inspired when he took charge of the most dangerous place on Earth in September.

Zardari is the corruption-tainted amateur politician who became president in the wake of the assassination of his wife, Benazir Bhutto, late last year. He seemed absolutely the wrong man to handle Pakistan's nuclear weapons and its collapsing economy or to deal with his country's support for Islamic terrorist networks.

But Zardari has tackled those problems with courage and pushed for greatly expanded trade and other business links with India. The Bush administration helped the Pakistani leader, in a perverse way, by making clear the limits of U.S. support for him without significant reform.

That initial progress now stands at risk. The multiple terrorist attacks in Mumbai could undo Zardari's initiatives and bring India and Pakistan back to war footing. Without citing proof, India's foreign minister is suggesting that "elements with links to Pakistan" carried out the butchery in India's financial capital. But it has yet to be shown that Zardari's government had any role in the attacks. ...

Peacemakers are blessed in the Bible. But in turbulent areas such as the Middle East and South Asia, they are more frequently targeted. Gunmen cut down Israel's Yitzhak Rabin, the Palestinian envoy Said Hammami, Jordan's King Abdullah I and many others only when they sought peace, not when they made war.

We don't know if the Mumbai murderers were targeting Zardari by ricochet. But these attacks -- part of an upsurge in terrorist violence that has struck India's cities in the past two years -- carry the trademarks of extremist "fedayeen" groups based in Pakistan and Pakistani-controlled Kashmir.

Zardari has been poking at a snake with a stick. As part of his opening to India, he has scaled back support for Kashmiri separatists -- although Kashmir is the mobilizing issue used by the Pakistani military to maintain its domination of the country's politics and government budgets.

Three days before the Mumbai atrocities, Zardari disbanded the political wing of the military's notorious Inter-Services Intelligence agency, a conduit for support to Kashmiri, Afghan and other terror networks. Earlier he backed counterinsurgency operations in tribal areas infested by the Taliban and al-Qaeda, and he is cooperating tacitly with U.S. Predator strikes against the Islamic extremists.

This is the same Zardari who spent more than a decade in Pakistani jails on corruption charges and allegedly displayed such rapacious designs on public funds while his wife was prime minister that he was nicknamed "Mr. 10 Percent."

But now he is scrambling to fill the national pocketbook to meet Pakistan's import bills and a government payroll that goes disproportionately to the country's bloated military. The same driving force -- the love of money -- pushes Zardari toward statesmanship and perhaps keeps the coup-prone army from overthrowing him.

A quiet shift in U.S. policy simultaneously contributes to Pakistani desperation and boldness. The Bush administration lavished billions on Pakistan while it was

ruled by Gen. Pervez Musharraf, whose continued survival became President Bush's top goal. Poorly advised by the State Department and the CIA, Bush let the clever generals of Pakistan swindle him.

Zardari, however, is clearly expendable to Washington. He can be allowed to fail. And because of his reputation, no government can afford the political costs of being taken to the cleaners by Mr. 10 Percent.

... Financial aid to Pakistan must now be channeled multilaterally, ideally through nongovernmental organizations that practice strict accountability.

And Obama should not repeat his vague campaign statements that indicated he might swap assistance to Pakistan on Kashmir in return for help in finding Osama bin Laden. That would resume the self-defeating bribery and bartering that failed under Bush, and it would pour oil on a burning fire.

2. Kathy Gannon, "Mumbai Attack Puts Focus on Pakistan Militant Link,"
Washington Post, December 1, 2008, at
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/01/AR2008120102131.html>

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan -- The militant group blamed for the Mumbai attacks has roots in the disputed Kashmir region where Pakistan's military has faced off against India for decades.

There have long been suspicions that Pakistan's military and intelligence services helped create, arm and train Lashkar-e-Taiba as a proxy force against India's much larger military.

Though ties between the militant group and Pakistan's army have never been firmly established, the issue is coming under fresh scrutiny and could determine India's response to the terror attacks. Pakistan has repeatedly denied any connection to the group.

Any evidence linking the Mumbai attackers to the Pakistani leadership would raise tensions between the nuclear-armed neighbors after years of attempts to mend relations. In a worst-case scenario, it could push India's government to mobilize troops along the border or even bomb militant targets within Pakistan.

The only surviving gunman told police he is Pakistani and trained at a Lashkar camp in Pakistan, according to Indian security officials; Indian leaders have also blamed "elements within Pakistan" for the strikes.

The Islamabad government acknowledges the attackers may be Pakistani or may even have trained on its soil, but insists they did so without its knowledge. ... But a senior Pakistani government official acknowledged individuals among the lower-ranks of the intelligence agencies may sympathize with groups like Lashkar, which has been linked to al-Qaida and whose members are believed to be involved in attacks against the government and army close to the Afghan border.

... Relations between the military government under President Gen. Pervez Musharraf and jihadi groups deteriorated following the July 2007 assault on the Red Mosque in Islamabad, which left scores of militants dead. The mosque was historically used as a jumping off point for militants en route to the fight in Kashmir.

Hundreds of Pakistani soldiers have died in a spike in suicide bombings since the mosque assault. A Pakistani army operation in the Bajur border region that began in September has also targeted militant hideouts, some of them belonging to Lashkar-e-Taiba, according to military officials in the area.

But defense analyst Ayesha Siddiqa said it appears the military still tolerates Lashkar and a related group, Jaish-e-Mohammed, especially in southern Punjab province, where both groups have their base.

... After Pakistan banned the group in 2002, Lashkar-e-Taiba, which means the Army of the Pure, is believed to have resurfaced under a new name, Jamaat-ud-Dawa, according to the U.S. and intelligence experts.

Jamaat-ud-Dawa says it focuses on charity work and publicly insists it has no links to Lashkar, which it says operates only in Kashmir, where an Islamic separatist insurgency against Indian rule has left more than 60,000 people dead since 1989.

Militant groups such as Lashkar want a Kashmiri merger with Pakistan, as Islamabad is also demanding. Some separatist groups want independence from both countries.

... Lashkar and Jaish-e-Mohammed established training camps in Afghanistan during the Taliban regime, and were closely aligned to al-Qaida operatives there. Several senior Jaish-e-Mohammed operatives were close to al-Qaida leader Osama bin Laden. Masood Azhar, the group's leader, was one of three prisoners released by India to put an end to the December 1999 hijacking of an Indian Airlines aircraft in Kandahar, Afghanistan.

In the U.S., one of the largest terror prosecutions since 2001 involved a group of young Muslim men from the Washington, D.C., area who trained at Lashkar camps in Pakistan, and who used paintball games in the Virginia woods as a way of preparing for global holy war.

Most members of the so-called "Virginia jihad network" never intended to stay with Lashkar, but viewed training with the group as a gateway for joining the Taliban or fighting in Chechnya, Afghanistan and other hotspots.

... Jamaat-ud-Dawa is run by Hafiz Saeed, who used to head Lashkar. After the devastating earthquake in October 2005, the group set up camps throughout Pakistani Kashmir, the region hardest hit by the quake that killed 71,000 people. At the time, residents readily acknowledged that Jamaat-ud-Dawad was the successor to Lashkar-e-Taiba.

3. Muqtedar Khan, "Losing the War on Terror," *Newsweek*, December 1, 2008, at http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/guestvoices/2008/12/losing_the_war_on_terror.html

I once lived about a mile from the Taj hotel in Mumbai, India. I worked for an engineering firm and freelanced as a copywriter for advertising agencies in Mumbai. Every time I got a new gig, I would celebrate by going to the Taj for a buffet or a breakfast. For a 23-year-old, it was a thrill to be able to afford the atmosphere of the Taj.

To me it was a place where aspirations found their destination. In those days, my wife-to-be was also a management trainee at the Taj. For both of us the Taj embodied the memories of youthful excitement and hopeful beginnings. Now those memories have forever been clouded by the madness that raged last week. We pray for those who have lost family members and wish the city back to its glamorous best.

The horrible carnage in Mumbai is sending depressing messages about the realities of the present age of terror.

The first message is from the terrorists - "we have no moral conscience; in our pursuit of what we think is justice we will not balk from any form of evil that one can imagine". The horror of this message is compounded by the daring and the spectacular fashion in which the operation was carried out. The terrorists are determined, brazen, motivated -- and they were in middle school when 9/11 happened!

The second reality is a verdict on the complete and utter failure of the wars on terror that the U.S. and its allies have been waging since 2001. If this is what the terrorists are capable of after being incessantly hounded by the world's major powers, then we should be preparing for a bleak future indeed.

The wars on terror that are being waged in South Asia have caused too many innocent deaths. The "targeted strikes" have killed hundreds of civilians in South Asia in the past few months. Many people are being tortured by law enforcement agencies. People have lost families, homes and businesses in riots by murderous gangs often protected by the government. And governments continue to avoid addressing root causes such as Palestine and Kashmir. Increasingly abuse of Islam, its values, its history and its symbols is being used as a weapon in the war on terror and this too continues to win more recruits for the extremists. All the above in conjunction with religious extremism contribute to more egregious forms of terror.

This is a wakeup call. There must be a significant rethinking in how we confront the challenge of terrorism. Current strategies have generally failed, but there have been a few successes. The Saudis for example, have succeeded in reducing terror inside Saudi Arabia through dialogue and re-education of youth. In Iraq the U.S. won over the Iraqis - the so called sons of Iraq -- who had joined Al Qaeda through dialogue and political and monetary incentives. Why can't the same creative approach be brought to South Asia?

In India even those who combat hate are often consumed by hate. Pragmatism evaporates when hatred reigns. But the U.S. and NATO can try an alternative to their current failed approach.

The final question this carnage poses is to all Indians - Muslims and Hindus alike. What kind of India do they want? India is on the verge of a historical breakthrough. At its current rate of growth it will soon be a developed nation and a major world power. But in order to sustain the growth it needs internal stability. Without internal stability it will become a land of contradictions, always on the verge but never really there.

India will need to improve its ability to deal with terrorist threats. Intelligence gathering and operational performance are not on par with the threats it faces. It must also work to restore the faith of Indian Muslims in the state so that they work with it rather than against it. If another riot in which thousands of Muslims are slaughtered, as they were in Mumbai in 1992-93 and in Gujarat 2002, is allowed by the government then needless to say there will be more alienation and more radicalization of Indian Muslims and the problems will only grow.

Finally, India must find the way to work with Pakistan without resorting to another war that will only make matters worse. Rejecting outright President-Elect Obama's recent offer to send President Clinton as a mediator to resolve the Kashmir conflict is not a commitment to peace. India is eager for U.S. support and intervention in every other matter, why not in the case of Kashmir?

Dr. Muqtedar Khan is Director of Islamic Studies at the University of Delaware and Fellow of the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding.

4. Robert Kagan, "The Sovereignty Dodge: What Pakistan Won't Do, the World Should," *Washington Post*, December 2, 2008, at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/01/AR2008120102438_pf.html

"We don't think the world's great nations and countries can be held hostage by non-state actors," Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari said yesterday. Fair enough. But what is the world to do when those non-state actors operate from the territory of a state and are the creation of that state's intelligence services?

One can feel sympathy for Zardari's plight. He and his new civilian government did not train or assist the Pakistani terrorist organizations that probably carried out last week's attacks in Mumbai. Nor is it his fault that al-Qaeda, the Taliban and other dangerous groups operate in Waziristan and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of western Pakistan, from which they launch attacks on U.S. and European forces trying to bring peace to Afghanistan. For that we can thank elements of the Pakistani military, Pakistani intelligence and the late military dictatorship of Pervez Musharraf. Reversing decades-old policies of support for these groups may be impossible for any Pakistani leader, especially when the only forces capable of rooting them out are the same forces that created them and sustain them.

So if the world is indeed not to be held hostage by non-state actors operating from Pakistan, what can be done? The Bush administration is right to press Pakistan to cooperate fully with India's investigation of the Mumbai attacks. But that may not have much effect. Pakistani intelligence services have already balked at sending their top official to India to help. Nor is mere cooperation by Pakistan likely to satisfy the outraged Indian people. They, like Americans after Sept. 11, 2001, want to see some action taken against the groups that carried out the attacks. So all the warnings in the world may not be enough to forestall an Indian attack, especially given the Indian government's political vulnerability, even if it risks another Indo-Pakistani war.

Rather than simply begging the Indians to show restraint, a better option could be to internationalize the response. Have the international community declare that parts of Pakistan have become ungovernable and a menace to international security. Establish an international force to work with the Pakistanis to root out terrorist camps in Kashmir as well as in the tribal areas. This would have the advantage of preventing a direct military confrontation between India and Pakistan. It might also save face for the Pakistani government, since the international community would be helping the central government reestablish its authority in areas where it has lost it. But whether or not Islamabad is happy, don't the international community and the United States, at the end of the day, have some obligation to demonstrate to the Indian people that we take attacks on them as seriously as we take attacks on ourselves?

Would such an action violate Pakistan's sovereignty? Yes, but nations should not be able to claim sovereign rights when they cannot control territory from which terrorist attacks are launched. If there is such a thing as a "responsibility to protect," which justifies international intervention to prevent humanitarian catastrophe either caused or allowed by a nation's government, there must also be a responsibility to protect one's neighbors from attacks from one's own territory, even when the attacks are carried out by "non-state actors."

In Pakistan's case, the continuing complicity of the military and intelligence services with terrorist groups pretty much shreds any claim to sovereign protection. The Bush administration has tried for years to work with both the military and the civilian government, providing billions of dollars in aid and advanced weaponry. But as my Carnegie Endowment colleague Ashley Tellis has noted, the strategy hasn't shown much success. After Mumbai, it has to be judged a failure. Until now, the military and intelligence services have remained more interested in wielding influence in Afghanistan through the Taliban and fighting India in Kashmir through terrorist groups than in cracking down. Perhaps they need a further incentive -- such as the prospect of seeing parts of their country placed in an international receivership.

Would the U.N. Security Council authorize such action? China has been Pakistan's ally and protector, and Russia might have its own reasons for opposing a resolution. Neither likes the idea of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty -- except, in Russia's case, in Georgia -- which is why they block foreign pressure on Sudan concerning Darfur, and on Iran and other rogue states. This would be yet another test of whether China and Russia, supposed allies in the war against terrorism, are really interested in fighting terrorism outside their own borders. But if such an action were under consideration at the United Nations, that might be enough to gain Pakistan's voluntary cooperation. Either way, it would be useful for the United States, Europe and other nations to

begin establishing the principle that Pakistan and other states that harbor terrorists should not take their sovereignty for granted. In the 21st century, sovereign rights need to be earned.

Robert Kagan, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, writes a monthly column for The Post.

II. EUROPE

A. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE

1. Mark McDonald, "Experts doubt Qaeda link in Mumbai attacks," Thursday, November 27, 2008, <http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/11/27/asia/28group.php>

HONG KONG: The men came wearing black hoods, firing automatic weapons and throwing grenades, taking hostages, attacking two hotels, a cinema, a café, a train station and other popular and undefended "soft targets."

An e-mail message to Indian media outlets that claimed responsibility for the bloody attacks in Mumbai on Wednesday night said the militants were from the Deccan Mujahideen.

Global terrorism experts said Thursday they had never heard of the group. And based on its tactics, they said, it was probably not a cell or group linked to Al Qaeda.

"It's even unclear whether it's a real group or not," said Bruce Hoffman, a professor at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and the author of the book "Inside Terrorism." "It could be a cover name for another group, or a name adopted just for this particular incident."

Christine Fair, senior political scientist and a South Asia expert at the RAND Corporation, was careful to say that the identity of the terrorists could not yet be known. But she insisted the style of the attacks and the targets in Mumbai suggested that the militants were likely to be Indian Muslims - and not linked to Al Qaeda or the violent South Asian terrorist group Lashkar-e-Taiba.

"There's absolutely nothing Al Qaeda-like about it," she said of the attack. "Did you see any suicide bombers? And there are no fingerprints of Lashkar. They don't do hostage taking, and they don't do grenades."

Hoffman agreed that the assault was "not exactly Al Qaeda's modus operandi, which is suicide attacks."

But he said the timed attacks, which he called "tactical, sophisticated and coordinated," perhaps pointed to a broader organization behind the perpetrators. Fair also noted that the fact the group had not proclaimed its ideology in a manifesto was "not at all unusual."

"You don't see these types of terrorist operations very often, if at all," Hoffman said. "These aren't just a bunch of radical guys coming together to cause mayhem.

"This takes a different skill set. It doesn't take much skill to make a bomb. This is not just pressing a button as a suicide bomber and dying. You don't learn this over the Internet."

The word Deccan describes the middle and south of India, which is dominated by the Deccan Plateau. Mujahideen, of course, is the commonly used Arabic word for holy fighters. The very name - if it is a real group - suggests a domestic Islamist agenda.

"It's maybe not so much a group as a cell that will take on a name for a specific operation," said Fair. "In India you hear these unusual names."

Fair did not agree that the attacks on Wednesday necessarily required deep planning and training.

"This wasn't something that required a logistical mastermind," she said. "These were not hardened targets. A huge train station with zero security. Two hotels with no security, both owned by Indians. Leopold's Café. How hard is it, really? It's not rocket science."

Fair believes the attacks could be "yet another manifestation of domestic terrorism" that has its genesis in a longstanding institutional discrimination against Muslims.

"There are a lot of very, very angry Muslims in India," she said, "The economic disparities are startling, and India has been very slow to publicly embrace its rising Muslim problem. You cannot put lipstick on this pig. This is a major domestic political challenge for India."

The CIA puts the population of India at 1.15 billion, with Hindus making up about 80 percent of the total and Muslims 13.4 percent.

Fair said one incident - "a watershed event" - that continues to anger Muslims were the riots that swept nearby Gujarat State in 2002. The violence killed between 1,000 and 2,000 people, most of them Muslims.

"The public political face of India says, 'Our Muslims have not been radicalized.' But the Indian intelligence apparatus knows that's not true. India's Muslim communities are being sucked into the global landscape of Islamist jihad.

"Indians will have a strong incentive to link this to Al Qaeda. 'Al Qaeda's in your toilet!' But this is a domestic issue. This is not India's 9/11."

For Hoffman, who has studied terrorism for more than 30 years, the Mumbai attacks are "alarming on a number of levels."

"It's not often that things in terrorism alarm me. So much is a repeat of what we see almost every day, like suicide bombings. There's no real innovation in terrorism, which is why 9/11 was so terrifying, because it was so innovative and heinously clever.

"But these attacks show how a handful of men, basically using weapons off the shelf, can paralyze a city and frustrate highly trained security forces. These attacks were calculated to spread alarm and anxiety - to put it quite frankly, to unhinge things - and that's exactly what they've done."

2. William Pfaff, "What was the Message," *International Herald Tribune*, December 3, 2008, at <http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/12/03/opinion/edpfaff.php>

PARIS: What is the message of a terrorist attack that fails to deliver a message? Threats and warnings are being exchanged by India and Pakistan about the terrorist attack on Mumbai, carried out by presumed Muslim extremists. But acting for what purpose, and under whose instructions?

The attacks are presumed by the Indians to have to do with the Kashmiri Muslims fighting to force India to withdraw from their part of the disputed region in the north of the Indian subcontinent, bordering the two countries and also Tibet and China. Its Hindu ruler chose in 1947 to deliver its Muslim population to India during the frantic days of British India's partition. The UN ordered a referendum among the Muslims (believed today to favor independence). India has never accepted.

If Kashmir was the motive for the Mumbai attacks, why were the targets hotels and restaurants frequented by Western tourists, but also by residents of Mumbai and other prosperous Indians, and a Lubavitch Hasidic Jewish center - an outpost of mainly American and Israeli Jews? None of them have anything to do with Kashmir.

This makes the message seem like a Middle Eastern message, having to do with Iraq and Palestine. But the terrorist who was captured said he was a Pakistani, and the evidence thus far is that the group of terrorists left from Pakistan.

Could Samuel Huntington be right after all? Are we witnessing an indiscriminate war between civilizations? But we know that the modern conflict between Muslims and Europeans and Americans began with the Europeans' post-1918 partition and colonization of the Ottoman Empire's Arab possessions, and a quarter-century later, by Israel's European-supported installation in Palestine.

After that, there was the Suez attack, a fiasco for Britain and France, when Washington supported Egypt. A quarter-century after that, the Americans and the Muslim Pakistanis, together with the Saudi Arabians, organized the successful Muslim mujahideen resistance to the Russian invasion and occupation of Afghanistan.

In 1980, there was a terrible war between Muslim Iraqis and Muslim Iranians. Desert Storm followed that, caused by the invasion of Muslim Kuwait by Muslim Iraq, resisted by Muslim as well as European armies under American leadership. After that came the American refusal to remove the military bases it had built in Saudi Arabia, which was the main grievance that inspired Osama bin Laden's 9/11 attack on New York and Washington.

The Asian Muslim countries, including Indonesia, where more Muslims live than anywhere else, had nothing to do with any of this. So what actually is it all about?

Certainly not Huntington's fantasy of a war of civilizations, despite the American political and journalistic habit of forgetting the past and pinning everything that happens today on the Muslims and Osama bin Laden. .

There is great concern today that India will retaliate against Pakistan for the Mumbai attacks, even though there is no conclusive proof of official Pakistani responsibility. That the attack was by a militant offshoot of the Kashmir clash is more plausible.

It would be illogical for the new Pakistani civilian government to be involved with an action that embroiled it in further conflict with India while it has extremely difficult relations with the United States over American attacks on supposed Taliban and Al Qaeda centers inside the Pakistani frontier tribal zones, and while intense American and NATO pressure is on Pakistan to do more against the Taliban.

