



The killing of Osama Bin Laden: the Pakistan connection

Standard Note: SN/IA/5947

Last updated: 3 May 2011

Author: Jon Lunn

Section International Affairs and Defence Section

1) [John Brennan, Deputy National Security Advisor for Homeland Security and Counter-Terrorism, briefs about the military operation, 2 May 2011](#)

Extract:

Q And if I could just ask, have you been able to determine how bin Laden was able to hide in this relatively prominent location, and do you believe the Pakistanis when they say that they had no idea that he was there?

MR. BRENNAN: People have been referring to this as hiding in plain sight. Clearly this was something that was considered as a possibility. Pakistan is a large country. We are looking right now at how he was able to hold out there for so long, and whether or not there was any type of support system within Pakistan that allowed him to stay there.

We know that the people at the compound there were working on his behalf, and that's how we ultimately found our way to that compound. But we are right now less than 24 hours after this operation, so we are talking with the Pakistanis on a regular basis now, and we're going to pursue all leads to find out exactly what type of support system and benefactors that bin Laden might have had.

Q But you don't necessarily take them at their word that they didn't know?

MR. BRENNAN: We are pursuing all leads in this issue.

Q Just to follow on that, is it really credible that Pakistani authorities had no idea that this compound was being built and that it existed -- such an elaborate compound?

MR. BRENNAN: I think it's inconceivable that bin Laden did not have a support system in the country that allowed him to remain there for an extended period of time. I am not going to speculate about what type of support he might have had on an official basis inside of Pakistan. We are closely talking to the Pakistanis right now, and again, we are leaving open opportunities to continue to pursue whatever leads might be out there.

See video of briefing [here](#).

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required. This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

2) [Senior Administration official briefs the press](#), 2 May 2011

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We shared our intelligence on this bin Laden compound with no other country, including Pakistan. That was for one reason and one reason alone: We believed it was essential to the security of the operation and our personnel. In fact, only a very small group of people inside our own government knew of this operation in advance.

Shortly after the raid, U.S. officials contacted senior Pakistani leaders to brief them on the intent and the results of the raid. We have also contacted a number of our close allies and partners throughout the world.

Sine 9/11, the United States has made it clear to Pakistan that we would pursue bin Laden wherever he might be. Pakistan has long understood that we are at war with al Qaeda. The United States had a legal and moral obligation to act on the information it had.

And let me emphasize that great care was taken to ensure operational success, minimize the possibility of non-combatant casualties, and to adhere to American and international law in carrying out the mission.

3) Steve Coll, [“Notes on the death of Osama bin Laden”](#), New Yorker, 2 May 2011

Extract:

Abbottabad is essentially a military-cantonment city in Pakistan, in the hills to the north of the capital of Islamabad, in an area where much of the land is controlled or owned by the Pakistani Army and retired Army officers. Although the city is technically in what used to be called the Northwest Frontier Province, it lies on the far eastern side of the province and is as close to Pakistani-held Kashmir as it is to the border city of Peshawar. The city is most notable for housing the Pakistan Military Academy, the Pakistani Army’s premier training college, equivalent to West Point. Looking at maps and satellite photos on the Web last night, I saw the wide expanse of the Academy not far from where the million-dollar, heavily secured mansion where bin Laden lived was constructed in 2005. The maps I looked at had sections of land nearby marked off as “restricted areas,” indicating that they were under military control. It stretches credulity to think that a mansion of that scale could have been built and occupied by bin Laden for six years without its coming to the attention of anyone in the Pakistani Army.

The initial circumstantial evidence suggests that the opposite is more likely—that bin Laden was effectively being housed under Pakistani state control. Pakistan will deny this, it seems safe to predict, and perhaps no convincing evidence will ever surface to prove the case. If I were a prosecutor at the United States Department of Justice, however, I would be tempted to call a grand jury. Who owned the land on which the house was constructed? How was the land acquired, and from whom? Who designed the house, which seems to have been purpose-built to secure bin Laden? Who was the general contractor? Who installed the security systems? Who worked there? Are there witnesses who will now testify as to who visited the house, how often, and for what purpose? These questions are not relevant only to the full realization of justice for the victims of September 11th. They are also relevant to the victims of terrorist