Der Spiegel Online carried an article on Nov. 27 entitled "Terror in India - Obama's First Test." Why a test for President-elect Barack Obama? Even if he were already president of the U.S., what would he be expected do about it?

It would be closer to the truth to suggest that this might have been influenced by conflicts in which the United States has directly or indirectly taken an irresponsible hand, without positive results for the United States and with tragic results for others. But the U.S. has never had anything to do with Kashmir.

The mind-set expressed in the Spiegel headline - that anything unpleasant that happens in the world is either the result of American actions or something for which the United States must take responsibility - is widespread, and the result of an American policy of global interventionism that Obama and his new national security team seem ready to continue. If they do so, they are likely to regret it.

3. H.D.S. Greenway, "The Unhealed Wound of Kashmir," *International Herald Tribune*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/12/02/opinion/edgreenway.php>

If the twin towers of the World Trade Center seemed to symbolize New York, how much more does the storied Taj Mahal hotel, with its overwrought architecture and mock Mughal flourishes, symbolize the great, rambling city of Bombay, which the Indians now call Mumbai.

When it was built in 1903 - the dream of Jamsetji Tata, who named it after India's most enduring monument - it was the first building in Bombay to be lit by electric lights. Today the Tata Group is among India's greatest industrial conglomerates with a worldwide reach.

The triumphal arch between the hotel and the bay, The Gateway to India, was built to commemorate the 1911 landing of the king - Emperor George V - at the height of the British Empire, and through it marched the last British soldiers to leave India, the Somerset Light Infantry, in 1948, when the imperial sun was setting and India was newly free.

The maharajas in the Taj lobby were replaced by industrial moguls and high-end foreigners, and the hotel became the place where well-off Indians had their weddings and their grand occasions, just as much a symbol of the new India shouldering its way onto the world stage as of the colonial past.

The terrorists knew that, of course, as they slipped by the Gateway to attack the Taj. Terrorists are great ones for symbolism, and to strike Mumbai was the equivalent of striking New York with Hollywood thrown in.

India points the finger toward Pakistan, and it's becoming clear that the unhealed wound of Kashmir is spreading its gangrenous grievance yet again. The mostly

Muslim region was assigned to India when the subcontinent was being partitioned, and the Muslim population remains unreconciled to Indian rule.

The terrorists seemed so familiar with their targets, including a hard-to-find Jewish center. One wonders if they had local help. How sad for India if local Muslims were involved. Although a minority, Muslims in India represent one of the world's biggest Muslim populations, after Indonesia and Pakistan, which was created as a Muslim homeland. Communal violence has always been the lethal gene in the Indian body politic, and Mumbai's Muslims were hunted down and massacred by angry Hindus as recently as 1993.

One terrorist screamed "Remember Babri Masjid!" - a mosque destroyed by Hindu nationalists in 1992. Another cried "Remember Godhra!" the scene of anti-Muslim riots in Gujarat six years ago.

Local elections have begun in India, leading up to a general election next year, and the Hindu nationalist opposition, the Bharatiya Janata Party, longs to paint the ruling Congress Party as soft on terrorism and national security.

The big question is to what degree will Pakistan be blamed? A similar attack on the Indian Parliament seven years ago brought the two countries to the brink of war. Pakistan wants no trouble with India while a consuming fire of Islamic militancy blazes in its own country. But elements of Pakistan's military and security forces have been known to give succor and support to militants just in order to bedevil India over Kashmir. The terrorists clearly hoped to worsen Indo-Pakistan relations.

India and Pakistan have fought several wars, most of them over Kashmir, and Pakistan feels threatened by India's growing influence in Afghanistan. India, in turn, fears becoming a war zone itself, with constant bombings and terrorist outrages, some of them traceable to Pakistan.

The British partition of India 60 years ago, which cost so many lives and so much anguish, was designed to resolve the problems between Hindus and Muslims. It did not. The grievances growing out of that partition live on to poison both successor states to the British Raj.

This is a nightmare for the incoming Obama administration, which, like its predecessor, wants peace between the two nuclear neighbors and Pakistan's attention focused on its own growing Islamic insurgency.

The danger is that an attack this spectacular can trigger an overreaction that will create more terrorists, to which the actions of the Bush administration after 9/11 so sadly attest. Hopefully, India will prove the wiser.

But most certainly, the Taj will rise again.

B. DER SPIEGEL

1. Gregor Peter Schmitz, "Terror in India: Obama's First Test," *Der Spiegel*, November 27, 2008, at <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,druck-593055,00.html>

The series of terror attacks in Mumbai comes at a sensitive time for the US. President Bush is no longer in a position to lead, and President-elect Barack Obama has not yet been given the reins. Still, the attacks represent Obama's first foreign policy test.

The mood was a festive one on Wednesday in Washington D.C. Just like every year before Thanksgiving, US President George W. Bush "pardoned" a turkey -- this year's version was named Pumpkin. President-elect Barack Obama and his wife Michelle, for their part, joined TV legend Barbara Walters for a chat. The atmosphere was relaxed -- they talked, for example, about how the Obama daughters would be in charge of making their own beds when they moved into the White House in January.

But then the images from the terror attacks in Mumbai began flickering across the television screen. And suddenly, the pre-holiday calm in Washington and Chicago, where Obama's transition team is headquartered, came to an abrupt end.

Bush and Obama quickly issued statements. "President Bush offers his condolences to the Indian people and the families of the innocent civilians killed and injured in the attacks in Mumbai," the White House statement said. "The US government continues to monitor the situation...and stands by ready to assist and support the Indian government." Terror experts from the State Department and the Defense Department quickly began analyzing the situation.

The Obama statement was in a similar vein. "These coordinated attacks on innocent civilians demonstrate the grave and urgent threat of terrorism," Obama spokesman Brooke Anderson said. "The United States must continue to strengthen our partnerships with India and nations around the world to root out and destroy terrorist networks."

A Previously Unknown Terror Group

Obama also quickly got on the phone with US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, who briefed him on the situation. But the exact circumstances of the series of attacks, which killed over 100 people and injured some 250, were unclear on Wednesday evening in Washington. A previously unknown group calling itself Deccan Mujahideen sent out e-mails to media organizations claiming responsibility for the attack. But there are a number of groups in India that could be behind the Deccan Mujahideen, including groups from neighboring Pakistan.

This much is certain: If it is indeed confirmed that Americans and Britons were targeted and that the attacks were inspired by al-Qaida's radical ideology, then the difficult transition phase in Washington has become even more complicated. "If the terror threat spreads from Pakistan and Afghanistan to the important American ally India, that's an enormous problem for the United States," ex-presidential advisor David Gergen said on CNN Wednesday night.

The crisis could be Obama's first big foreign policy test. ... Now, Obama may also be forced into taking responsibility for foreign policy earlier than expected. Indeed, the attacks could be seen as a personal warning directed against him ...

Forcing Obama's Hand?

Al-Qaida may have a special interest in providing such a test. Obama's middle name "Hussein" and his popularity in Arab countries could pose a serious threat to the organization. Contrary to Bush, Obama is difficult to portray as an American infidel. Al-Qaida lieutenant Ayman al-Zawahiri in his remarks on the American election was forced to provide more creative criticism, calling Obama a "house negro." Terrorists may in fact be trying to force Obama into reacting harshly, so that he appears to the world as war-minded as Bush ...

2. "India's Security Apparatus has Failed," *Der Spiegel*, December 1, 2008, at <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,druck-593733,00.html>

Public anger in India is growing in the aftermath of last week's terrorist attacks on Mumbai. Top officials are resigning and tensions with Pakistan are on the rise. German commentators warn that the last thing the world needs is a new crisis in South Asia.

The initial grief and shock at the terrible events in Mumbai last week is giving way to anger. Indians are beginning to ask why their politicians and security forces were incapable of protecting them from the terror.

Heads are beginning to roll in the Indian political establishment as the recriminations mount. At the same time tensions are rising between the government in New Delhi and Pakistan, particularly as the interrogation of the only surviving gunman indicates that the militants who laid siege to Mumbai for three days had come from Pakistan.

... India's Home Affairs Minister Shivraj Patil stepped down on Sunday as Indians took to the streets to protest against the government. On Monday the top official in the state of Maharashtra, Vilasrao Deshmukh, offered to resign. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has promised to beef up maritime and air security and is to hold cross-party talks on the establishment of a new federal investigative agency.

Meanwhile the specter of relations further deteriorating between Pakistan and India has the international community worried. Although New Delhi has held back from accusing the government in Islamabad of being directly responsible, analysts say the involvement of Pakistan's military intelligence agency ISI cannot be ruled out, particularly if Lashkar-e-Taiba proves to be behind the events. The group is regarded as a creation of the ISI ...

Pakistan's President Asif Ali Zardari has appealed to India not to punish his country for the attacks. "Even if the militants are linked to Lashkar-e-Taiba, who do you think we are fighting?" he said in an interview with the Financial Times published on Monday.

On Monday the United States said that it expected Pakistan to cooperate fully in any investigation into the terrorist rampage. US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, who is to travel to India later this week, said: "I don't want to jump to any conclusions myself on this, but I do think that this is a time for complete, absolute, total transparency and cooperation and that's what we expect."

German commentators voiced their concern on Monday about the prospects of an escalation in tensions between India and Pakistan and many are scathing of India's weak security regime.

The center-right *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* writes:

"Perhaps the attackers were sent from (Pakistan) to Mumbai. However, it is well known that the government in Islamabad does not have any control over parts of the country. And is also well known that the army and, in particular, the ISI intelligence agency operates partly on its own account. President Zardari and the government in Islamabad have no understandable reason to want to jeopardize relations with India, just as efforts to calm the tensions in Kashmir are finally

showing some success. The economically languishing Pakistan, on the contrary, has an interest in improving its relations with India, in order to profit from that country's growth."

"A new crisis between India and Pakistan would also be a disaster for the West. Both states are needed to regain control over the situation in Afghanistan. And the government in New Delhi cannot afford a crisis, even if a dispute with archenemy Pakistan is part of the usual election campaign arsenal. The consequences of the global financial and economic crisis have also reached India."

The conservative *Die Welt* writes:

"This year ... India became the most important target of the international jihad. Terrorists learn quickly, they are flexible in their choice of victims. If the West arms itself better, then they look for softer targets. And where can they cause more mayhem than in a country with 150 million Muslims and a festering problem with its minorities, that is still in conflict with nuclear-armed Pakistan?"

"The country has now received its wake-up call and has to improve its security. The federally organized state needs a centralized anti-terror institution with clear responsibilities and an intelligence information pool that local authorities can also access. This attack has shown yet again that once the terrorists are in a hotel, a train station -- or here in our Christmas markets -- then it is already far too late. Survival depends on good early detection by intelligence agencies."

The business daily *Handelsblatt* reports:

"Delhi's political establishment has to resist the temptation to use the scapegoat of Pakistan to deflect from its own failures. One thing is right: India's neighbor is home to the control center of the global jihad and has to take tougher measures against Islamists and their sympathizers."

"However, India like the West has to realize that the fight against cross-border terrorism can only be won with Pakistan. ... (President Zardari) has promised to help fight the common threat posed by terrorism. Delhi should take him at his word. If the leadership buries the promising peace process then the terrorists' calculations will have borne fruit: Pakistan would be deflected from the fight against the Taliban and al-Qaida and in the upsurge of nationalism the extremists could easily mutate from criminals into heroes."

The Financial Times Deutschland writes:

"The Pakistani government has made it clear that, unlike in the past, it wants to reduce militant Islamists' room for maneuver in the country."

"As great as the fear is that there will be new escalation in South Asia, in fact India and Pakistan have common interests in the fight against terrorism. It is important, not only for Delhi, but also for Pakistan, that those behind the attack on Mumbai are identified quickly, particularly if the Lashkar-e-Toiba terrorist group, which operates from Pakistan and has close ties to the ISI, really played a role."

"The governments in both states will want to do everything to stop the calls for revenge growing louder on the streets, something that could lead to the simmering Kashmir conflict developing its own dangerous dynamic. Neither India nor Pakistan can have any interest in seeing Kashmir develop into another battlefield on the map of the global jihad."

The left-leaning *Die Tageszeitung* writes:

"Although (India) has repeatedly been the target of terror attacks, its political class has continued to sun itself in the glow of the impressive economic growth, while nourishing ambitions of superpower status. They ignored the fact that more influence in the world does not come without more responsibility and greater risks. And India's security apparatus has completely failed. India has to finally reform itself politically and take measures against terrorism -- and its causes. That includes getting politicians and the justice system to investigate and severely punish acts of violence committed by Hindus. The politicians who foment hate between uneducated voters are playing right into the hands of terrorists."

"If India does not act with a cool head now it will not only endanger its identity as a multi-ethnic and multi-religious state. It risks becoming dragged into the vortex of Islamism. This is not only threatening the existence of Pakistan, but peace in whole of South Asia."

3. Claus Christian Malzahn, "India Is Pointing in the Right Direction," *Der Spiegel*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,593415,00.html>

Mumbai a terror zone, and India bitterly points its finger at Pakistan. The unloved neighbor needs all the help the West can offer. Pakistan is nearly a failed state -- and a US invasion under President Obama can't be ruled out.

It is still not clear who exactly carried out the terror attacks in Mumbai this week. But the actions speak for themselves. The murderers expressly went after Britons, Americans and Jews. In the world's largest democracy, attacks were carried out by a determined minority against the will of an overwhelming majority. The crimes bear the clear and bloody fingerprints of militant, political Islamism.

The uncomfortable resonance left behind by the series of attacks is that the criminals were almost omnipotent: They could strike where, when and -- almost -- whomever they wanted. The terror didn't just claim its victims in one awful moment; it spread out and lasted for days. There was a similar feeling during the terror attacks on the living quarters of Westerners in Saudi Arabia in 2004 as well as the battle at Pakistan's Red Mosque, in the center of Islamabad. But this time the terror overtook an entire city.

The attacks struck the heart of an Indian civil society that has always functioned fairly well, despite recurring conflicts between the country's Hindu majority and Muslim minority. The terror struck a country that is closely allied, politically and economically, with the West. The terrorists' mission can be neatly summarized: political, economic and cultural destabilization of the whole subcontinent.

The attacks were an attempt to spread religious war from the whole of Afghanistan and regions of Pakistan to their southern neighbor, India. It's obvious the terrorists follow the ideology of al-Qaida, though it's unclear whether the head of that organization gave orders for this mission. Perhaps we'll never know -- it wouldn't be the first time. But we can assume the murderers from Mumbai see themselves as part of an international movement in which Zawahiri and bin Laden hold high ranks.

Now the population of India, shocked to the core by the brutality, is pointing unmistakably in one direction: to the northwest. "Elements with links to Pakistan" are responsible for the massacre, says India's foreign minister ...

... The Indian embassy in Kabul was made the target of a bloody attack earlier this summer. Western intelligence services have traced the attackers in that case back to the Pakistani intelligence service, the ISI. Pakistani groups in the past have often been responsible for terror attacks in India. Of course, there are also "homegrown" jihadists in India as well. But in Pakistan, above all in its tribal area near the border with Afghanistan, these fighters have the territory they need to plan the spread of their war beyond its local confines. ...

Brainwashing for the Holy War

Nevertheless, Pakistan's foreign minister offered India his help on Friday. He pledged to send the head of the ISI to share information with his Indian counterparts. These are praiseworthy developments, but it will take more than words to prevent attacks like those in Mumbai from happening again.

Even if the governments in New Delhi and Islamabad have cautiously begun to discuss their core differences, like the status of Kashmir, and even if telegrams of sympathy are sent from Islamabad to Mumbai and New Delhi, the benefits will be limited. And if the murky political and military situation in Pakistan is not clarified and solved, then the war on the terror between Kabul, Karachi and Mumbai will almost certainly be lost.

For years a kind of death industry has been taking hold in Pakistan's tribal areas. There are hundreds of Koranic schools which could better be described as cadet schools for Islamists. Boys as young as five are sent here by their impoverished parents. The state provides hardly any free education; the schools that exist are poorly equipped. Children learn the Koran by heart in Arabic, often without understanding a word. After all they speak Pashtun, not Arabic.

The idea is to condition or brainwash them. The goal is jihad. As young men these warriors are given military training which underscores their so-called spiritual training.

Anyone who doubts the existence of this death-machinery can visit the hundreds of schools just a few hours' drive from Quetta, near Afghanistan's border. To get there one has to pass checkpoints and roadblocks erected by the ISI, Pakistan's intelligence agency. The ISI carefully protects this region, which might be described as an extended barracks for jihad, interspersed with rural villages. Why? No one in Islamabad seems willing to answer that question.

Is Pakistan a Failed State?

The Pakistani government has long ago given up control of this region. The army and the ISI, which takes a lion's share of the national budget, lead their own independent existence. Their links to the Taliban and to Islamic groups in Kashmir and India have grown.

Even if the government in Islamabad showed a will to crack down on these tribal areas, it's doubtful the army and the ISI would follow orders. Even Pakistan's former President Pervez Musharraf was unable to keep a lid on terrorism, and unlike his successor he had not just political but military power. All in all,

medium-term prospects for the subcontinent are rather gloomy. ... And somewhere in Pakistan, nuclear weapons are stored. The Americans have always vouched that the weapons of mass destruction in the bunkers between Karachi and Lahore were secure -- but that was before American helicopters were fired at in Pakistani airspace by, ostensibly, their closest allies in the War on Terror.

From a political point of view Pakistan is nearly a failed state. ... Naturally Obama will talk with the government in Islamabad. But the fact that he has emphasized military strength shows that he is soberly, if pessimistically, assessing the political power relations between the army and the Pakistani government.

The coming weeks should demonstrate what the Pakistanis are in a position to undertake in the battle against terror. ...

The Enemy of My Enemy

It's difficult to win a war when one side refuses to accept moral, military, or state boundaries while the other is permanently bound by them. Clausewitz himself might groan in despair. Carl von Clausewitz -- the Prussian war theoretician -- wrote that the goal of a war is to disarm the enemy. But how do you begin to disarm an enemy in tribal areas where it is hard to tell the difference between harmless peasants and fighters in disguise?

The jihadis who tried to transform Mumbai into a killing zone have the deaths of Hindus, Jews, Americans, Britons, and also Germans to answer for. ... These death squads can only be defeated if the political actors in the subcontinent start to see through the borderless game their enemies are playing, and if they share information and act together. This would require a level of trust and goodwill that hasn't existed between India and Pakistan for many years.

... India's foreign minister has blamed "elements with links to Pakistan" for the terror attacks. A couple of years ago it would have called them "Pakistani elements." In the Great Game against terror in the subcontinent, this is a difference as small as it is important -- and given the depressing outlook for the region, one is thankful for any nuance that offers a glimmer of hope.

Maybe now the regimes can agree to a marriage of convenience. They, do, after all, have the same enemies.

C. THE ECONOMIST

1. "Terror in India: A Dangerous New Frontline in the Global War Against Terrorism," November 27, 2008, at http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm?story_id=12701072

TERROR has stalked Mumbai, India's commercial capital, all too many times before. In 1993 more than 250 people died in a series of bomb attacks, seen as reprisals for the demolition by Hindu fanatics of the mosque at Ayodhya. In 2003, more than 50 people were killed by two car bombs, including one just outside the Taj Mahal hotel, next to the monumental tourist attraction, the "Gateway of India". And in 2006 over 180 people were killed in seven separate explosions at railway stations and on commuter trains. But the latest atrocity – or rather co-ordinated series of atrocities – is something new to the city. It has alarming implications not just for India, but for the entire international fight against terrorism.

It differs from most previous attacks in two important ways: in the sophistication of the operation's planning and the terrorist manpower that must have been involved; and in selecting foreigners as targets: hostage-takers seem to have sought out American, British and Israeli victims. As *The Economist* went to press, the crisis in Mumbai was still unfolding. Hostages were still held, fires still smouldering at the Taj Mahal hotel and occasional gunfire and explosions still to be heard. It was uncertain who was responsible, though a previously unknown group calling itself the Deccan Mujahideen had contacted television stations to claim credit.

Whether or not such a group really exists, suspicion will inevitably fall on Islamist extremists. Moreover, the tactic – familiar from New York's twin towers to the London Underground – of simultaneous assaults on "soft" targets, designed to kill large numbers of civilians, suggests an al-Qaeda involvement, or at least that the group has provided an inspiration. This is deeply worrying for India, which until recently thought itself immune from that particular scourge. Introducing Manmohan Singh, India's prime minister, to Laura Bush a few years ago, George Bush reportedly noted that India was a country of 150m Muslims and not a single al-Qaeda member.

Home-grown poison

In the past, terrorist attacks in India were routinely blamed on foreigners. This usually meant Pakistan, either as part of deliberate government policy or as the work of rogue elements of the state apparatus, or occasionally Bangladesh, also suspected at times of tolerating terrorist training camps on its soil. But in recent months a series of attacks in Delhi, Jaipur, Bengaluru (Bangalore) and Ahmedabad have been claimed by the "Indian Mujahideen". Indeed, this group,

which the government since claims to have dismantled, had explicitly threatened to carry out “deadly attacks” in Mumbai.

India’s Muslim population does indeed look like fertile ground for those sowing hatred. Although there is a general impression that the two-decade-long insurgency in Indian-administered Kashmir—the country’s only Muslim-majority state—is in remission, it still festers. Last year the conflict killed more than 800 people. This year more than 30 unarmed demonstrators were killed in mass protests against Indian rule. Tension there is again high as a state election, which separatist leaders want boycotted, is under way. Elsewhere in India, the Muslim minority is economically disadvantaged. A report the government commissioned in 2006 found Muslims across the country faring, on average, worse than the Hindu majority in education, jobs and income. And Muslims have occasionally been subject to hideous communal slaughter. More than 2,000 died in a pogrom in the state of Gujarat in 2002, for which the perpetrators have never been brought to justice.

That pogrom followed allegations that a Muslim mob had been responsible for the deaths of Hindu activists. This highlights one of the dangers facing India now: of a rise in communal tension and tit-for-tat violence. A general election is due by next May, which adds to the risks. One of India’s two biggest parties, the Bharatiya Janata Party, now in opposition, champions the rights of India’s Hindus. Accusing the Congress-led government of being “soft on terrorism” is a campaign tactic it has often used. In this it may now be constrained by the recent arrest of alleged Hindu bombers, seeking to avenge the attacks by the Indian Mujahideen. But the emergence of that new phenomenon—Hindu terrorism—is scarcely a comfort.

The usual suspects

A second danger is that if Indian suspicions again point to a Pakistani involvement, the slow thawing of relations between the two hostile neighbours will revert to the deep freeze. In fact Pakistan’s new president, Asif Zardari, has been going out of his way—and courting controversy at home—to placate India. He has annoyed jihadists by describing Kashmiri militants as “terrorists” (as India has long wanted them to be known). And he has said Pakistan would never be first to use its nuclear weapons. This week it has also emerged that Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence, the spook network habitually blamed by India for involvement in cross-border attacks, has been revamped. Its “political” arm (previously, in theory, non-existent) is said to have been disbanded. So any official Pakistani involvement would suggest that Mr Zardari and his government are not in control.

A third danger is one that faces not just India, but the world as a whole: that the attacks in Mumbai mark a serious setback or even turning-point in the battle

against al-Qaeda and its clones. The group has been losing ground in some of the Muslim countries where it has been fighting: in Indonesia, for example, where since the Bali bombings in 2002 the extremists have been in retreat; or in Iraq, where the Sunni “awakening” illuminated the resentment many Iraqis felt for the terrorists. Killing fellow Muslims has been the group’s biggest mistake. But countries where Muslims are in a minority may offer terrorists a better target. Many Muslims in such places feel marginalised, pushed to the fringes of society. Attacks there can provoke a backlash, feeding a sense of Muslim beleaguerment for al-Qaeda to exploit. This tactic has already worked in places such as Britain. If it succeeds in India, which has the biggest Muslim minority in the world, the implications for the global struggle against terrorism could be catastrophic.

2. “India under Attack: A Terrorist Onslaught of Stunning Scope and Horror,” *Economist*, November 27, 2008, at http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=12708194

THE sheer scale and audacity of the assault were staggering. Gangs of well-armed youths attacked two luxury hotels, a restaurant, a railway station and at least one hospital. Gunfire and explosions rang through Mumbai overnight on November 26th-27th and through the next morning. As *The Economist* went to press, more than 100 people were reported to have been killed, and the toll seemed likely to rise. Several foreigners, including some from America, Japan and Britain, were among the dead. So were over a dozen policemen, including Mumbai’s chief counter-terrorism officer. Up to 100 hostages, including selected American and British guests, were alleged to be held hostage inside a hotel.

Even in a city – and country – with a grim record of terrorist violence, these were extraordinary scenes. The attacks started at around 10.30pm on November 26th, when gunmen started shooting and throwing grenades at Mumbai’s main Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus railway station. Television footage showed two men shooting at random as they drove through nearby streets in a stolen police jeep.

Around the same time, a bomb was reported to have exploded in a taxi parked near the city’s main airport. More or less simultaneously, gunmen speaking Hindi and Urdu, the language of many north-Indian Muslims and of neighbouring Pakistan, stormed two hotels—the Taj Mahal and the Trident Oberoi—and Café Leopold, a restaurant popular with tourists. Police outside the Taj Mahal, India’s most famous hotel, lapped by the Arabian Sea, said gunmen arrived there by inflatable dinghy. In the early hours, a gunfight erupted on Marine Drive, the scenic coastal road seen in so many Bollywood films, in which another Mumbai police chief was killed.

As dawn broke, flames were rising from the domed roof of the Taj Mahal. Navy and army commandos, who had retaken the hotel's lower floors and killed two terrorists, reported bodies in many rooms and perhaps half a dozen terrorists still living. A trickle of terrified employees and guests, some with gunshot wounds, continued to flee the building. One fugitive, Amit, a hotel-restaurant manager, said his chef had been hit by three bullets and many colleagues remained inside. A few badly injured survivors were wheeled from the hotel on brass luggage-trolleys. By midday on November 27th most of the hostages were reported to have been released from the hotel, although there were reports of further shooting.

Meanwhile at the nearby Trident Oberoi, as many as 100 hostages were reported still to be held. Gunfire and explosions were reported from the upper storeys of the building.

There seemed little doubt that the attackers were Muslim militants of some description, but their exact provenance was unclear. Responsibility was claimed by a previously little-known group called the Deccan Mujahideen. Speaking to Indian television by telephone, a gunman holding hostages in the Trident Oberoi demanded that Muslim prisoners, including those captured in Kashmir, should be released from Indian jails. "Release all the mujahideens, and Muslims living in India should not be troubled," he said.

In the past five months India has suffered from a spate of Islamist militancy, with bomb-blasts in half a dozen cities, including Delhi, Bangalore and Jaipur. A home-grown Muslim terrorist group, the Indian Mujahideen, has been blamed for the spree, in which over 150 people were killed. In a chilling, 14-page admission of responsibility for the Delhi bombings in September, the Indian Mujahideen castigated the counter-terrorism efforts of Mumbai's police, and promised Mumbaikars future "deadly attacks".

As India's first indigenous Muslim terrorist group—so they have often been described—the Indian Mujahideen are a worrying sign. They seem to have evolved from a decade-long campaign by Pakistan-based militants, including many fighting an insurgency in Kashmir, to incite India's 150m Muslims to revolt. These groups have been held primarily responsible for half a dozen major terrorist attacks in Mumbai in recent years. In 1993 local Muslim gangsters backed by Pakistan-based militants set off 13 near-simultaneous bomb-blasts in the city, killing more than 250 people. In 2006 another co-ordinated bombing spree on Mumbai's railway killed over 180 commuters. A Pakistan-based group, Lashkar-e-Toiba, was blamed at the time.

This week's attacks in Mumbai seemed different, however. Attacks by bands of gunmen on numerous targets, instead of the mere laying of bombs, and the seizure of so many hostages, led to speculation, unsupported by evidence, that local militants in India could not have mounted the attacks without considerable foreign help. And the targets chosen—world-famous hotels and Western tourists—were a new phenomenon for India, despite being a pattern familiar from attacks directed or inspired by al-Qaeda elsewhere in the world.

Al-Qaeda has often threatened to launch strikes in India. In 2006 Arab terrorists belonging to the organisation were foiled in an attempt to set off bombs in Goa, India's main destination for foreign tourists. Among the targets of the latest attacks was a Jewish religious centre in southern Mumbai which was reported to have been fired on by the gunmen. Police said that an Israeli rabbi and his family were among a group being held as hostages in a nearby apartment block.

Despite these worrying signs, Indian officials have so far resisted suggestions that Indian Muslims are being radicalised and joining a global jihad. Many refer approvingly to the observation of George Bush that Muslims from India have not in general turned up to fight the infidels on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. But security analysts have meanwhile despaired at the unpreparedness of India's security agencies to counter a domestic Islamist threat. Whether or not al-Qaeda was behind the latest attack, that happy complacency must now have ended.

D. THE GUARDIAN

1. Peter Cruickshank, "Tackling Kashmir," *Guardian*, December 3, 2008, at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2008/dec/03/mumbai-terrorism-kashmir-pakistan-india>

Although the investigation into last week's attacks in Mumbai is at an early stage, the first indications are that it was carried out by Lashkar e Taiba (LeT), a Kashmiri militant group, with close organisational ties to al-Qaida. According to Indian authorities, a captured Pakistani terrorist has confessed that he was tasked by the Kashmiri terrorist outfit to launch the attacks.

The confession did not take terrorism experts by surprise. Last week's suicidal assault on Mumbai – which was both discriminate and wildly indiscriminate, as if the trigger-happy terrorists imagined themselves in some grisly video game where bonus points were awarded for killing Americans, Britons and Israelis – bore both striking similarity to the "fedayeen" operations that LeT has regularly carried out against Indian troops in Kashmir, and the hallmark of a group strongly affiliated with al-Qaida.

Furthermore, the terrorists' sophistication, their forward planning, apparent use of booby traps and deadly effectiveness under fire, means they almost certainly received rigorous training from a well-established Jihadist group. Even without the confession supplied to Indian authorities, suspicions would be falling on Lashkar e Taiba. Of all Pakistani militant groups, LeT has long had the most intensive training programme for would-be fighters. And unlike some other groups who mostly recruit from madrasas, LeT has also concentrated its recruitment drive on university-educated individuals that it can train to be skilled operatives. (It is useful here to point out that, according to early reports, the captured terrorist speaks good English).

If the attack was launched by LeT, then its immediate goal was almost certainly to torpedo the possibility of a settlement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. The prospects for such a deal had improved after the election of a civilian government in Pakistan, less hawkish on the Kashmir issue than Pakistan's military brass.

... There should be no higher priority for the incoming Obama administration than preventing tensions from again rising between India and Pakistan. That will not be easy. With a general election approaching, India's Congress party is under intense pressure to deal decisively with the terrorist threat emanating from Pakistan. Indian leaders may feel, with some justification, that the United States is not the only power with the right to launch unilateral military strikes against terrorists in Pakistan. ...

The stakes in south Asia are very high, and not only because of the all-too-imaginable consequences of a nuclear exchange between Pakistan and India. Already, Pakistani officials have vowed to redeploy troops fighting al-Qaida and affiliated militant groups in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (Fata) of northwestern Pakistan, if India takes retaliatory measures. ... The removal of Pakistani military pressure from the tribal areas would allow al-Qaida to boost its operational capabilities considerably in the area, significantly threatening the national security of many western states.

... If LeT elements did indeed launch the Mumbai attacks, part of its goal undoubtedly would have been to force a redirection of the Pakistani military from counter-insurgency operations against LeT's allies in the tribal areas back towards confronting India.

Preventing tensions from escalating between India and Pakistan must only be the first step in a comprehensive South Asia strategy for the incoming Obama administration. Another crisis will soon erupt unless US policymakers devote significant effort to restructuring the geopolitical relationship between Pakistan

and India in the medium term. Key here is Kashmir, a conflict hitherto relatively neglected by Washington. ...

Ultimately, however, the relationship between Pakistan and India cannot be improved unless the relationship between the Pakistani military and Pakistani state is also restructured. ...

Over the next four years, the Obama administration should dedicate significant resources to strengthening civilian government in Pakistan, while also putting pressure on the Pakistani military to rein in the activities of militant groups. ...

... Yesterday India, rather than announcing a mobilisation of troops, requested Pakistan hand over 20 militant leaders suspected of having previously orchestrated attacks in India, including Hafiz Mohammed Saeed, the leader of LeT. If India can produce persuasive evidence that these suspects have been engaged in international terrorism, the United States and Britain should put great pressure on Pakistani authorities to give up at least some of these leaders, even if it causes some internal strife. The alternative will be a new cycle of escalated tension with India. Pakistan has outsourced its wars for a decade and a half to Islamist extremists; it cannot afford to likewise outsource its future.

Paul Cruickshank is the author of Al Qaeda: the current threat, (Pocket Issue 2008)

**2. Simon Jenkins, "At Last, This Exhausted Region is energised - By its Old
Foe," Guardian, December 3, 2008, at
[http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/03/us-iraq-india-
pakistan-lebanon](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/03/us-iraq-india-pakistan-lebanon)**

The massacre in Mumbai has stirred the ghost of war between India and Pakistan, just when relations were supposedly improving. That is what the terrorists wanted. That is the lesson that came from the west after 9/11. If belligerence and thumping retaliation are the lodestars of counter-terrorism, India is now entitled to assault Pakistan.

Until Washington went to war on Afghanistan in the autumn of 2001, virtually every nation in the region sympathised with the US over 9/11. The widespread view was that Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida had gone too far, much too far. It might take time to curb him, but even Iran and Egypt sent condolences, and Yasser Arafat gave blood for the people of New York. We tend to forget this.

The wars on Afghanistan and Iraq crushed all opportunity to use the disaster as a prelude to reconciliation, though Tony Blair did boldly pursue that opening in the weeks immediately after 9/11. It was obliterated by the Pentagon's rush to

war. The spirit of jihad fuelled a retaliatory jihad. The west breathed the word crusade.

A similar opportunity can be detected again. Sensible Indians know that sensible Pakistanis are appalled by the horror taking hold of their country. Opinion in both states can see that the surest route to curbing extremism is to normalise relations and collaborate against an insurgency that is feasting on the Nato occupation of Afghanistan. More Pakistani soldiers have died as a result of the occupation than those of any other state.

Exhausted is the best word to describe the so-called arc of instability from the Mediterranean to Islamabad after eight years of western intervention. ... Lebanon is exhausted by its feud with Syria and Syria by its feud with Israel. Hamas in Gaza is exhausted by its feud with Fatah. Israel, even as it approaches an election, is exhausted by the threat from Hizbullah. As a result its politicians might, just might, at last cut a deal with Syria - through the agency of the Saudis - on Golan and the West Bank.

Eastwards, the war in Iraq is petering out through sheer exhaustion. Two million Iraqis camped outside Damascus cannot hope to go home until the Americans have left and some new settlement reached between Sunnis and Shias.

Iran, too, is a nation exhausted by external sanctions and internal squabbling between clerics and secularists, its economy deteriorating and oil revenues crashing. If only the outside world can back off, a moderate victory in its forthcoming election is just possible.

In Afghanistan exhaustion is reflected in the desperate pragmatism of its ruler, Hamid Karzai. He surveys his dwindling sphere of power but cannot cleanse his regime of the corruption and drug-lordism that exasperates his western masters. Seven years after the toppling of the Taliban, the leaders of the west now advocate talking to them.

Along the North-West Frontier, NATO is entering precisely the strategic trap that closed round the Russians in the 1990s - and the British in the 19th century. Yet even here, the rough coalition of Taliban, al-Qaida and other insurgents is hard pressed by the Pakistan army, while extremist subsidies flowing from the Gulf are said to be declining. It is possible, just possible, that even al-Qaida too is exhausted.

Long wave theory suggests that the Muslim world may now be ready for a reaction against the extremism that has brought such devastation on its head for the past two decades. It has not just torn apart small countries, such as Lebanon,

Iraq and Afghanistan, but convulsed large ones, such as Turkey, Egypt, Iran and Pakistan. It has given unprecedented potency to sects, militias and gangs, yet has failed to create peace - let alone the caliphate.

Any traveller to these parts at present is overwhelmed by Obamania. From the dinner tables of Lahore to the lecture halls of Beirut's American University, the president-elect carries an astonishing burden of expectation. To a people for whom George W Bush became synonymous with mindless anti-Americanism, Obama's race, name, moderation and lack of bombast have risen like a messiah from another land.

The hopes are unreal. Obama will back the Saudi plan for the Middle East and push Israel to the negotiating table. He will end the occupation of Iraq. He will calm relations with Iran and recognise that US aggression has aided only extremism. He will unleash his general, David Petraeus, to negotiate with the Taliban. He will stop bombing Pakistan villages and recruiting thousands to al-Qaida. Obama will aid Pakistan's secular schools, not its army.

These expectations are close to absurd. ... Yet Obama's store of goodwill must be unprecedented for a US leader in modern times. Were he to visit Cairo or Beirut or even Tehran, he would be greeted as a custodian of promise. An area battered by dreadful US policies for a decade wants only a smile, a nudge and a promise to do better from a country that has done it such harm. It is not the plausibility of these expectations that is significant but the fervour with which they are held. The Lebanon Daily Star wrote for the region last week when it declared: "We all went to the polls on November 4." If Obama can withdraw his troops from the region, stifling the chief oxygen of jihad, a moment of opportunity would be at hand. ...

E. RUSSIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS RELEASE

"On the Terrorist Acts in Mumbai," November 27, 2008, at http://www.in.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/378B2A3A2086880CC325750E0052BCDB

On November 26, a series of terrorist acts were carried out in different areas of the Indian city Mumbai, killing more than 100 people and injuring hundreds of others. After several blasts the terrorists seized the Taj Mahal and Oberoi hotels in the central part of the city and took guests hostage.

President of the Russian Federation Dmitry Medvedev has sent a message of condolences to the President and Prime Minister of the Republic of India expressing sympathy to the Indian people, strongly condemning the monstrous terrorist crimes, which undermine the foundations of civilized society and stable

law and order, and expressing confidence that the culprits will be given the harshest punishment. Russia supports the resolute actions of India to suppress terrorist acts.

According to available data, Russian citizens did not suffer as a result of the terrorist acts. The Russian Embassy in India and Consulate General in Mumbai maintain close cooperation with the Indian authorities.

III. WEST ASIA

A. JERUSALEM POST

1. Shmuley Boteach, "Love the Victims, Loathe their Killers," *Jerusalem Post*, December 3, 2009, at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702389332&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

All terrorism is monstrous, but the murder of Rabbi Gavriel and Rivka Holtzberg by "religious Islamic extremists" stands out for its unspeakable infamy. The deliberate targeting of a small Jewish center and its married young directors, whose only purpose it was to provide for the religious needs of a community and feed travelers, proves that those who perpetrated this crime are bereft not only of even a hint of humanity, but every shred of faith as well. ...

When Osama bin Laden, whose beard masks the face of the ultimate religious hypocrite, attacked the World Trade Center in New York, the target was purportedly chosen as the very symbol of American materialism and excess. But what could these "religious" people have been thinking in exterminating a 20-something couple with two babies who moved from the world's richest country to India to provide religious services and faith to the poor and the needy? What blow against Western decadence were they striking by targeting a Chabad House whose entire purpose it is to spread spirituality to people whose lives lack it? Now is not only a time to remember the victims but to hate their killers. One cannot love the innocent without simultaneously loathing those who orphan their children.

I KNOW how uncomfortable people feel about hatred. It smacks of revenge. It poisons the heart of those who hate. But this is true only if we hate the good, the innocent or the neutral. Hating monsters, however, motivates us to fight them. Only if an act like this repulses us to our core will we summon the will to fight these devils so that they can never murder again. ...

... NOW IS the time for our Muslim cleric brethren to rise in chorus and condemn the repulsive assassins who use Islam to justify their hatred.

... I suggest that best possible response by the world Jewish community to this tragedy is to implement a program of a Jewish peace corps to Chabad Houses the world over. Young people, especially students 16 to 30, should offer to spend two weeks of each summer volunteering for a Chabad House somewhere in the world to help the emissaries with their very difficult and important work.

Finally, the world witnessed how the Holtzberg's non-Jewish nanny, Sandra Samuels, saved their two-year-old Moshe's life, running out with the child while risking being mowed down by machine-gun fire. In that instant, we saw how religious differences pale beside the higher of us all being equally God's children, Indian and Jew, Muslim and Christian, and how acts of courage and compassion are what unite us.

The writer is the founder of This World: The Jewish Values Network. His upcoming book, *The Kosher Sutra*, will be published in January by HarperOne.

2. Kanchan Gupta, "At a Time of Shared Grief, Let's Not Hurt Each Other,"
December 3, 2009, at
<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702404796&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

As a friend of Israel, I grieve as much for the six Jews, among them Rabbi Gavriel Noach Holtzberg and his wife Rivka, as for my fellow Indians and others who were killed in last week's mass slaughter by Islamic terrorists in Mumbai. As a father of two children, I weep for two-year-old Moshe Holtzberg.

Fear lurks at the back of my mind: Some day I could become a victim of jihadi terror and my children would be orphaned; worse, like many parents in India, I would live to see them killed by terrorists. It's all a matter of chance - of being in the wrong place at the wrong time: Life is uncertain in the bad times we are living in.

At this very moment, all of India is shocked, outraged and furious that such a terrible massacre should have happened on our soil. We feel frustrated that it could not be prevented. We feel angry that so many lives have been lost in so cruel a manner. We feel humiliated that a nation of more than a billion people has been made to look so vulnerable and weak.

YET, IN this gathering gloom, there is also steely determination. In cities and towns and villages, people are determined not be overwhelmed by the violence unleashed by terrorists. We value our democracy and we cherish our way of life. Neither is negotiable, nor will we compromise on our open, plural society.

Based on my interactions with Israelis during my visit to Israel and from the many conversations I have had with Israeli friends in Delhi and abroad, I can safely suggest that these are values shared by both countries. It is because we are democracies and boast of open societies anchored in freedom of speech and human liberty that we continue to be targeted by Islamists.

This, in a way, is a shared experience, a shared tragedy, for India and Israel. Israel has suffered on account of Islamist terrorism for long. India has been bleeding since 1989. If we go back in history, we will find that the sword of Islam has been wielded with as much ferocity against Hindus as against Jews.

... THERE HAS been criticism in Israel of the manner in which Indian security forces handled the hostage situation at Chabad House. I can understand Defense Minister Ehud Barak's anguish, as well as that of other Israeli officials. Many things are said in grief and anger that are not necessarily meant to hurt a friend.

But four points need to be made, if only to dispel notions of failure on part of Indian security forces. First, Chabad House received as much attention as the other two establishments which were attacked: Taj Mahal Palace Hotel and Oberoi Trident Hotel. Second, in all probability, the hostages at Chabad House were killed even before our National Security Guard commandos could move in. The brutal slayings and the commando raid are not necessarily linked. Third, the commandos suffered casualties during the Chabad House raid. Fourth, it was Sandra Samuel, the 44-year-old Indian nanny of Moshe, who saved the child from a horrific death: Had she not shown exemplary courage, which was really far beyond the call of duty, we would have been grieving for one more life lost to jihadi violence.

The war that is being waged on India also affects Israel. It would be to our benefit if we were to join hands and stand together, and look our common enemy in the eye, not as two separate nations but as partners in a noble mission. Recrimination and accusation will serve little or no purpose, other than in strengthening those who wish to destroy both Israel and India. ...

The writer is associate editor of *The Pioneer* in New Delhi. www.dailypioneer.com

3. Kevin Kolben, "Blowing an Opportunity with India," *Jerusalem Post*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702404789&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

Like many others with India connections, for much of the last few days I have been bolted to my computer screen, trying to follow and absorb every development in the horrible attack on Mumbai. These are places and institutions very much known to me: The Oberoi Trident is where my students and I stay during my annual study trip to India; and ever since my first trip to India in the mid-'90s, when I stayed in the grubby Salvation Army Red Shield Hostel just across from the far more luxurious Taj Mahal Palace Hotel, the Colaba area has remained a mainstay for me whenever I visit my favorite Indian city.

The attack on the Chabad House also hit home. Although I had never visited the new Chabad outpost, several years ago, while spending a summer conducting research in Mumbai, I became friendly with the two Chabad emissaries at the time, Reb Shlomo and Reb Shlomo, who had just started to set up shop there. The new Chabad House at Nariman House was the legacy of their initial work. So watching the violence unfold from the safe perch of my couch in Tel Aviv felt very personal.

Here in Israel, the coverage of the attacks has been extensive. Israelis always pay close attention to terror attacks by Islamic militant groups around the world, and especially so when Jews and Israelis are specifically targeted. But unfortunately, in typical Israeli fashion, much of the commentary in the media, informally on the street and occasionally in the government has been critical: The operation took too long, it wasn't professional and, of course, "why didn't they just let us come in and take care of it." The recent statements by the head of the Zaka team that flew to Mumbai have also added fuel to the fire, causing many headaches for the Foreign Ministry which recognizes the delicacy of Indian sensibilities.

SOME OF this criticism is perhaps warranted. Indeed, India is a developing country with many resource challenges and skill deficits. And in the end, six Israelis are dead. But all the negative chatter in Israel will only lead to a wasted opportunity for building up support and unity with a country that in a number of ways has a common history and shared fate.

Despite having both gained independence from British rule and establishing a state in 1948, relations between the two countries have been a work in progress. Although India's relationship with its Jews has never been problematic in the religiously heterogeneous and largely tolerant country, there has long been skepticism of the Zionist project and the Israeli state's often misguided approach to the Palestinian issue. Indeed, India and Israel only established diplomatic ties in 1992, a delay due largely to India's traditional ties to the Soviet block and to its post-colonial sympathies with the Palestinian cause. Today, the main opposition to Israel-India relations emanates from the still relevant and influential Left parties, as well as many of the country's intellectuals, who often view Israel's political existence in a colonial frame.

But the relationship between the two countries over the last decade has rapidly strengthened. ... In addition to the stream of tourists, trade between the two countries has rapidly increased, making India the third largest export destination in Asia for Israel. Non-military trade in 2008 between the two countries has been estimated at \$3.3 billion, and defense related trade at about \$1.5 billion.

India is currently Israel's biggest buyer of arms and weapons systems, and Israel is set to replace Russia as India's second largest supplier.

There are also numerous links in the hi-tech sector, as well as the low-tech sector such as industrial dairy cow technologies and deep-sea aquaculture. In the meantime, Israeli military officials recently visited India and Kashmir, looking to provide training to Indian forces on counterterrorism techniques.

SOME INDIAN and Israeli officials think that this attack was intended, in part, to disrupt the growing economic and military ties between the two countries.

But it is unfortunate that some Israelis have chosen to criticize and attack India, rattling the old cages of mistrust instead of creating and building on a sense of shared fate and mutual interest. The message now should be one of solidarity, rather than one that provides fire for those who view Israel as no more than a colonial outpost with imperialist intentions, or for those protecting national pride from outside critics. Israel has much to gain from building economic, political, and cultural ties with India, which is fast growing into one of the world's most important economies and political actors.

There is no need to take this opportunity to miss an opportunity.

The writer is an assistant professor at Rutgers Business School in New Jersey and a visiting professor at Tel Aviv University's Buchmann School of Law during 2008-9. He writes about transnational labor and economic regulation, and frequently visits and conducts research in India.

4. Editorial, "Thinking Beyond Mumbai," *Jerusalem Post*, December 1, 2008, at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702389266&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

We well know that Muslim extremists are at war with other civilizations. We know, too, that there is a struggle between Islamists and moderates for the soul of Islam. What we often fail to remember, however, is yet another overlapping dispute within Islam - between the Sunni and Shi'ite worlds.

Pakistan, for instance, has a history of sectarian violence between Sunnis and Shi'ites dating back to the 1960s. Last week's coordinated terrorist attacks in Mumbai seem to have their roots in Pakistan, where Sunni jihadis who cut their teeth on murderous assaults against Shi'ites are now proving that they won't hesitate to slaughter Christians, Jews, Hindus or anyone else they regard as a deviant sect.

All of this highlights a fact that should become increasingly relevant to the foreign policy planning of the incoming Obama administration, as well as to the next Israeli government: The line between jihad within Islam and jihad against non-Muslims is becoming more and more blurred.

WESTERN observers tend to see the Islamic world in monolithic terms, thereby missing the basic fault line that characterizes the world's 1.5 billion Muslims: the divide between the Sunni majority and the Shi'ite minority. That divide, rooted in 7th-century disagreements over the succession to Muhammad, is becoming ever more salient. No view of the strategic reality in the Middle East - and of Iran's role in particular - can be adequate without taking it into account.

The Sunni-Shi'ite schism fueled Sunni Arab dictator Saddam Hussein's devastating war on Shi'ite, non-Arab Iran - and on his own Shi'ite Arab subjects.

The same schism is, in large measure, what lies at the heart of the sectarian violence in Iraq today. It also explains the insecurity of Bashar Assad of Syria, a country which is mostly Sunni but which since 1970 has been ruled by a small Shi'ite-like sect known as the Alawites.

In the opposite manner, this schism dictates the political dynamics of Bahrain, where a Sunni minority rules a restive Shi'ite majority. In Lebanon, it motivates Hizbullah's brazen bid for Shi'ite supremacy, and finds Egypt and Saudi Arabia attempting to protect Sunni interests in the face of continued Syrian intervention.

Since 1989, internecine Sunni-Shi'ite violence has claimed more than 4,000 lives in Pakistan, a predominantly Sunni country which has the second-largest Shi'ite population after Iran.

The Sunni-Shi'ite divide also bears heavily on the question of Arabian crude oil, since some 45 percent of the world's proven oil reserves lie in Shi'ite territory.

TRUE, the Sunni-Shi'ite rivalry is but one layer in the exceptionally complex and at times indecipherable matrix of Islamic politics. It is also true that it can occasionally be overcome, as when Persian Shi'ite Iran supports Arab Sunni Hamas because both share a radical agenda.

But ever since Ayatollah Khomeini's 1979 revolution in Iran, Sunni establishments from Cairo to Baghdad to Amman, fearing a rising Shi'ite tide, got their backs up.

Some Sunni caliphs - especially in Saudi Arabia, home to the extreme Wahhabi form of Sunni Islam - began to call Shi'ites a bigger threat to Islam than

Christianity and Judaism. Jordan's King Abdullah spoke anxiously of a "Shi'ite crescent" reaching from Beirut to Teheran. In Egypt, the Arab world's largest Sunni country, Hosni Mubarak declared a couple of years back that "most Shi'ites are loyal to Iran, and not to the countries they are living in."

The Saudi-Pakistani alliance, which underwrote both the Taliban and jihadis in Kashmir, was a marriage of convenience formed to counter Iran's Shi'ite influence. An Iranian diplomat was kidnapped earlier this month in Pakistan's northwest.

More recently - and more ominously - some Sunni states declared their intention to acquire nuclear capabilities in response to Iran's ambitions in that direction. To paper over these differences, Iran has offered to share civilian nuclear technology with the Sunnis.

We are seeing a new alignment of relatively moderate Sunni states, like Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Egypt, developing against Shi'ite extremist regimes in Iran, Syria and Hizbullahland.

By factoring in the Sunni-Shi'ite divide even when we think about Pakistan and Mumbai, we register a phenomenon that threatens destabilization from India to Egypt.

5. Editorial, "The Scourge of Terror," *Jerusalem Post*, November 30, 2008, at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702364464&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

Israelis began Shabbat knowing that the siege at Chabad House in Mumbai had ended disastrously. On Saturday night, though, the full scope of the devastation was revealed: Nine Jews were murdered, seven of them Israelis. We still do not know if there are additional Israeli or Jewish victims among the other casualties.

The toll of this mega-terrorist attack - which began Wednesday night and did not end until Saturday morning - is estimated at about 200 killed, including some 20 foreigners. Hundreds were wounded. These figures may yet climb.

Most of the victims, it should be noted, were Indian citizens, and this newspaper reiterates its condolences to their families and government. Throughout Mumbai, hundreds of households are in mourning.

Though we are a nation of only some seven million souls, we well appreciate that even in a nation of more than 1 billion, every human life is precious.

But naturally the murders of our compatriots and coreligionists, and the bereavement of their families are, today, foremost on our minds. A two-year-old boy, Moshe Holtzberg, will grow up an orphan. The anniversary of the death of his parents, Chabad emissaries Rabbi Gavriel Holtzberg and his rabbanit, Rivka, will in perpetuity coincide with his birthday.

This will be a week of funerals in Israel, and in Jewish communities abroad, for the Mumbai victims. Psalms will be recited - "Man is like a breath, his days are like a passing shadow..." The kaddish prayer will be chanted. And those offering condolences will pray that the families of the deceased are "comforted among the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem."

There will be time to reflect on each individual life that was taken. But even now, one thing is plain: Those killed at the Chabad House were murdered because they were Jewish or Israeli.

The terrorists did not inquire whether their victims were haredi, Orthodox, traditional or secular. Nor did the killers ask about their politics. All that really mattered was that they were living representatives of Jewish civilization.

Each of them died sanctifying God's name.

Israeli officials are right to argue that the civilized world is under attack. This time the assault came in India, next time it will come somewhere else. The enemy is Islamic extremism. Its immediate goal is to vanquish - by any means necessary - Western symbols and values from those parts of the world it claims as Muslim.

IT WILL take time for all the facts associated with this attack to come out. For now, there are more questions than answers.

1. How many terrorists were involved? Authorities say at least nine were killed and one - a Pakistani national - captured.

But there is every reason to believe that the number of terrorists and facilitators who brought Mumbai to a halt is far greater. This was an operation that was meticulously planned and executed. It stretches credulity to believe that these individuals were acting alone.

2. Could the security operation at the Chabad House have been better executed? Might the hostages have been rescued?

It is possible that the terrorists murdered their victims within minutes of storming the facility. And Indian forces may have been stretched too thin and

were operating without several of their top commanders who had been killed at the outset of the assault on Mumbai. Rather than second guess their efforts, we prefer to wait until more is known.

3. And finally, even though this was clearly an assault against innocent civilians and exclusively against civilian targets - hospitals, hotels and a train station - why does much of the British media, including the BBC and SkyNews, label the killers "militants" instead of terrorists? Why does the The Guardian join Al-Jazeera in calling them "gunmen"?

This may sound like a marginal concern, but nomenclature matters: The primary, often only, target of terrorists are civilians. Anti-civilian warfare is a key tool of Muslim extremists. Terrorism is a cruelty that has become the scourge of modern civilization and changed the way we live. It has debased humanity.

The international community, together with responsible elements in the media, should show zero tolerance for the kind of depravity manifested in Mumbai.

And a vital step to confronting it effectively is to recognize terrorism and call it by its name.

6. Editorial, "Mumbai Terror: In Cold Blood," *Jerusalem Post*, November 27, 2008, at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1227702350509&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

The dreadful images coming out of Mumbai since late Wednesday night have stunned Israelis - and not just because the city's Chabad House was targeted along with a hospital, open market, the main train station, a popular restaurant and two posh landmark hotels. At least 125 people are known killed and some 327 wounded.

The bloodbath reminds us that, though Muslim extremism is often traceable to some local grievance, it's in essence part of a larger conflict between civilizations. Islamists are violently affronted when Hindus, Jews, Buddhist or Christians are sovereign over a Muslim minority.

AS WE try to make sense of the mayhem unleashed on Mumbai, a city of some 13 million souls, our thoughts naturally are with the family of Gavriel and Rivka Holtzberg. We are anxious, too, for the dozen or so other Israeli hostages. And we express our condolences to the people of Mumbai who have lost loved ones in this reprehensible assault.

Mumbai has been attacked six times since 1993, most recently in 2006 when 200 people were killed in a train-bombing. The nature of the latest attacks, however, with multiple terror teams hitting some 10 targets with explosives, automatic rifle-fire and grenades - in an operation that carried on from one day into the next - suggests a far higher level of coordination and training than anything seen before. Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said the attacks were launched from outside India "with the single-minded determination to create havoc in the commercial capital of the country." Plainly, the terrorists are connected to elements in the failed state of Pakistan. At least some of them may have arrived by sea, landing across from the Taj Mahal hotel.

They hunted-down guests with US, British and Israeli passports to take as hostages. At the Chabad House, Indian neighbors nobly tried to fend off the attackers until they themselves were driven back by terrorists' bullets.

Israelis feel at one with the people of India, especially at times like these. Both countries are modern incarnations of ancient civilizations. We share common political values, overlapping security concerns and a growing commerce.

India was established in 1947; Israel in 1948. Both peoples rejected British rule, both faced Muslim opposition to their independence. The subcontinent was divided into the secular state of India and the Muslim state of Pakistan. In the Mideast, the Palestinian Arabs rejected the idea of two states for two peoples. Substantially, they still do.

Though much still needs to be done to draw India and Israel closer, enormous steps have been taken since New Delhi first recognized Israel in 1950 and finally established an embassy in 1992. Israel has actually maintained a consular presence in Mumbai, formerly Bombay, since 1952.

India is a genuine multicultural democracy. Among its 1.1 billion people are 150 million Muslims. Its former president, and father of New Delhi's nuclear program, is a Muslim.

NO ONE yet knows who carried out these attacks and speculation is rampant. Pakistan has in the past encouraged terrorism in Kashmir. Its doubtful India's unstable neighbor is explicitly responsible for the aggression (the government there denounced it), but Pakistan has multiple power centers and its intelligence service has previously been linked to the Taliban. Both they and al-Qaida have an interest in diverting attention away from the Pakistan-Afghan border. And coincidentally, Pakistani troops reportedly opened fire on Indian positions along their joint border on Thursday. Still, al-Qaida specializes in mega-attacks using suicide bombers, which was not the case here. Even if it turns out that this

outrage was the handiwork of Lashkar-e-Toiba - or one of its front-groups - which wants to turn India into a Muslim state, that still doesn't unveil the real masterminds.

Whoever did this wanted to create panic, scare off foreigners, undermine India's economy and turn the country's people against one another.

ISRAELIS have long argued that no political grievance, no perceived injustice and no religious creed can ever justify waging war against civilians. Others have sometimes made excuses for "resistance" movements.

If any consolation can be derived out of the heartbreak in Mumbai, perhaps it will be that India will work ever more vigorously in international forums to isolate terrorists and the state's that sponsor them.

B. HAARETZ

1. Anshel Pfeffer, "Stop Offending India," Haaretz, December 2, 2009, at <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1042340.html>

There are many Israelis who are convinced that they are experts on terrorism. There are also more than a few who fancy they know a lot about India. Terrorism in India is a slightly more complex topic, and the chorus of those who were once somebody in security, quick to harshly criticize over the weekend the way in which Indian security forces handled the coordinated terrorist assault in Mumbai, were guilty of more than arrogance. That chorus is liable to do serious damage to a vital strategic relationship.

... there are those in Israel who think we have advice to offer a mammoth country that is home to 1.1 billion people belonging to hundreds of religious groups and sects while it is coping with simultaneous multiple attacks on large civilian targets, a scenario Israel has never experienced. The insulting tone of inaccurate reports stating that India "refused" to accept aid from Israel is especially ludicrous.

... The Indians are also angry that the Israelis are focusing solely on the attack on Chabad House and the Israeli and Jewish victims who were killed there, while ignoring the fact that the security forces managed to rescue hundreds of civilians from the large hotels under attack and forgetting about the losses suffered by the Indian police and army units who stormed the terrorists.

For years, India has been perceived in Israel as the leader of the non-aligned countries and as a country that instinctively backs the Arab states. In recent years, though, senior officials in both countries attest to the blossoming of an

unprecedented relationship. Both India and Israel are highly concerned over the nuclear Islamic superpower that is Pakistan, which is now in the advanced stages of disintegrating. There is a free flow of information exchange between the two countries. The attack on Mumbai highlights both of their positions on the front line against Islamic terrorism. The great deal of attention being paid to Israeli criticism of India does not help solidify this front.

"We must not spit now into the well from which we drink," said an Israeli defense source who is familiar with the ties between the two states. "There is a common fight against terror, and we need to leverage this into even closer cooperation."

2. Editorial, "A Little Modesty wouldn't Hurt," *Haaretz*, December 1, 2008, at <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1042341.html>

The terrorist attacks in Mumbai, which left 174 people dead and hundreds wounded, also claimed at least six Israeli and Jewish victims. Naturally, the event evoked sorrow over the loss of life, tinged with rage toward the terrorists who targeted Chabad House, which is run by an organization whose offices constitute a meeting place for Israelis and Jews traveling abroad. To our regret, these obligatory reactions were accompanied by shrill voices that emitted an odious scent of patronization and by baseless populist declarations.

Israeli officials who earn their living from defense contracting and security consultations were quick to criticize India's security forces and to dish out advice on how to deal with terrorist attacks. An outstanding example was Minister Rafi Eitan, who blamed the Indians' shoddy preparation for such scenarios. This is the same Eitan who, during his service in the Israeli defense establishment, embroiled Israel in the Pollard affair, tripping up the Jewish spy in a case that got him a life sentence. Eitan could learn a thing or two from the Indian home minister, who oversees most of his country's security agencies. He resigned from his post after accepting responsibility for the lack of prior intelligence on the terrorist cell as well as for the slow response to the attack.

Unfortunately, no country, including Israel, is immune to terrorism, and no elite unit can guarantee the safe rescue of hostages taken captive by fanatic terrorists, who embarked on their mission with the aim of killing and ready to be killed themselves. Even countries with the most advanced security and intelligence services, like the United States, cannot thwart terror attacks or prevent the mass slaughter of civilians, as happened on September 11, 2001.

It is more convenient to recall the 1976 Entebbe rescue operation than to remember the very same, vaunted Sayeret Matkal unit storming a school in

Ma'alot, which had been taken over by a group of terrorists two years earlier. The operation left 22 children dead. Less than one year later, the attempt by Sayeret commandos to rescue hostages held in Tel Aviv's Savoy Hotel left eight civilians dead, and also cost the lives of paratroop brigade commander Uzi Yairi and Sayeret soldier Itamar Ben David. In October 1994, the soldier Nachshon Wachsman was killed as Sayeret Matkal forces broke into the house where he was being held hostage by terrorists. IDF Captain Nir Poraz was killed in the operation and seven soldiers were wounded. Meanwhile, Gilad Shalit has been held captive for over two years just a few kilometers from the heart of the country.

The Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem acted commendably in distancing itself from the criticism, releasing a statement that read: "In Israel, we are convinced that the Indian security forces did everything in order to prevent harm from coming to the hostages and civilians during the storming of Chabad House." The ministry emphasized that relations between Israel and India withstood a test during the tragic events in Mumbai. It would behoove a government official to call out certain politicians like Housing Minister Ze'ev Boim, who proposed that thousands of Jewish institutions around the world, including Chabad centers, be added to the long list of Israeli missions that are outfitted with security details from the Shin Bet security service.

Terrorist attacks are a cause for sorrow and rage, not for arrogant statements and impossible ideas.

3. Anshel Pfeffer, "Israel: 8 Israelis Killed in Mumbai Terror Attacks,"
Haaretz, November 29, 2008, at
<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1041834.html>

MUMBAI - A Foreign Ministry statement issued Saturday announced that eight Israelis in all had been killed in a wave of terror attacks that rocked the Indian city of Mumbai, leaving at least 195 people dead and hundreds wounded.

An earlier announcement revealed that the bodies of eight hostages had been removed from the Chabad House in Mumbai and taken to local hospitals for identification. On Friday, only six of the eight had been found. According to the ministry statement, five of the eight hostages were Israelis, some holding dual citizenships.

Haaretz correspondent in Mumbai Ashel Pfeffer reported Saturday that the bodies of six of the eight hostages found at the Chabad center had been positively identified. He added that Israel may have to fly crime lab analysts to

India for positive identification before the bodies can be flown back to Israel for burial.

On Friday, Defense Minister Ehud Barak told Channel 1 Television that the bodies of two women and three men had been found at the Chabad center, one of 10 targets attacked by suspected Muslim terrorists across India's financial capital. The body of a third woman was found later in the building.

The Chabad-Lubavitch movement confirmed Friday evening that an Israeli-born American rabbi Gavriel Holtzberg, 29, and his wife Rivka, 28 were among the dead.

Barak said two men who supervised Jewish dietary laws were also apparently among the dead. They were later identified as Leibish Teitlebau, an American from Brooklyn, and Ben-Zion Croman, an Israeli with dual U.S. citizenship.

Barak added that some of the bodies had been tied up, and that two women had been killed many hours before.

"All in all, it was a difficult spectacle," he said.

The defense minister said, without elaborating, that the roots of the attack were in India, but involved militants in Pakistan and Afghanistan as well.

While acknowledging the complexity of ending the attacks across sprawling Mumbai, Barak added, "I'm not sure it had to last three days, but that's what happened."

Israel offered all manner of help to Indian officials, Barak said, including assistance "that is inappropriate to detail here."

Israel's ambassador to India, Mark Sofer, however, consistently dismissed reports that Israeli commandos took part in the operation.

... Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni, speaking at a news conference in Jerusalem, said Friday that it was no coincidence the Chabad center had been attacked.

"There is no doubt, we know, that the targets the terrorists singled out were Jewish, Israeli targets and targets identified with the West, Americans and Britons," Livni said.

"Our world is under attack, it doesn't matter whether it happens in India or somewhere else," she added. "There are Islamic extremists who don't accept our existence or Western values."

Her words echoed those of Mark Sofer, who said earlier that out of the thousands of buildings in Mumbai, it was hard to believe that the terrorists had stumbled by chance upon the Jewish center.

... Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh blamed the attacks on militant groups based in neighboring countries, usually meaning Pakistan, raising fears of renewed tension between the nuclear-armed rivals. "It is evident that the group which carried out these attacks, based outside the country, had come with single-minded determination to create havoc in the commercial capital of the country," he said in a televised address. "We will take the strongest possible measures to ensure that there is no repetition of such terrorist acts."

5. Amos Harel, "Israel Cannot Defend against Attacks such as one at Mumbai Chabad House," *Haaretz*, November 28, 2008, at <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1041744.html>

Since last February, the defense establishment has been involved in a worldwide effort to protect Israeli citizens and Jewish centers from attack by Hezbollah as revenge for the assassination of Imad Mughniyeh. Serious attacks have been thwarted during that time. But the terror attack in Mumbai, in which the local Chabad House was a secondary target, indicates that Israel will never quite cover local Islamic terror in developing nations.

It is possible, with tremendous effort and close cooperation with foreign intelligence services, to stop Hezbollah cells when they plot attacks on Israeli embassies. Unofficial delegates can be briefed to be alert and cautious. But it is all but impossible to protect the Israeli tourist or delegate caught in such a ferocious and coordinated attack as the one in India this week.

... Israel has traditionally handled hostage situations differently. Frequent use of negotiations has not led to surrender to terrorist demands, but to their weakening, and the acquisition of valuable intelligence for rescue units. In the Mumbai hotels, the scenario was very different. Elite Indian commando forces battled dozens of hostage-takers in urban territory with the bodies of the victims lying on hallway floors. But at Chabad House, maybe because it was a smaller site, the Indians opted to delay storming the building.

As far as Israel is concerned, the terror attacks were preceded only by vague alerts of possible attacks on Israeli targets in India (more specific threats against

the Chabad House in Thailand led to private security during the Jewish holidays). Although intelligence gathering on international Islamic terror is a high Mossad priority, and even though Military Intelligence has expanded its operations since the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, the information is very limited. Chabad House is a prominent and well-known target and, like other sites attacked on Wednesday, is considered a "soft" target. In other words, no real security.

The delay in storming the building apparently allowed time for Israeli involvement in analyzing the tactical conditions and exploiting expertise in negotiating with hostage-takers. The Israeli army has a detailed plan for rescuing hostages abroad, but it is unlikely India would have allowed it. Why did the attackers also choose a Jewish target? A senior researcher at the Institute for Counter-Terrorism, Lior Lotan, says that Chabad House was a secondary target, a hit on the "Smaller Satan" while attacking the "Great Satan," the "Crusaders," Western tourists and relations between the West and Indian authorities.

Dr. Yoram Schweitzer of Tel Aviv University's Institute for National Security Studies says Al-Qaida's interest in Israel has increased over the years. Since 2002, there have been a series of attacks on Jews and Israelis, from the attack in Mombasa, Kenya, to Katyusha rockets fired into Israel from Jordan and Lebanon. Also the broad security cooperation between Israel and India increased motivation for the attack.

However, the extent of Al-Qaida's involvement in the attack is still unclear. ... However, targeting tourism and using it to harm the Indian economy is well suited to Osama bin Laden and his followers and their philosophy. ... The attack does appear to be a success for the terrorists. It indicates careful planning, effective implementation and control over a large number of subcells. Above all, it is a huge failure by the Indian defense establishment, surprised in the heart of their financial capital, apparently also missing the terrorists' arrival by boat from Pakistan.

C. TEHRAN TIMES

1. "Iran Warns India, Pakistan to Beware of 'Traps,'" *Tehran Times*, December 4, 2008, at http://www.tehrantimes.com/index_View.asp?code=183977

TEHRAN - Iranian Majlis Speaker Ali Larijani on Wednesday warned India and Pakistan not to "stumble into the trap of" countries which seek adventures in the region.

Tensions between India and Pakistan have soared over the deadly terrorist attacks in Mumbai.

India says the attackers had Pakistani links. Pakistan has rejected the charges and announced its readiness to cooperate with Indian intelligence services in identifying the terrorists.

Larijani called the attacks "brutal". "This event has created many ambiguities and sounds more like a preamble to new adventurous moves in the region."

The top lawmaker called on Islamabad and New Delhi to investigate the issue calmly.

Iran has good relations with both Pakistan and India. Iran is wary of any new tension in Southwest Asia. Tehran has even called for a trilateral Iran-Pakistan-India cooperation to help settle security problems in Afghanistan. ...

2. Vanda Felbab-Brown, "The Implications of the Mumbai Attacks for Afghanistan," *Brookings/Tehran Times*, December 3, 2009, at http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index_view.asp?code=183925

The bloody terrorist attacks in Mumbai have serious repercussions for NATO efforts to stabilize Afghanistan and defeat the Taliban insurgency. Whether or not any alleged links between the Mumbai terrorists and Pakistan are confirmed, the rise in tensions between India and Pakistan and the possible further escalation of their bilateral disputes will hamper the military campaign against the Taliban, likely exacerbate a crisis of governance in Afghanistan, and jeopardize efforts to imbed the country in a regional security framework.

At minimum, the terrorist attacks will delay a quick launch of a regional initiative toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India that has been urged by analysts to be the centerpiece of the incoming administration's policy toward the region. The initiative was devised to assist Pakistan and India in reaching accommodation over Kashmir and reducing tensions along their border so that Pakistan could genuinely embrace efforts against militants on its western front. Pakistani reluctance for several years until recently to attack the Taliban safe havens in Baluchistan, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and the Northwest Frontier Province significantly contributed to the Taliban's ability to recoup in Pakistan and launch an intense insurgency against the Karzai government and NATO. Pakistan's rather fickle and lukewarm efforts have been mainly due to U.S. inducements - both pressure, including in the form of U.S. air strikes into Pakistan, and U.S. aid transfers.

Underlying Pakistan's reluctance to target the Taliban have been not only the longstanding and carefully cultivated ties to the mujahadeen by the Pakistani

intelligence services, the Director for Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI), but also crucially the Pakistani military view that Afghanistan could provide a necessary strategic depth for Pakistan during a military confrontation with India. Given India's conventional military superiority and the difficulties in defending the narrow territory that separates the border with India from Islamabad and Peshawar, the Pakistani military has considered it imperative to be able to fall back into Afghanistan, recoup forces there, and launch a counterattack against India. Above all, an encirclement by hostile powers in Afghanistan and India had to be avoided. Thus, a regional initiative that reduced one of the main triggers of India-Pakistan conflict - Kashmir - would permit Pakistan to come fully on board, focusing its resources on its western front and systematically targeting the Taliban and other groups. Reducing tensions between India and Pakistan is also a critical piece of a necessary larger regional framework toward Afghanistan, which for centuries has been plagued by regional and great power rivalries.

The tensions between India and Pakistan following the Mumbai attacks can greatly reduce the political will in both Islamabad and New Delhi to agree to such conflict resolution efforts. In India, the Congress Party government, already weak before the attacks, will likely find it too risky politically to participate in such efforts, especially before the national elections there next year. In Pakistan, the civilian government of Asif Zardari will struggle to maintain control over the military-intelligence services to conduct policy, especially towards its archrival India.

Any escalation of tensions between India and Pakistan will also result in the redeployment of the Pakistani military away from its border with Afghanistan toward its eastern border. Such a standoff between the two militaries following the 2001 Jaish-e-Mohammed (a militant Kashmiri group with deep connections to the Pakistani intelligence services) attack on the Indian parliament critically contributed to the ability of al Qaeda to slip out of Afghanistan into Pakistan. Any reduction of pressure on the Taliban and other groups, such as the Haqqani and Hekmatyar networks, that operate along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, will augment their ability to regroup, resupply, train, recruit, and fundraise in Pakistan, thus increasing the already serious level of violence in Afghanistan. Although the Taliban insurgency is self-sustaining at this point and has developed a substantial internal base, the external safehaven in Pakistan greatly hampers the counterinsurgency effort in Afghanistan. The United States and NATO do not have the military resources in Afghanistan to seal off the border with Pakistan; the three U.S. brigades to be deployed to Afghanistan will not redress this problem. Any lessening of the anti-Taliban effort on the Pakistan side will be felt in Afghanistan.

A serious escalation of the tension between India and Pakistan could easily result in a full-blown proxy war between the two countries. Afghanistan has repeatedly been the theater for such rivalry. During the 1980s, while Pakistan and the United States supported the mujahedeen, India backed the pro-Soviet regime of president Mohammad Najibullah. During the 1990s, while Pakistan supported the Taliban, India provided assistance to the Northern Alliance.

Since the fall of the Taliban in 2001, President Karzai's embrace of India has been a major irritant to Islamabad. Indian consulates in Afghanistan are regarded by Pakistan as spying outfits and sources of aid to the separatist movement in Pakistan's province of Baluchistan while Indian aid in dam construction in the Afghan province of Kunar is interpreted by Islamabad as a way to divert water resources from Pakistan. Pakistan's paranoia about being encircled and possibly carved up between Afghanistan and India was already tragically revealed by the attack on the Indian Embassy in Kabul in July 2008. Although the attack was conducted by the Haqqani network, U.S. intelligence sources have reported that elements in the ISI provided support. A major confrontation between India and Pakistan may in fact push India into conducting operations in Afghanistan that the Pakistanis fear.

Such a proxy war would spell the end of Pakistani assistance against the Taliban. It would also further fracture the fragile and frequently fratricidal relations among Afghanistan's political leaders. With the approaching presidential elections in Afghanistan next summer, the rivalry among the political elite in Afghanistan is already intense. The sense of exclusion and grievances among the various leaders are running high, fed by and reverberating through ethnic, tribal, and clan competition. Any proxy war in Afghanistan by the regional powers would fuel these internal fissures, possibly bringing Afghanistan to the brink of a 1990s-like civil war. Already, the collapse of governance in much of the country, caused by insecurity as well as a weak and frequently corrupt and predatory leadership, has eviscerated the legitimacy of the Kabul government and added fuel to the Taliban insurgency. Countrywide arming of various militias, stimulated by a proxy war, would reverse one of the remaining widely-popular accomplishments after the fall of the Taliban, the disarmament of the various warlords.

IV. SOUTH ASIA

A. DAWN

1. Editorial, "A Go-Ahead for India?" *Dawn*, December 3, 2008, at <http://www.dawn.com/2008/12/03/ed.htm>

NO American president has ever encouraged any aggression on India's part towards Pakistan. Invariably, American presidents have worked for peace, especially after the two countries acquired nuclear status. Islamabad might have often felt disappointed by America's refusal to be more categorical on issues such as the Kashmiris' right to self-determination, but the standard line pursued by all American presidents has been to urge Pakistan and India to work for peace. In December 2001, when the Indian parliament building was attacked and India massed troops on Pakistan's borders, the Republican administration cautioned the two countries to exercise restraint. In fact, behind the scenes President Bush and then Secretary of State Colin Powell worked hard to lower tensions to avoid a war. However, last Monday, president-elect Barack Obama seemed to have ditched this time-honoured American policy. Obama did not use the word 'retaliate' but the implications of his remarks can be understood in the context of his affirmative response to a newsman's question at a press conference. The newsman reminded him of his campaign pledge that he would attack Pakistan if he had actionable intelligence and asked him whether India had the same 'right'. Obama replied, "I think that sovereign nations, obviously, have the right to protect themselves." Does this mean that, for the first time in the six decades of America's relationship with the subcontinent, a US president-elect is encouraging belligerence instead of working for peace? His words that America would "remain steadfast in India's efforts to catch the perpetrators" of the Mumbai attacks come at a time when India is in the grip of anger.

There are concerns that India has benefited from the war on terror and has managed to advance its national interests. After all, the relationship between Pakistan and India did not begin on the day the terrorists attacked Mumbai; it goes deep into history. The Kashmir dispute has existed since 1947 and the two countries have fought four wars, with a fifth one averted following the attack on the Indian parliament. Instead of trying to mediate as an honest broker America's next president appears to be fanning hostilities. He may be doing so to gain India's trust or because of his suspicions regarding the role of Pakistan's spy agencies in making trouble for India, but his statement will only encourage pro-Taliban parties and promote extremist sentiments in Pakistan.

The government has to address the issue coolly. Overreaction to New Delhi's demands would mean disastrous consequences for the region. Pakistan must continue to pursue the war on terror and point out to its allies the consequences

of a conflict in the subcontinent, indicating how this would be counterproductive and make the terrorists more powerful.

2. Editorial, "Times of Terror," *Dawn*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.dawn.com/2008/12/02/ed.htm>

AT a time of considerable tension between India and Pakistan following the Mumbai attacks, the government has acted sensibly in calling for an all-party conference rather than assuming a unilateral posture in dealing with the crisis. By reaching out to and garnering the support of a number of politicians including opposition chief Nawaz Sharif, who cautioned New Delhi against drawing hasty conclusions, the government can ensure unity within political ranks on a serious bilateral issue. Indeed, this kind of exercise should become the norm when faced with external threats or internal challenges. No doubt the opposition is meant to act as a check on governance. Nevertheless, a cohesive stand on factors that are pulling the country down – such as the economy or threats from external sources – is essential. But for this to happen, apart from seeking the support of various political parties in times of crises, what is also needed is an attempt to tackle internal disarray – a prime example of which was the announcement of the ISI chief's visit to New Delhi to assuage suspicions which the government was later forced to retract. Only then will it be able to come up with consistent and measured responses, which are what it needs in the backdrop of the Mumbai attacks with the Indian government and media gunning for Pakistan, linking the country to the recent act of terrorism.

Although there is reason to hope that the crisis will not escalate, especially as no troop movement along the borders has been detected or declared and New Delhi has refrained from directly implicating Islamabad in the attack, the Indo-Pakistan peace process has received a serious blow. For this New Delhi and the Indian media must shoulder most of the blame. Within hours of the attack and without giving concrete evidence, New Delhi was announcing a Pakistani link. No doubt, the ongoing state elections and its own intelligence lapse were responsible for its haste in passing the buck. But what cannot be condoned is the behaviour of the Indian media, that taking its cue from the politicians – and from a culture of nationalism that is especially apparent where Islamabad is concerned – came down hard on Pakistan, often conjuring up fantastical descriptions of the way the siege of Mumbai was laid. Not only does this put pressure on the Indian government to keep up its accusations and resist moves for a cooperative stance, it also damages people-to-people ties, for after all, the media is meant to speak for the common man. The postures of aggression and defensiveness must then be abandoned. India and Pakistan face a common threat – Pakistan more so than India – and unless the two countries adopt all means

to cooperate with one another, the costs for the billion-plus people of South Asia will be high in these times of terror.

3. Dr. Tariq Rahman, "Far Away from Peace," *Dawn*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.dawn.com/2008/12/02/op.htm#2>

IN March 2007 I visited Mumbai to attend a conference being held at the University of Mumbai. It was a short visit but I loved the city with its clean promenades along the beach. Across the waters was the Arabian peninsula and upwards was the port of Karachi.

As I stood by the sea I wished for the day when India and Pakistan would reach that level of peace and understanding that visas — assuming they were still required — would be stamped on the border without any hassle.

Little did I know then that in late November the next year Mumbai would see mayhem and insanity of the kind that no South Asian city has witnessed.

On Sept 13, 2001 I wrote an article advising the US not to lash out at Afghanistan like a wounded bear. ... Yet I offer the same advice to India. First, the knee-jerk reaction to blame Pakistan — the state of Pakistan — must stop. It is counterproductive since it prevents the Pakistani government from trying to help India. All the top leaders in government are trying to help India but as the Indian media becomes increasingly strident in its tone these leaders will dare not go against public opinion. They will be made to retreat and be on the defensive and this is only in the interests of the terrorists. After all their aim is to destabilise South Asia and this will be achieved if tensions spiral.

There are several theories as to where the attackers came from. The most popular in the Indian media is that they came from Pakistan. If this is true then they must have either been sent by the state or they were non-state actors acting on their own. The first option is to be ruled out as the Pakistani government stands to gain from peace not war as the top-ranking government figures have declared again and again. If anything this event has actually harmed Pakistan's interests like settling the dispute regarding the sharing of river water, etc.

This leaves the option that they were non-state actors based in Pakistan. Considering that Pakistani cities have been under almost daily attack since the last one year and more, why should it be incredible for some Indian analysts to believe that the enemies of both Pakistan and India have shifted their attention from one country to another?

But if indeed these are non-state actors from Pakistan who keep attacking our cities too they are not immediately under Pakistan's control. Of course they should not have been allowed to proliferate at all.

The blunder of Pakistan in joining America's proxy war in Afghanistan in the 1980s is the fault of Pakistani decision-makers of that period as it is of American decision-makers. Now both have the albatross of Al Qaeda and the Taliban around their necks. Pakistan should never have used these religious fighters in Kashmir as it is alleged. That too is a whirlwind we are reaping. But then if India had solved the Kashmir issue before all the hardened militants had been sucked into the imbroglio we might have had a less dangerous South Asia. And this brings me to the other theory about why Mumbai was attacked.

The other theory is that it is a home-grown Indian insurgency. In that case is it the work of extremist Hindu groups or radicalised individuals – like the attack on the Samjhauta Express apparently by a serving Indian army officer? Or that of Kashmiri militants? Or militants from Jharkand and Nagaland? Or even the 'Indian Taliban' or jihadis? Or possibly even fanatics from Hyderabad? ...

B. DAILY TIMES

1. Editorial, "Mumbai Attack: What Next?" *Daily Times*, December 3, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\12\03\story_3-12-2008_pg3_1

Reacting to criticism in India and an isolating media trend inside Pakistan, President Asif Ali Zardari has asked India in an interview to Financial Times on Monday not to blame Pakistan for last week's attacks in Mumbai, saying "non-state actors could not hijack nations". The next sentence is even more significant: "Even if the militants are linked to Lashkar-e-Tayba, who do you think we are fighting?"

Mr Zardari also pointed to a development that the media in Pakistan was ignoring: that the attack could be a tactic to divert attention from the real war going on in the Tribal Areas between the terrorists and the Pakistan army. He came very near to saying that it was in fact a plot to force the army to vacate the Tribal Areas and deploy along the Indian border because of the Indian threat to mobilise forces as they did in 2001.

The interior adviser, Mr Rehman Malik, was clearer in his diagnosis: he said in Lahore that "the Mumbai attacks were designed to force Pakistan to deploy its troops on the country's eastern borders, thereby clearing the western borders for infiltration" into Afghanistan. Although the PPP government has praised the

Pakistani media for being “balanced”, the fact is that by reacting so emotionally to the fear and loathing spread by the reckless and xenophobic Indian media, the Pakistani media has tended to isolate the government at a critical point.

The Indian government has given our High Commissioner in Delhi a formal protest note linking the Mumbai attack to Pakistan, which the latter has rejected because of lack of proof. The single terrorist caught by the Indians is said to have “confessed” that his group landed on Mumbai harbour by a boat. He has also “confessed” to training imparted to his group by the Pakistani banned terrorist organisation Lashkar-e-Tayba. But “confessions” being no more credible than “confessions” in such situations, if the media war subsides – and there are signs on some channels that it is subsiding – one can get down to objective analysis.

Pakistan is going through its toughest anti-terrorist phase. The army is making inroads in the Bajaur stronghold of the Taliban who are apparently desperate to find a way to relieve the pressure on them. Realising that the people of the Tribal Areas were tending to accept state authority and assist the Army, they have offered ceasefire and even gone through the motions of a unilateral one. Although they have benefited morally from the “unanimous” parliamentary resolution asking the army to get out of the Tribal Areas, their reversals have not ceased.

The Taliban have resorted to a more intensified wave of suicide-bombing and have targeted Peshawar and areas close to Peshawar as a deterrent but with no palpable results. The Army is still effective in its operations. This is when the vectors of “higher planning” seem to have come together. Taking account of the widespread media campaign that the war against terrorism is not Pakistan’s war, we can logically speculate that an authority higher than the Taliban may have commissioned a plot to push the Army out of the Tribal Areas on to the border with India. The Mumbai attackers were all suicide-bombers out of whom one has actually chickened out and has allegedly started to “sing”.

Mr Zardari’s statement that the attack could have come from “non-state actors” and that his government was actually fighting against these same “actors” reveals how isolated the PPP government has become in the wake of the attack and the media war that has followed it. Retired generals, pointedly two ex-ISI chiefs, have come on TV to describe what the next war with India will look like. Tragically, what has come out is a visceral non-professional exaggeration of the bravery of Pakistani Muslims when they battle Indian Hindus.

Once this fever subsides, more cold-blooded analysis should make Pakistanis realise the real predicament they are in. If the Indians mobilise and Pakistan mobilises in response, the western border will be unprotected. It will be

unprotected against two forces: the NATO forces arrayed across the Durand Line and the Taliban who cross the border and raid inside Afghanistan. The war between these two forces will intensify in the absence of our troops, and CIA drone attacks may not only extend further inside Pakistan's settled areas but also might escalate to air force attacks, followed by "boots on ground".

Welcoming this kind of eventuality on the Indo-Pak border is not a wise gambit for our war mongers. Commentators who rejoice over the fact that any concentration of Indian troops on the border will hurt India economically and meet with international criticism should consider this: what if the Indians should deploy to merely provoke American attacks from Afghanistan, targeting locations where these "non-state actors" are known to be ensconced? The media should consider that its emotional response may give India the initiative to cause harm to Pakistan without actually getting into a fight.

The PPP government should not feel uncomfortable in this brief period of political isolation. It is handling the crisis in the right way and its policy of cooperation with India and coordination with a very pro-India international community is based on wisdom.

2. Asma Jehangir, "A Turning Point," *Daily Times*, December 3, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\12\03\story_3-12-2008_pg3_5

The recent carnage in Mumbai is terrifying. Indians are entitled to be angry, hurt and disgusted. The government of India has alleged that initial evidence indicates that some of the terrorists came from a 'neighbouring country'. Even though the prime minister of India has so far not accused the government of Pakistan of being directly involved in the attacks, it is apparent who the 'neighbour' is. The Pakistani foreign minister and others have so far reacted responsibly. To his credit, he admonished journalists who tried to downplay the tragedy or who shirked away any need for alarm.

Yet the media on both sides is full of jingoistic messages. Some Indians want revenge and even went so far as to urge their government to bomb Pakistan. A few voices in India have cautioned against a call for revenge and have suggested looking deeper into the failure of the security system in India itself. They are pushing for effective diplomacy to be deployed so that Pakistan's rulers are encouraged to take action against those who are using their country as a launching pad for terrorist activities.

Those in India who want reprisals against Pakistan are falling into the very trap that the terrorists and their allies have set for them. It is no secret that both the

terrorists and their patrons within sections of the Pakistani intelligence community want a disengagement of the military against the Taliban and Al Qaeda in north-western Pakistan. ... It also suits the militants to distract the military on all sides, so that they have a free hand to consolidate their power base within Pakistan. Therefore the Indians must take note that the risk of a better organised force of militants will not only endanger the people of Pakistan but may also create havoc in India in time to come.

Some of the reaction in Pakistan is mind-boggling. Several militant organisations have issued public statements rejecting all claims that Pakistan's territory was in any way used to prepare the Mumbai attacks. Some, like the Tehreek-e Taliban Pakistan, have claimed that the "terror attacks in Mumbai were part of a conspiracy to defame Pakistan and the Mujahideen". The TTP has warned India against attacking Pakistan and assured Pakistanis that in such an eventuality the Mujahideen would "fight shoulder to shoulder with the armed forces and the people of Pakistan". Through this statement, they want to appear as having arrogated to themselves the authority to respond on behalf of Pakistan and to appear as the saviours of its people. Ironically the TTP is fighting Pakistan's military in the tribal areas and is accused of having killed hundreds of Pakistanis in the most inhumane manner. ...

A spokesperson of the PMLN lambasted the government for 'bowing' to India by agreeing to send the director-general of the ISI or his representative to India. In the past, the PMLN has itself been severely critical of the role of the ISI and supported calls for reforms within it. Regrettably, at this critical moment, the opposition is dangerously exploiting the situation.

In contrast to the PMLN statement, LK Advani, the hawkish leader of the opposition in India, has for now assured all support to the Indian prime minister. Perhaps we need to learn a few lessons of how the opposition can also be constructive in times of national emergency. ...

Most sections of society within Pakistan seem to be in a state of denial regarding the allegations made by the Indian authorities. They are not willing to accept even a remote possibility of any connection between Pakistan and the terrorist attacks that took place in Mumbai last week. At the same time, any attack within Pakistan is treated differently. A large number of people have openly blamed militant groups operating within Pakistan and rogue elements within our intelligence agencies for acts of violence carried out in Pakistan. Yet, we are not willing to grant the same significance to any claims made by neighbours against the very same elements that admittedly are under insufficient control.

... A balanced and transparent approach is urgently needed. It is clear that India too needs to look into the effectiveness of its own security forces. However, that does not absolve the government of Pakistan from ensuring that its territory is not used as a breeding ground for militants, where they can plan, train and carry out terrorist activities. It is in no one's interest to let a handful of organised militants keep the entire region hostage and polarise its populations.

... The current and persistent state of insecurity should be a wake-up call for the region. Governments should reinforce their commitment to dismantle all forms of international terrorism growing within the region.

The writer is Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan

3. Editorial, "After Mumbai, Karachi," *Daily Times*, December 2, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\12\02\story_2-12-2008_pg3_1

Ethnic rioting in Karachi saw nine people killed and 150 injured on Saturday. On Sunday, 20 more were killed and 50 injured. Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani has called for a report on what is happening, but at least one TV channel reported that an intelligence report sent to the prime minister has held India responsible for the mayhem. Comment that followed gilded the lily and connected all sorts of dots from Balochistan to the Tribal Areas where India was supposed to be making Pakistan suffer.

The truth, however, is that Karachi was experiencing trouble before the Mumbai attack. Politicians belonging to the MQM and the ANP had appeared on TV flinging outrageous accusations at each other, with the MQM repeating its charge that Talibanisation was taking place and it had begun with Sohrab Goth, the no-go area where the Pakhtuns live. The ANP said that the Pakhtuns could not be linked to Talibanisation as they were part of Karachi's economic and social culture and had lived in the city for decades. There was also reference to specific places where new kiosks were coming up in preparation for the attacks that the Tehreek-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP) had warned about.

The worst affected areas were Banaras, Orangi Town, Qasba Colony, Baldia, Ittehad Town, Sohrab Goth, Pak Colony, Gurumandir, Patel Para, Nagan Chowrangi, Gulistan-e-Johar, Malir, Quaidabad Banaras, Qasba Colony and the surrounding areas, where heavy contingents of police and Rangers were deployed to restore the law and order situation. One can identify localities where the MQM and the Pakhtuns dominate. This means that an ethnic war is on. Riders on motorbikes and killers ensconced in cars pass through localities firing at all. Clearly, the target is the community, and not any specific group.

On Sunday, as expected, the citizens of Karachi got tired of what was going on and protested. They believed that the law enforcement agencies had failed to control the city's law and order situation and had arrested only a few of the miscreants from different parts of the city. So lethal is the ethnic divide that officers were not ready to name the parties involved. One hundred killers were caught but it was not possible for the police to convey to the people what they had confessed. Let us hope that the prime minister will receive the facts as they are and that the shooting spree between the two ethnic groups is not dismissed out of hand through the device of accusing India.

In some ways the Karachi violence is worse than what happened in Mumbai. Only Orangi has two million people living in it in close to slum conditions. The rioters have struck indiscriminately, killing people, raping women, and burning houses, thus forcing the inhabitants to shift elsewhere. Similar conditions prevail in Sohrab Goth where the Pakhtuns live. If this continues, Karachi might soon have internal refugees who can't go home either because their homes have been burnt down or because they fear the killers will get them. All signs here are of ethnic conflict. This level of bitter rivalry is seen only in communal conflicts, not in foreign-instigated violence.

Those who are encouraging a "united stand against India" campaign in the media should look carefully into the nature of trouble inside Pakistan. It is not wise to trust a statement – concocted or real – from Waziristan that the loyal tribesmen will stand side by side with the Pakistan army if India brings its troops to the border as it did in 2001. One ex-ISI chief actually expressed joy during a TV interview at the prospect of a war with India because Baitullah Mehsud would in that case be fighting for Pakistan. One should remind the war enthusiasts that every time the tribesmen have been used in war against India it hasn't really redounded to Pakistan's advantage.

The Sindh government has ignored early warnings of the conflict. The reason is embedded in the three-way ethnic divide in Karachi: the Sindhi, Pakhtun and Muhajir divide. The fourth segment is that of the religious elements who are not without muscle because of the strong madrassa presence in the city and the tendency among the Pakhtun to link up with them. The PPP-MQM coalition in Sindh goes against the grain of the Sindhi leaders of the ruling party and the tensions between the two are showing despite a degree of restraint on the part of their central leaders.

Let us be frank about facts. The ethnic trouble in Karachi is of long gestation and will go only if the rulers come to some kind of truce at the political level; otherwise ethnic antagonism is said to be more long lasting than any inter-state

hatred. Whipping up hatred against India is not as important as suppressing the ethnic rage in Karachi.

4. Rasul Baksh Rais, "Stoking the Fires," *Daily Times*, December 2, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\12\02\story_2-12-2008_pg3_2

Since the terrorist attacks on the Indian parliament seven years ago, there has been a familiar pattern in India-Pakistan relations: after each terrorist attack in India, Indian politicians and the more hawkish elements in the Indian media point fingers at Pakistan. Threats of war are exchanged as normal diplomacy is suspended and talks on bilateral issues frozen.

What agonises Pakistanis most is the haste with which Indian leaders accuse Pakistan of involvement in terrorist attacks. ...Yes, terrorists from Pakistan have attacked Indian targets in the past, and sadly they may do so again. The question that both India and Pakistan need to examine very closely is that terrorists, be they from Hindu or Muslim extremist groups, are not friends of our peoples. They are our common enemies. This realisation can be the foundation on which to build up cooperation.

... It will not help the peace process if India regularly accuses Pakistan of involvement in terrorist acts when there are extremists in both countries that would like to keep them locked in conflict.

The terrorists, be they from Pakistan or from other countries, including India, have an obvious agenda: to de-rail the Indo-Pak peace process. If we judge the developments over the last few days, particularly the hysteria gripping the Indian media, the terrorists have succeeded in this objective.

Unfortunately, Indian leaders followed the tone set by the media without giving much thought to the implications of their statements. Even the careful and intelligent Prime Minister Manmohan Singh didn't speak in his usual measured language. Within hours of the attacks, he addressed the nation, clearly stating that the roots of terrorism were in 'foreign lands'. ...

Perhaps it made better political sense for the Indian prime minister to hit out at Pakistan without naming it; given that the media was not mincing its words about the origin of the Mumbai attackers, 'foreign lands' meant Pakistan. The political cost of not pulling punches at Pakistan would be great in an event of such magnitude.

The main issue is not the incompetence of security agencies when they fail to prevent such attacks. India is too big a country and too complex a society. The main issue is in fact the nature of our common enemy, the terrorists, and its capacity to commit horrific attacks at will.

Terrorism poses a new and very difficult challenge to the national security of both India and Pakistan. Pakistan too has been the target of all types of terrorists, local and foreign. The damage to the Pakistani economy and society is incalculable, without an end in sight.

The challenge now is to fight this menace. National resources and efforts, no matter how massive, would be inadequate to meet the challenge of transnational terrorism. The war on terror requires international cooperation, more meaningful and institutionalised than has been forthcoming.

An even bigger challenge is for India and Pakistan to cooperate with each other in fighting terrorism. It is not going to be easy given the present climate of distrust.

While fighting the war on terror, it is equally important to look at the social, political and economic environment that creates the extremist mindset. We can no longer avoid addressing the social roots of conflict in South Asia, and must address issues of ethnicity, communalism, disenfranchisement of minorities and unrestrained use of state force against those demanding their rights.

Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais is author of *Recovering the Frontier State: War, Ethnicity and State in Afghanistan* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books 2008) and a professor of Political Science at the Lahore University of Management Sciences. He can be reached at rasul@lums.edu.pk

6. Mobasher Javed Akbar, "India's Agony," *Daily Times*, November 30, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\11\30\story_30-11-2008_pg3_4

In most cities of South Asia, hidden beneath the grime and neglect of extreme poverty, there exists a little Somalia waiting to burst out and infect the body politic. This netherworld, patrolled and nourished by criminals who operate a vast black-market economy, has bred, in Mumbai, a community that has utter contempt for the state, because it knows that its survival depends on corrupting the police. Like underground magma, that underworld has now burst into the streets of Mumbai.

Because the denizens of this netherworld know neither patriotism nor morality, they are easily lured into partnership with terrorists, particularly when they have reason to feel aggrieved. In Mumbai, a large proportion of them are Muslims

who were denied space in the formal economy and have developed strong vested interests over the past 50 years.

Details about the Mumbai outrage, where terrorists killed almost 200 people, are still unfolding. But we do know that at least 30 men armed with AK-47 rifles and grenades held India's business and financial centre hostage, targeting both Indians and foreigners, particularly Americans and Britons. It is likely that this operation was propelled from Pakistan through the Lashkar-e Taiba, a terrorist organisation sustained by hatred of secular India and backed by shadowy Pakistani agencies and street support.

In the blood and drama of the events, however, we might miss a significant element of the story. The attacks were an operation that must have required months of planning: serious weapons were deployed, a small army was mobilised, targets were studied, transport was organised, and weak points identified. A plan of attack that involved hundreds of people was put in motion, and yet the massive infrastructure of India's government discovered nothing.

Indeed, the attacks represent more than a failure of police work. They represent a collapse of governance; ...

India is a tough nation. No one should have illusions about that. It has fought off Muslim terrorists in Kashmir, Sikh terrorists in Punjab, Christian terrorists in Nagaland, and Hindu terrorists in Assam and across the country. It understands that you cannot blame the whole community for the sins of a few.

But under ineffectual governance, particularly during the last three years, India is in danger of degenerating into a soft state. ...

I am an Indian and a Muslim and proud to be both. Like any Indian, today I am angry, frustrated, and depressed. I am angry at the manic dogs of war that invaded Mumbai. I am frustrated by the impotence of my government in Mumbai and Delhi, tone-deaf to the anguish of my fellow citizens. And I am depressed at the damage being done to the idea of India.

MJ Akbar, a former member of India's parliament and advisor to the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, was the founding editor of The Asian Age and is an Asia Society Associate Fellow

7. Hasan Askari Rizvi, "Pointing Fingers," *Daily Times*, November 30, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\11\30\story_30-11-2008_pg3_2

The Mumbai terrorist attacks, the worst suffered by India, have drawn attention to, once again, the growing menace of terrorism against state and society in South Asia. The magnitude of this attack was far greater than the suicide attack on the Marriott in Islamabad on September 20. These attacks have shaken India just like the Marriott blast jolted Pakistan, and have spread insecurity throughout India. They have also embarrassed the Indian government for the security lapses that made it possible for a group of terrorists to launch such a coordinated attack.

The Mumbai attacks do not fit into the pattern of terrorism witnessed since 9/11. Normally, militant Islamist groups planted or lobbed bombs, sent suicide bombers, or launched quick assaults on their targets. Such attacks lasted for a few hours, if not less. There were instances of hostage-taking, but invariably the terrorists would take the hostages to their camps or hideouts.

In Mumbai, however, the attackers struck in a highly coordinated manner and were entrenched in the hotels for almost three days, using small arms to engage the security forces. This indicates a lot of planning and shipping of weapons in large quantities from outside Mumbai. This effort would have taken several days, if not weeks.

This incident will help India's official circles and political leadership understand Pakistan's predicament. Pakistan has experienced intense violence perpetrated by radical groups, causing insecurity across the country. India will soon learn what Pakistan already knows: it is not easy to control shadowy militant groups, especially when they cultivate support in sections of society.

Now India is facing a similar challenge of coping with local radical groups that have proliferated over the years. These groups are the product mainly, though not exclusively, of the alienation of marginal segments of Indian society. Some of these groups have adopted violence and radical ideology to challenge what they view as an unjust and exploitative Indian state.

... Instead of speculating on the identity of those responsible for the Mumbai attacks, there is a need to carefully examine the evidence. Such a massive and coordinated operation is beyond the capacity of an external group unless it has developed strong links with a well-entrenched and powerful domestic group.

... India needs to face the reality of homegrown radicalism, and realise the futility of blaming Pakistan for its troubles. There are three major groups that challenging the Indian state.

First, there are several dissident and separatist groups that use violence to challenge the Indian state and assert their primacy in their respective areas of operation. These include the violent groups in north-eastern states, especially Assam, that have a long tradition of taking on officials and state symbols. Many radical groups like the Maoists of different denominations built their clout by articulating local grievances in east, central and southern India. These groups create localised threats as all of them resort to violence.

Second, Hindu extremism and militancy has also sunk strong roots in parts of India. Encouraged by the Hindutva discourse, these groups tend to use violence as a means of reviving the glory of Hinduism. These groups have targeted religious minorities, especially Christians and Muslims. The Hindutva and Hindu militancy have affected the frame of mind of a significant portion of middle and upper middle class Indians. This discourse has penetrated the bureaucracy and the military as well. If a large section of the populace develops a soft spot for the extreme Right, these groups get enough space to carry out their narrow, highly nationalist hateful agenda.

Islamic militancy has also developed in India among Muslim youths that feel alienated and marginalised in the Indian political system.

... Al Qaeda and Laskhar-e Taiba do not appear to be directly involved in the Mumbai attacks, but there could be some local radical outfits that are inspired by the disposition of these groups. Further, the role of the Mumbai underworld should not be ruled out. Instead of looking outwards to look for the causes of this latest episode of violence, India should instead look inwards. ...

Any deterioration in India-Pakistan relations would compel Pakistan to pull out a large number of its troops from the tribal areas and shift them to the eastern border with India. This will adversely affect Pakistan's current efforts to control insurgency in the tribal areas, and will give a relatively free hand to these groups to pursue their agenda in Afghanistan and Pakistan. This will not only benefit the militants operating on the western border with Afghanistan, but will also benefit the groups accused of committing terrorist acts in India. If India is genuinely committed to eliminating terrorism, it needs to work together with Pakistan and adopt joint strategies rather than engage in a blame game.

Dr Hasan-Askari Rizvi is a political and defence analyst

8. Editorial, "Pak-India Ties: Time to Tread Carefully," *Daily Times*, November 29, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\11\29\story_29-11-2008_pg3_1

The Mumbai standoff with the terrorists went into its third day on Friday with remnants of the attackers ensconced in the buildings they had occupied along with hostages, including symbolically the Nariman House Jewish centre. The death tally had gone up to 125 with 9 foreigners killed too. India is jolted and commentators are calling it India's 9/11, the same way Pakistan called the attack on the Marriott Hotel in Islamabad Pakistan's 9/11. In the middle of this the Indian prime minister, in a nation-wide address, said that "neighbouring nations would have to face a cost if they allowed their territory to be used to launch attacks on India", a thinly veiled reference to Pakistan. This shows the domestic pressure he has to face, especially from the BJP and other rightwing groups who have already accused his government of being soft on the Muslims. But the statement does threaten to throw a spanner in the works of the normalisation process. For its part Pakistan has already condemned the attacks and warned that "jumping to a conclusion" won't help either side.

It is clear that Pakistan has not "allowed" its territory to be used by Al Qaeda. In fact, it is under attack from Al Qaeda and its many affiliate groups. The last time Al Qaeda attacked inside Pakistan was when an Arab suicide-bomber blew up the Danish embassy in June this year. In September, another suicide attack destroyed the Marriott Hotel in Islamabad amid comment that it could have also targeted the Americans staying there. In Pakistan speculation was widespread about the involvement of "foreign" elements, but finally the case was cracked when on November 22, 2008 an arrested Pakistani confessed in a court that the plan to attack the Marriott had been hatched inside Afghanistan in a province used earlier by Al Qaeda for the Danish embassy blast.

The Indian prime minister's phrase "allowed their territory to be used" brings India into the category where the US leads by holding Pakistan accountable for its lack of sovereign hold over its own territory. Pakistan's territory was used for the 9/11 action, and today the main bone of contention are the cross-border raids being carried out from Pakistani territory against the NATO forces in Afghanistan. But India should be careful about joining this club as it would take away the option of "cooperating" with the present government in Islamabad on the rising tide of terror in the two countries.

Very thin evidence linking speed boats – and at least two "captured" Pakistani cargo ships going to Karachi off the coast of Indian Gujarat – to the terrorists positioned in the hotels in Mumbai threatens to produce a new bilateral crisis.

Pakistan has issued statements from the president and the prime minister in a tone that clearly indicates sympathy and collaboration. President Zardari who took the risk of crossing the traditional nuclear “red line” by offering not to exercise its “first use” option will be put on the backfoot if hostile rhetoric now rising in India takes over. As Indian commentators speculated about Lashkar-e-Tayba and Jaish-e-Muhammad, Karachi in Pakistan was experiencing a deadly standoff between the police and what is known as Afghani Gang in Sohrab Goth, the latter liberally using hand grenades. There are reports of Talibanisation in Karachi that have divided instead of uniting the political forces there.

Pakistan faces the spread of Taliban and Al Qaeda elements southwards into the settled areas as CIA drones operate in the Tribal Areas. There is insurgency in Balochistan which is steadily killing persons suspected of being against Baloch nationalism. Equally there is the calamity of an earthquake in the province which Pakistan is finding it difficult to tackle. Relations with the US are tense over the drone attacks and Pakistan needs cooperation with its regional neighbours to avoid becoming isolated while its economy needs to be helped out of its current trough of depression. Above all, it needs understanding from India while it stands ready to share intelligence with it on the latest Mumbai bombing.

Recent events have not helped. India has been accusing Pakistan’s intelligence of having attacked the Indian embassy in Kabul with a suicide-bomber while Pakistan has alleged Indian hand in the Balochistan insurgency and even terrorism emanating from the Tribal Areas. This has been a blind continuation of allegations that began in 2001 when the Indian parliament was attacked, triggering Indian troop deployment along the border with Pakistan. This kind of “jurisprudence” is being pulled out again to explain the latest attack. “Analysis” emanating from the West about the Mumbai attack having the signature of Al Qaeda in combination with some Pakistani Islamic group has not helped either.

Pakistan needs to activate friendly diplomacy instead of “replying” to the allegations being made by upset Indians over the media. The past may have been problematic but the present clearly shows both countries afflicted by the same disease. Both need to cooperate and must stop their “proxy” war in Afghanistan. The cue for this must come from the friendly statements made earlier by President Zardari, expressing Pakistan’s willingness to move rapidly on a course of normalisation with India.

9. Rafia Zakaria, “25 Terrorists, 2 Billion Hostages,” *Daily Times*, November 29, 2008, at http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2008\11\29\story_29-11-2008_pg3_5

... While responsibility for the attacks has yet to be pinned on a definitive group, rumours and speculation abound: some are blaming a local offshoot of the Indian Mujahideen known as the "Deccan Mujahedeen", others are choosing to focus on the Pakistan-based Lashkar-e Taiba.

According to an intelligence assessment issued by StratFor, the Indian government, facing elections in the near future, is likely to blame the latter, which would allow it to take a more assertive stance against Pakistan. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's address to the nation, which focused on "outside connections" of the perpetrators of these attacks, substantiates the fear that the incident will further sour relations between India and Pakistan. This deterioration in relations would leave the latter in a strategic vice with both the United States and India punishing the Pakistani state for the actions of non-state groups allegedly tied to it.

However, the strategic dimensions of the conflict represent one plane of analysis of the macabre saga; another is the incredible burden yet another high profile terrorist attack places on the world's two billion Muslims. Muslim minorities in various countries, already castigated through negative stereotypes and maligned as innately violent, will now have an even heavier burden of prejudices to counter. Once again, the world has been stunned by "Islamic" terrorists, whose ruthlessness and inhumanity have garnered global attention and focused the spotlight once again on a hijacked religion.

As the tragic saga in Mumbai continues, and the choral chants of "Islamic terror" emanate from a world media wedded to the inveterate clash of civilisations framework, few will pause to consider the fact that in neighbouring Pakistan, a Muslim country, nearly 500 Muslims have lost their lives to suicide bombings just this year. According to the *Christian Science Monitor*, over 33 suicide bombings have taken place this year in Pakistan, which has outdone Iraq for most suicide attacks in a year. ...

... religious tensions are likely to escalate both within India and between India and Pakistan. Indian Muslims, already alienated and disenfranchised, are likely to face the brunt of Indian wrath. Economically disenfranchised, nearly thirty three percent of them live below the poverty line. Nearly half of Muslim women are uneducated and over a quarter of Muslim children between the ages of 6-14 have never attended school.

This already beleaguered minority, limited in its ability to influence policy or stake a claim in the Indian state, is likely to be pushed further into the recesses of discrimination: easy, accessible victims to avenge the wrath of a nation eager to avenge the horror unleashed in Mumbai.

The Mumbai attacks represent yet another episode in the cruel and seemingly unending saga of terror that seems to have the world in its grip. Since this latest attack is against non-Muslims, Muslims around the world will again face repeated scrutiny and questions regarding the relationship of their faith with terrorism. Once again, ordinary Muslims will be scrutinised and lumped together with the minority that has hijacked their faith.

... Great terror engenders great fear and fear is a blinding force. Will this latest terror attack allow India and the world to go beyond appearances and recognise that the war is not between Muslims and non-Muslims but against a committed and utterly ruthless minority that hates and destroys Muslims, Jews, Christians and Hindus with impunity?

Or will the world, reeling under the unprecedented weight of the cruelty of terrorism, once again pin blame on all of the world's two billion Muslims? ...

Rafia Zakaria is an attorney living in the United States where she teaches courses on Constitutional Law and Political Philosophy. She can be contacted at rafia.zakaria@gmail.com

C. DAILY STAR

1. Shahedul Anam Khan, "Mumbai Havoc and Lessons for Us," *Daily Star*, December 4, 2008, at <http://www.thedailystar.net/story.php?nid=65984>

THE nature of the terrorist attacks in Mumbai has demonstrated a change of tactics, not of strategy. And, of course, the modus operandii adopted was meant to fit the aim, which was to kill as many as possible -- the targets were the same -- unsuspecting helpless civilians.

But what was the purpose of the barbaric act, and what did the terrorists want to achieve, and what did they achieve after all?

... The Indian authorities have identified the ten terrorists from the statements of the one that has survived the encounter. While the Indian politicians may take comfort in the fact that there is lack of evidence to suggest involvement of any Indian in the terrorist attacks, anyone with a modicum of knowledge of the execution of such operations, planned, if not conceived, and launched from outside India, will know that it cannot be done without a local support base, either inserted from outside, well in advance, to develop a firm base, or created from within.

Very often in the past the Indian authorities had shifted the blame on the state or non-state actors in the neighbouring countries. ... The fact is that there are enough causes and many disgruntled groups in India who have an axe to grind against the establishment. It is not that the terrorists are trying to weaken the country; on the contrary it is the weakness of the country that the terrorists are exploiting.

India is under great pressure from within to react with force. There may be some in the administration that may feel provoked to take the US lead and go for suspected training camps in Pakistan, in exercising its right to "defend itself." But there are compelling strategic compulsions that one feels might prevent India from exercising an option that has the potential for greater conflagration between the two countries.

However, terrorism in South Asia is not India's problem alone. We all are affected by it, one way or the other. Bangladesh has a fair share of extremist elements and has experienced their violence, and Pakistan is being haunted by the Frankenstein that it helped the US to create in the eighties.

Let's put the matter in perspective. While during the time near to 200 innocent civilians were being killed in Mumbai in India, at least 97 persons were killed in separate incidents in the NWFP during that period, and approximately 45 persons were killed in militancy-related incidents in the FATA, of Pakistan, while in Sri Lanka at least 164 LTTE militants, 105 soldiers and 10 civilians were killed in separate incidents between November 24 and November 30.

These militants may be of different cultural and religious colour, but they are the enemies of peace. The reality is that we are all facing a common foe, and we must all stand up to it together. ... The only lesson from the Mumbai mayhem is, cooperate regionally or suffer.

The author is, Editor, Defence & Strategic Affairs, The Daily Star.

2. Harun ur Rashid, "Tackling Terror," *Daily Star*, December 2, 2008, at <http://www.thedailystar.net/story.php?nid=65720>

... 26/11 is India's 9/11. Some say that they were attacking symbols of wealth and of India's global ties and power. Luxury hotels were transformed from calm travel destinations to places of terror and death.

Impact on Bangladesh

A sense of insecurity in the region has been created by the Mumbai attack because it may take place in any country, including Bangladesh.

... Bangladesh has a porous border with India and terrorists may sneak into Bangladesh to create havoc. Bangladesh has been a victim of terrorism in the past.

In Bangladesh, terrorists are ideological groups with political ambitions. They may include extreme leftwing members and Islamic militants, and have reportedly established connections with criminal gangs, foreign extremists, and smuggling network. They have easy access to lethal arms and weapons and sources of funds are difficult to trace.

According to a report, there are 1027 organised criminal gangs and 12 outlawed groups in Bangladesh -- some of them consisting of militants.

... There are media reports that sleeping cells of terrorists are active in different shapes and forms in many places within Bangladesh. Reportedly some of these groups are also trying to send their volunteers to places like Afghanistan for training. This strategy of sleeping cells has made the job of law enforcement agencies in Bangladesh more difficult.

The deadly Mumbai attack has underscored the need for vigilance against the surreptitious nature of activities of extremists to prevent terrorist attacks. That includes close monitoring of the movement of people near the border, smuggling of illegal weapons, and unauthorised entry of people.

One of the most important aspects of counter-terrorism is the capacity of agencies to identify the infrastructure and network of extremist organisations. Mass awareness of terrorism, media participation, and a partnership between authorities and people need to be established to detect terrorist cells.

Strict vigilance seems to be the answer to counter-terrorism because terrorists live within the community. The best source of intelligence on terrorist cells has tended to come from localities and neighbourhoods.

More importantly, many analysts say that terror feeds on poverty. ... It is argued that right policies, good governance and participatory democracy may reduce the chance of terrorism in our country.

Barrister Harun ur Rashid Former Bangladesh Ambassador to the UN, Geneva.

3. Editorial, "Mumbai Siege Continues: Indo-Pak Intelligence to Cooperate,"
Daily Star, November 29, 2008, at
<http://www.thedailystar.net/story.php?nid=65372>

We continue to be shocked by the enormity of the long-drawn-out carnage by a group of terrorists in Mumbai that has left over 125 people dead and over 300 injured. As of writing this comment it has not come to an end yet as terrorists continue to keep hostages in some buildings. The Indian intelligence has claimed that the home grown terrorist outfit Deccan Mujahedeen has links with a bigger militant group based in Pakistan, which was also hinted at by Indian Foreign Minister Pranab Mukherjee. But in a positive development Pakistan prime minister Yousuf Raza Gilani has responded to the request of Indian prime minister Manmohan Singh and agreed to send the ISI chief to India to assist in the investigation. In a separate telephone call to Manmohan Singh on Friday Pakistan president Asif Ali Zardari had also talked about extending cooperation with India "in exposing and apprehending the culprits and the masterminds behind the attack". Pakistan foreign minister has also said India and Pakistan should join hands to defeat a common enemy, requesting India however not to play politics over the attack.

We believe this is the first sign of a constructive engagement between Pakistan and India, which sharply contrasts with the pattern of accusation and denial the two countries pursued in the past. We hope this time around the call for cooperation will be seen and utilised in full earnest by both the countries to fight a common enemy - terrorism. Pakistan has its own home grown terrorist groups working relentlessly to destabilise the state. The country's involvement in Afghanistan has not been something very pleasant and it has come home to haunt them. Today, the government is calling terrorists its enemy and is ready to join hands with India to get to the bottom of the terrorist attacks. We hope such spirit of cooperation between India and Pakistan will extend to other SAARC member countries and they will get their resources together to destroy terrorist networks in the region.

We hope the latest terrorist attack in Mumbai has left governments in other South Asian countries including Bangladesh wiser than before, as we have witnessed manifestation of many home grown terrorist outfits in the region. Pakistan is paying a heavy price today for not having acted early on against its home grown militant groups. We have said yesterday and we say it again that Bangladesh should not suffer from the illusion that it is immune to such terrorist attacks. We recall the bomb blasts in 63 districts a couple of years back and the recent arrest of a top JMB leader with a large quantity of explosives and weapons. Politicians of the two major parties must work together to fight the menace without ever using them to materialise their selfish interests, regardless

of the outcome of the coming election. We have to be preemptive in dealing with the armed militants without giving them the opportunity to strike first.

4. Editorial, "The Carnage in Mumbai," *Daily Star*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.thedailystar.net/story.php?nid=65209>

We strongly condemn the terror attacks that have left Mumbai reeling. This attack, vicious in its nature and with wide-ranging ramifications, has brought home to all of us in South Asia the lesson that a serious, purposeful and united effort toward combating the terrorist menace is now necessary. Indeed, the series of attacks that have occurred in India in recent months, together with the violent attack on the Marriott Hotel in Pakistan's Islamabad, were broad hints of how wide the network of terror was getting to be. With the Taj and Oberoi hotels in Mumbai (as well as other spots) now coming under attack, it is clear that terrorism is now no more a national but a broad regional menace. It is now anyone's guess as to where terrorism will strike next. But what is clear is that no one is safe and at this point it is for all South Asian nations to come together to combat the threat. At the same time, people everywhere must condemn the atrocity perpetrated in Mumbai. After having been claimed responsibility by the so-called Deccan Mujahideen, it is especially for Muslims everywhere, seeing that such atrocities are being perpetrated in their names, to condemn the killings loudly and make it clear that their faith abjures violence of all kinds.

The ramifications of the attacks, carried out in military precision by men coming in from the sea, and literally too, can easily be imagined. Those who perpetrated the attacks have clearly gone much farther than those who have in recent times been targeting people across the country. The fact that the attacks have been so coordinated and so easily carried out clearly raises the fear that not only India and Pakistan but the region as a whole is now in a state of severe vulnerability. In fact, the attacks have now introduced a strong feeling that unless drastic measures are taken to handle such terrorist acts on a regional basis, instability could become a real factor in South Asia and so leave societies open to depredations of the kind that have left Mumbai reeling. As we write, there are a large number of hostages still in the terrorists' hand and violence is still continuing as the terrorists continue to wreck havoc. We sincerely hope that no human life will be lost before the terrorists are captured.

It has been a sad day not only for the Indians but for people across the world as well and especially for us in South Asia. At this moment of trial what is important is the need to identify and apprehend the culprits. On a bigger scale, it is South Asian stability, which is at stake.

Our condolences go out to the families of the dead and injured.

D. NEPAL NEWS

1. "Nepal Denounces Terrorist Attacks in India's Mumbai," Nepalnews, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.nepalnews.com/archive/2008/nov/nov27/news09.php>

Nepal condemned the terrorist attacks in the Indian city of Mumbai Thursday that killed at least 101 people and left over 200 hundred injured in one of the worst coordinated attacks on India's commercial centre in recent memory.

"We strongly condemn this cowardly attack and the killing of the innocent peoples," President Dr Ram Baran Yadav said in a message to his Indian counterpart Pratiba Patil Thursday. He also extended his deepest condolence to the families of those who were indiscriminately in this attack.

Similarly, Prime Minister Pushpa Kamal Dahal said in another message issued today, "These attacks, directed against innocent people and to terrorise the industrial and commercial centre of India, deserve unequivocal condemnation from all over the world."

In the message issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), PM Dahal further said that the government and people of Nepal "unreservedly deplore in strongest terms these cowardly terrorist attacks" and expresses "full solidarity with the government and people of India at this hour of distress".

V. EAST ASIA AND AUSTRALIA

A. THE ASAHI SHIMBUN

1. Editorial, "Terrorism in Mumbai," *The Asahi Shimbun*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.asahi.com/english/Herald-asahi/TKY200811290080.html>

... an organization calling itself Mujahedeen (fighters of jihad) of the Deccan Plateau in southern India claimed responsibility for the attacks.

Some people say that the way the terrorists tried to take Americans and Britons hostage suggests the armed group may be under the influence of the international terrorist organization al-Qaida, which advocates "jihad against American and European domination."

The situation of India, which is frequently targeted by terrorists, is becoming increasingly complex. But one thing is clear. At the root of the problem is religious antagonism within the country. Hindus make up 80 percent of India's population of more than 1.1 billion, of which slightly more than 13 percent are Muslims.

In conflicts stemming from religious antagonism in India, Muslims have often been the victims. While India's economy has grown rapidly, its Muslim society has been left behind, and the gap with Hindu society is widening.

India first needs to squarely face these problems, which provide a breeding ground for extremists, and promote social harmony.

We cannot overlook the fact that the incidents occurred at a time when India and Pakistan were moving to improve relations.

Although it is unclear whether the terrorist attacks Wednesday are related to the Pakistani situation, they could hamper such moves for reconciliation. The stability of the two nations is also indispensable to advancing the war on terrorism in Afghanistan.

India prides itself as "the world's largest democracy" and has always attained a change of government through elections since its foundation in 1947. We urge India to bring the situation under control as soon as possible and to do everything in its power to settle its problems.

B. SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST

1. "Restraint Needed after Mayhem in Mumbai," *South China Morning Post*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.scmp.com/portal/site/SCMP/menuitem.2af62ecb329d3d7733492d9253a0a0a0/?vgnnextoid=4f0467db04edd110VgnVCM100000360a0a0aRCRD&ss=Insight&s=Opinion>

The co-ordinated attacks in India's commercial capital, Mumbai, are to be condemned in the strongest possible terms. No cause or grievance can justify such an outrage against civilians. The perpetrators must be hunted down and swiftly brought to justice. Security has to be stepped up so that there can be no repeat.

A little-known Indian Muslim extremist group has claimed responsibility, but this has yet to be verified. The nation's vibrant media is aflame with discussion that the mastermind is linked to overseas terrorists, al-Qaeda foremost among them. A Pakistani connection has predictably been mentioned. So, too, has a Kashmiri one. Such speculation is to be expected given that Muslim militants have been blamed for a spate of bomb attacks that have killed 700 people across the largely-Hindu country in the past three years.

Whatever the suspicions, though, this attack is unlike those before - foreign visitors and the cosmopolitan elite were plainly targets this time. Authorities must not jump to conclusions; India's ethnic and religious diversity is finely balanced. Time and again, violence has been ignited in disparate communities at the merest hint of injustice.

That foreigners have this time been picked out and shot and kidnapped is a worrying development. ... Echoing the tactics of terrorists in volatile parts of the world, the attackers were not afraid to be killed or arrested. They were relatively young and armed with sophisticated weapons. That each target was attacked at the same time shows a well-planned operation. These are the hallmarks of terrorist cells. If, as is suspected, it is homegrown, a dangerous situation has evolved that must be dealt with effectively.

India's economic boom and growing importance is closely tied to the global community, especially the US and Europe. Its government is eager to improve relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan. New Delhi and Washington have moved closer through a landmark nuclear technology deal. The peaceful nature of elections under way in Kashmir has won the government credit. Nationwide polls will be held early next year. Any one of these issues could be cause for extremists to resort to a violent show of disapproval.

Violence against innocent people is an act of cowardice. Taking lives in the name of an ideology or conviction is not an excuse for such action. Those who resort to such means instead of reasoned discussion are a threat to democracy. Their goals will never be attained through murder and intimidation; all that will be achieved is fragmentation and division of society.

India is at an important juncture in its development. Poverty is being alleviated at record rates. The lives of ordinary citizens are improving as never before. Confidence that aims can be attained is high. Internationally, the nation is growing in stature through hard work and innovation.

Terrorists cannot be allowed to take away what has been achieved. No effort should be spared in bringing those behind the Mumbai attacks to justice. But ensuring stability is central to India's continued development. As urgent as the task may be, authorities must be careful to avoid a communal backlash, by showing - and calling for - restraint.

2. **“Resilient India seen Riding out Attacks as Spending Grows,”** *South China Morning Post*, November 29, 2008, at <http://www.scmp.com/portal/site/SCMP/menuitem.2af62ecb329d3d7733492d9253a0a0a0/?vgnnextoid=9c08c74e104ed110VgnVCM100000360a0a0aRCRD&%20World=&cs=Asia+&cs=Business>

India's economy will probably withstand the effect of this week's terror attacks in Mumbai as rising incomes and record harvests boost consumer spending.

"Mumbai is no stranger [to terrorism]," said Sarah Hewin, an economist at Standard Chartered Bank. "Each time we have seen a bounce back and this time will be no exception."

Finance Minister Palaniappan Chidambaram, who did not comment on the shootings and blasts in India's business capital, expects growth to rebound to 9 per cent next year from as low as 7 per cent this year even as a global recession spreads.

Asia's third-largest economy expanded more than expected last quarter as consumer spending held up and investments increased.

"Things changed starting October, when monetary policy shifted to a softening stance that will continue until the middle of next year," said Mridul Saggur, a chief economist at Kotak Securities. "The fundamentals of the economy are positive."

Reserve Bank of India governor Duvvuri Subbarao has reduced the repurchase rate twice in the past five weeks, lowering it to 7.5 per cent from a seven-year high of 9 per cent.

The central bank has been given room to cut borrowing costs as weaker commodity prices reduce risks from inflation, now at a six-month low of 8.84 per cent.

Mr Chidambaram expects growth in India's US\$1.2 trillion economy to slow to between 7 per cent and 8 per cent in the year to March. He said it would "bounce back" on the strength of domestic consumption and investment. Mr Chidambaram said even at 7 per cent, India's growth was three times the rate of global expansion and was second only to China.

Gross domestic product grew 7.6 per cent in the three months to September from a year earlier, faster than the 7.2 per cent forecast by analysts. Domestic consumption in the country of 1.2 billion people, which averaged 59 per cent of the economy in the past year, held up at 58 per cent last quarter.

Domestic consumption accounts for 37 per cent of GDP in China. Savings make up 30 per cent of India's economy, compared with 1 per cent of GDP in the United States.

"There is a lot of money to be reinvested back into the economy," said Jai Sinha, a partner and co-head for India at Booz & Co.

Investments rose to 35.3 per cent of India's GDP last quarter from 32.3 per cent in the previous quarter. Record crop plantings by India's 400 million farmers would also boost rural incomes in the year ahead and help spur growth, Mr Chidambaram said on November 18.

Indian and overseas companies said they were not changing their business plans after terrorists attacked luxury hotels, a railway station and a hospital in Mumbai. ... "The events of the last 24 hours have not affected our longer-term business plans in the country," said Alice Hunt, a director for corporate media at GlaxoSmithKline.

Jan Lambregts, head of Asia research at Rabobank International, a subsidiary of the Dutch banking group, said India's "domestic demand component could show some resilience because inflation is coming off".

He forecast economic growth at about 7 per cent for next year, "which is quite decent given that it's a very tough year".

Venu Srinivasan, the chairman of TVS Motor, said: "In the short term there will be a shock, but in the medium term the investor confidence will come back. India's long-term growth story is intact."

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said India would go after individuals and organisations behind the terrorist attacks, which were "well-planned with external linkages".

India's stock and bond markets, which were shut on Thursday, opened little changed yesterday. Any decline in Indian financial markets in response to the terror attacks might prove to be "temporary" as borne out by Mumbai's experience since 1993, Moody's Economy.com said.

The benchmark Sensex rose 3 per cent the day after train bombings in Mumbai in July 2006 that killed 187 people and injured more than 800.

"This sort of incident is not new in India," Templeton Asset Management chairman Mark Mobius said. "Life does go on in India. It's a very vibrant economy," he said.

C. CHINA DAILY

1. O.P. Rana, "Lesson One Needs to Learn from Mumbai," *China Daily*, December 3, 2008, at http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2008-12/03/content_7265510.htm

Very few things can be more painful than seeing a city in your country go up in flames, and the sense of helplessness multiplies manifold if you are thousands of miles away from home.

... This is not the first time Mumbai has been made to bleed. And if lessons are not learnt, tragically it may not be the last. This sense of fear has made the Indian public and media speak in one voice. They have raised many questions - about the country's intelligence network, security arrangements, ability to deal with crises of such magnitude and accountability.

The country's leadership has responded by removing or getting the resignations of a few top officials. But those are internal matters. What is making headlines across the world is India blaming "elements" in Pakistan for the attack on Mumbai, and demanding that Islamabad take "strong action" against them.

Tempers on the Indian side were running so high over the weekend that one could smell gunpowder across its border with Pakistan. The Pakistani leadership has shown enough maturity not to respond violently to India's charges, though Indian media reports say Islamabad has been massing troops along the border.

The importance of rhetoric in politics and saber-rattling in diplomacy is lost on none. This is a difficult time for India, as it would have been for any other country in such a situation. But as a rising economic power, New Delhi has to think beyond the ordinary and the obvious. The worst possible thing that could happen to the subcontinent, and the world beyond, is another war.

If indeed India, or any other country, wants to declare a war, there are many things to choose from: hunger, illiteracy, inequality, disease, corruption of the mind, senseless violence and global warming. The list can go on. There are too many wars going on in this world in which the only casualties are only humans.

Pakistan is already fighting a war - with itself - to stop senseless violence within its boundaries. Hardly a week goes by without dozens of people being killed in blasts in some part of that country. Islamabad seems to have understood what senseless violence can do to a country. It is ready, President Asif Ali Zardari has said, to join hands with India to fight militancy. But the two countries have a more than 60-year history of mutual distrust. One does not take the other's words at face value.

This is exactly where great diplomacy is needed. Instead of canceling all talks and ceasing all contacts with Pakistan (and thus playing into the hands of the very militants who made Mumbai bleed), India should seize the opportunity not just with talks but with actions.

It might have taken the first step yesterday, when its foreign minister announced India was not considering military action in response to the attacks in Mumbai. For now, it has issued a demarche, asking Pakistan to hand over Indian fugitives who have taken shelter across the border, including two militant groups' chiefs and an underworld don.

This is a welcome step. But the Indian leadership should know any false step will only help fan passions and will be used by the country's divisive elements, which are many, to foment more trouble.

Many innocent lives have already been lost. The Indian leadership should ensure that others don't fall prey to the marauding band of jingoists, who have been targeting Muslims for all the ills in the country.

This is not the time to blame a person or group or a country. This is the time to protect all people and ensure they are not denied the rights to live properly and get the best possible education so that militancy can be nipped in the bud. Militants are not born but made. And the most potent weapons against militancy are not guns and jails but social equality and education.

D. PEOPLES DAILY

- 1. "Rice: Mumbai Attack Kind of Terror al-Qaida Participates in," *Peoples Daily*, December 3, 2008, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6546040.html>**

The visiting U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said Wednesday the terror attack in Mumbai was "the kind of terror in which al-Qaida participates."

"Whether there is a direct al-Qaida hand or not, this is clearly the kind of terror in which al-Qaida participates," she told a press conference during the one-day visit here.

"We are not here to jump to the conclusion that who is responsible," the Times Now channel cited Rice as saying.

The top U.S. diplomat also appealed Pakistan to act against terrorism. "It is time that Pakistan must act against the terrorism," she said. "Pakistan needs to act with urgency and resolve and needs to cooperate fully and transparently."

Rice said it is important the terrorist act must be prevented, adding that her presence in India was to express solidarity and stands with India.

She said the United States would like to cooperate with India and share information.

Rice arrived in New Delhi on Wednesday amidst escalating tension between India and Pakistan following the attacks on Mumbai.

- 2. "Malaysia to Probe into Mumbai Terrorists with Indian Assistance," *Peoples Daily*, December 2, 2008, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6544794.html>**

The Indian Government will assist the Malaysian police over allegations that some terrorists in last week's Mumbai attacks had used Malaysian addresses to rent apartments in the Indian city, its High Commissioner to Malaysia Ashok K. Kantha said on Tuesday.

The Indian Government, through its high commission here, was ready to offer whatever necessary assistance, Kantha said after conveying his condolence to the family of Hemalatha Kassippilai at the latter's home.

"Both Malaysia and India enjoy strong bilateral ties and for that goodwill, we will assist the Malaysian police in required sectors of the matter. We are following (up on) the development of the allegations," he said. "However, we need to wait for the outcome and let the authorities in India conduct their probe into the allegations. We hope for the best," he added.

Hemalatha, 51, a customer relations manager with a German reinsurance firm, was among 172 people killed during the Mumbai attacks.

3. "Life Goes Back to Normal in Mumbai," *Peoples Daily*, November 29, 2008, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6544793.html>

Shops are open, railway platforms are bustling with people. Almost a week after the horrifying attack, people of Mumbai have started to put their lives back on track with heightened morale.

"We can't dodge inside forever, we still have to live our lives," said Duru Mulchandani on Monday, who sells scarves at a shop near Taj Mahal Hotel, a main location tremendously devastated in the incident. The 46-year-old salesperson said that there was no way that people can hide as such kind of incident could happen anywhere, anytime. Mulchandani told Xinhua that in the premises she works for, selling all sorts of traditional Indian souvenirs used to attract a lot of tourists. "Fewer customers are coming now. We were closed for a couple of days and started again on Sunday. We wanted to go back to normal as soon as possible," she said.

At the Mumbai CST railway station, another location intruded by militants in the attack, is crowded with passengers as usual. Shoe-brushing vendors are sitting beside platform ends hoping to earn a living.

Security of the station is obviously tightened up as heavily armed forces and police are patrolling inside. But the scanning machines set at the entrances seem to have little use as people can pass through them freely.

In the recent few days, candle light vigils were held outside the Taj Mahal hotel and the Oberoi Trident hotel for people to mourn for the victims in the incident. Flowers, white candles and laments were placed on the ground with large crowds gathering and mourning. Some took the chance to call for people to unite amid grief by holding up slogans.

Nazmuddin Unwala, an Indian student, said that the fear that had enveloped the Taj hotel in the last 60 hours has given way to a sense of unity, and such attacks would not deter people from being united, according to local paper Times of India.

P. M. Mogre, Indian Merchant's Chamber told the reporter in a recent interview that after the incident, "India, Mumbai, will become stronger."

He said that with people's determination of protecting their homes, he is confident that Mumbai, the financial center of India, will recover soon and reach to an even higher position.

4. "India demands 20 most wanted criminals from Pakistan," *Peoples Daily*, December 2, 2009, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6544746.html>

India Tuesday said it was waiting for a response from Pakistan over the extradition of 20 most wanted criminals who are closely related to Mumbai Attack, reported Indo Asian News Service. The 20 most wanted, who are said to be in Pakistan now, were firmly behind New Delhi in the wake of the Mumbai attack, said the report.

"We issued a demarche (Monday). We are waiting for a response from Pakistan," said India External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee. Mukherjee was replying to a query about Pakistan's response to India's demand for handing over the 20 top criminals who are said to be behind major terror acts in India.

New Delhi also demanded the extradition of known terror masterminds like Dawood Ibrahim, Maulana Masood Azhar, and Lashkar-e-Taiba chief Hafiz Mohammed Saeed, who are suspected to be behind many major terror strikes against India. The Indian external affairs ministry summoned Pakistan's High Commissioner Shahid Malik in New Delhi Monday.

5. "News Analysis: Mumbai attacks reveal deep-rooted conflicts in India," *Peoples Daily*, December 1, 2009, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6543401.html>

The terrorist attacks in India's financial capital Mumbai starting Wednesday night have shocked the world with their brazenness and brutality. The attacks have added to a mounting sense of insecurity in the city and people are still struggling to come to terms with the fallout from the three-day rampage.

Terrorist Attacks More Frequent

India has witnessed deadly terrorist attacks almost every year in recent years, with casualties running into thousands. Since a wave of bombings hit Jaipur in May, several large Indian cities, including New Delhi and Bangalore, all became targets of terrorist attacks, which resulted in heavy casualties and losses.

As India's financial capital and the most populous city, Mumbai has come under terrorist attacks three times in recent years, the previous two being in 1993 and 2006. The latest attacks were more serious in terms of their magnitude.

The attacks were well-planned and the gunmen were cold-blooded. They were well-equipped and trained. They hurled grenades, fired indiscriminately, took people hostage and attacked hotels and hospitals.

Experts point to the level of sophistication of the attacks and also note that foreigners were targeted for the first time in terrorist attacks in India.

Causes Behind the Terror Attacks

Against a backdrop of intensified anti-terror efforts globally, there are deep-rooted causes behind the rampant terrorist activities in India.

Firstly, sectarian conflicts are serious in India. With many sects in the country, mostly belonging to Hindus and Muslims, many conflicts erupt between the two communities, fighting for different religious beliefs and their own interests.

A previously unknown group calling itself Deccan Mujahedeen claimed responsibility for the attacks, fueling speculation they might be linked to the Indian Mujahedeen formed by Islamic extremists, which had sent emails claiming responsibility for four attacks it said it mounted between November 2007 and September 2008.

Secondly, cross-border terrorism has become a major threat to the country's security. Bordering on Afghanistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh where some terrorist groups are operating, India is vulnerable to these attacks. The Kashmir separatists have grown more worried because of the improved ties between India and Pakistan and might have been involved the latest attacks in their bid to sabotage India-Pakistan relations.

Independent security analyst K. Subrahmanyam suggested that a primary motive for the Mumbai attacks could well have been a desire to "wreck the peace

process" launched by India and Pakistan in January 2004.

The attacks, involving multiple targets and hostage-taking, bears "the hallmarks of Al-Qaeda attacks in the Middle East and North Africa", said former national security advisor Brajesh Mishra.

Thirdly, separatism is flourishing in India which has a vast territory, a large population and unbalanced economic development. The widening gap between rich and poor has triggered discontent among minorities and social conflicts are becoming more serious.

According to statistics from the Indian Interior Ministry, there are 275 terrorist groups in the country. For years, the government has been trying to ease conflicts through dialogue and negotiations, but the effort has not yielded much results.

High Prices

The Mumbai attacks have dealt a heavy blow to the credibility of the ruling Congress party-led coalition government, especially in the run-up to the general elections scheduled for next year.

After the last militant was gunned down by the Indian commandos on Sunday, the public has been questioning the ineptness of some politicians and security loopholes. The Congress government was blamed by many for the loopholes that allowed the heavily-armed Islamist gunmen to come across the seas to land in Mumbai. Others decried the Hindu nationalist party BJP for seeking electoral advantage.

India's home minister and security minister both resigned on Sunday, taking responsibility for the deadly attacks.

The attacks were another blow to the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's cabinet, as public confidence in the government has been falling due to rising inflation at home and the global financial crisis. How to cope with the aftermath of the terror attacks would be an immediate challenge and serious test for the Singh cabinet.

6. "DPRK condemns India terrorist attacks," *Peoples Daily*, November 29, 2008, at <http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90851/6542881.html#>

The top legislator of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) on Friday said the DPRK "strongly condemns" the terrorist attacks in India.

"The DPRK government, opposing to all forms of terrorism and any support to it, strongly condemns this inhuman terrorist deed and extends firm solidarity with

the Indian government's efforts to save the situation and maintain the social stability," the official KCNA news quoted top legislator Kim Yong Nam as saying.

The attacks that began Wednesday night in India's financial capital of Mumbai have killed more than 100 people.

E. BERNAMA

1. "Police Awaiting Feedback on Alleged Malaysian Link in Mumbai Attack," Bernama, December 4, 2008, at <http://www.bernama.com.my/bernama/v3/news.php?id=376296>

SHAH ALAM, Dec 4 (Bernama) -- Inspector-General of Police Tan Sri Musa Hassan said today he is awaiting feedback from the Indian police pertaining to the media reports there which alleged that some of the assailants involved in the Mumbai terrorist attack over the weekend had used Malaysian addresses to rent an apartment in the city.

"So far, no information has been given to us by the Indian government in connection with the incident and thus, the reports will stay as a mere allegations until evidence is produced.

"The Indian government said that they too had not received any feedback from Interpol pertaining to the incident, but they also have not ask for any help from the Royal Malaysian Police (PDRM)," he told reporters opening a PDRM exhibition at the Shah Alam Gallery, here Thursday.

News report surfaced in India the assailants had used Malaysian addresses to rent an apartment in the Colaba area in the southern part of the city where they struck with AK-47 rifles and hand grenades.

There were also reports that a credit card issued in Malaysia was found on one of the dead terrorists.

On Tuesday, however, the Mumbai police said that so far, the ongoing probe on the worst terror attack in India which left almost 170 people dead, did not indicate any association with Malaysia.

In other development, Musa said of about two million police reports lodged this year, only 171,000 actually involved genuine criminal cases.

"The rest of the reports were mostly on domestic violence and cyber crimes which do not count under our crime index," he said.

Stressing that the crime rate in the country was still under control, Musa, however, advised political parties, whether from the government or the Opposition, to be the best role models for the people by not indulging in illegal assemblies.

"Political leaders who organise illegal assemblies can be equated as criminals," he added.

2. "Malaysia Condemns Mumbai Attacks," *Bernama*, November 27, 2008, at <http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/index.php/malaysia/13342-malaysia-condemns-mumbai-attacks->

KUALA LUMPUR, Nov 27 - Malaysia today condemned yesterday's horrific terrorist attacks on major public places in Mumbai, India that killed scores of people and injured many others.

Foreign Minister Datuk Seri Dr Rais Yatim said Malaysia was deeply shocked and saddened by the senseless act of violence "deliberately directed at civilian targets designed to inflict maximum human casualties."

"Malaysia remains firmly committed to the fight against terrorism and in engaging in a constructive manner, all regional and international efforts in combating terrorism," he said in a statement today.

He added that the horrendous attacks in Mumbai underscored the fundamental need for the international community to continue vigorously forging a comprehensive and effective front in combating all forms of terrorism and extremism.

At least 80 people, including a foreign tourist and four top police officers, were killed and over 250 injured in the attacks near the Taj Intercontinental and Trident (formerly Oberoi) hotels.

Among the targets was the city's busiest railway station, the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (CST), formerly the Victoria Terminus, a World Heritage Site.

F. SYDNEY MORNING HERALD

1. Editorial, "Soft Target for a Futile Cause," *Sydney Morning Herald*, November 28, 2008, at <http://www.smh.com.au/news/opinion/editorial/soft-target-for-a-futile-cause/2008/11/27/1227491726184.html>

ANALYSTS will be struggling to identify the attackers and their motives in Mumbai's latest atrocities. The list of candidate groups is long, and terrorist bombings have spread in recent months to previously immune cities across the country. So far, the only claimant to responsibility gives a hitherto unknown name. If, as seems likely, the perpetrators belong to an extreme Islamist terrorist group, we can begin trying to fathom the objectives.

Among the nine specific locations of attack were some where ordinary Indian citizens could be expected to bear the brunt, such as the main rail terminus, or where senior Indian police officials were located. But unlike a previous string of bombings, four luxury hotels and a restaurant popular with foreign backpackers were targets - and not just for bombs left to explode, but active attack with automatic rifles and grenades by young men or youths ready to die. In at least one case, American and British nationals were singled out for abduction as hostages.

This suggests a wider agenda than the disputes of the Subcontinent, such as over the status of Kashmir or the treatment of India's large Muslim minority. In any case, India has just carried out moderately successful state elections in its part of Kashmir; the time to disrupt the process would have been beforehand. The recent ratification of India's historic nuclear agreement with the US, and New Delhi's growing strategic closeness with Washington, might have caused global jihadists of the al-Qaeda type to think of an attack at India's vitals. Mumbai, as the financial centre of India and host to incoming tourists and investors, would fit this aim.

But what has it achieved? The world has joined India in outrage at the attack, and sympathy for the victims of many nationalities. There will be more police and intelligence co-operation with Indian security agencies, and more pressure on Pakistan to crack down on the terrorist groups that have operated from its territory. Mumbai will quickly recover, as it did from the bombing of the stock exchange and elsewhere in March 1993 or the railway bombings of July 2006.

The terrorists will no doubt hope to provoke the Indian state into oppressive surveillance of Muslims, or encourage the return of a stridently Hindu nationalist government at next year's elections, and thereby get more aggrieved recruits for their cause. Though it leaves cities like Mumbai prey to callous attacks like this, the open society remains India's best defence against extremism.

Blundering - or blundering through

2. Editorial, "Now is the Time to Stand Shoulder to Shoulder with India,"
Sydney Morning Herald, November 29, 2008, at
<http://www.smh.com.au/news/opinion/editorial/now-is-the-time-to-stand-shoulder-to-shoulder-with-india/2008/11/28/1227491828756.html>

A NATION of more than 1 billion citizens contains many with grievances. India's democracy allows freedom of expression of such grievances, but many times in the past the impatient and ruthless few have used violence to make their point. The US State Department estimates that about 2300 people died in attacks by various groups in India last year. Mumbai, the nation's financial capital, has suffered six major terrorist strikes since 1993, including a campaign of bombings in 2006 that killed more than 200 people.

This week's co-ordinated terrorist attacks on India's largest city came suddenly, but not without warning. Police had earlier been warned by self-declared Islamists that Mumbai would be attacked in reprisal for the country's alleged failure to protect the human rights of its Muslim citizens.

Terrorism, of course, has no religion, but for at least a quarter of a century now, political extremists professing religious piety have staged attacks in different parts of the country: Kashmir, Gujarat, Punjab, Orissa - the list is long. At the same time this week's atrocity bears the hallmarks of the global jihad that brought us the September 11, 2001 attacks and the Bali, London and Madrid bombings. Targets included transport infrastructure, five-star hotels and restaurants frequented by westerners, as well as a Jewish centre. The assailants were young men, heavily armed and well trained.

It is not yet known if they were imported for this purpose or were home-grown terrorists. India has known both in the 62 years since independence. At times, Pakistan has done its best to pour fuel on India's internal fires, and India's Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, has been quick to warn of serious consequences if the latest attacks are linked to neighbouring countries. Indian naval vessels have boarded two Pakistani merchant ships in the Arabian Sea amid claims the attackers arrived in Mumbai by boat and spoke a dialect of Punjabi unique to Pakistan. But these are early days. It is to be hoped that a rush to judgment - egged on by India's highly competitive news media - will be avoided. The terrorists' modus operandi was similar, for example, to previous attacks by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, or Tamil Tigers, in Sri Lanka, who have in the past co-operated with other terrorist groups. The world needs to know the identities, motivations and connections of the perpetrators of these latest attacks, and a patient, methodical and open-minded investigation based on hard,

publicly-available evidence has the best chance of success. Like al-Qaeda, the aim of terrorists everywhere is to sow insecurity and hatred in free societies. Those who have attacked Mumbai would like nothing better than to ignite a new and destabilising round of enmities between India and Pakistan.

They will also be gratified if their handiwork should trigger sectarian violence between Hindus and Muslims, and as India heads for national elections in the first half of next year the scope for political polarisation is obvious. In the twilight of the Bush Administration it is worth remembering that while terrorists can temporarily disrupt life in democratic nations, they can never destroy us. But democracies that lash out blindly in retaliation can do great damage to their own social and political fabric. India has demonstrated in the past a capacity for restraint in the face of extreme provocation. It deserves our strong support in this difficult time.

Australians are among the dead in Mumbai and their loss should cement our determination to fight shoulder to shoulder with the nation under attack. The Australian Government has a legal obligation to warn its citizens about security threats prevailing in India, but it would be perverse if such warnings serve the terrorists' purpose of damaging confidence in India. Many Australians know the risks and are still prepared to continue visiting and doing business there. Before and since independence, Indians have paid a heavy price for their freedom. Their nation has been called a functioning anarchy, the land of a million mutinies, but there is something miraculous and important about its progress. Australia must show solidarity with India's cause, and be ready to share the sacrifices necessary to ensure its ultimate victory.
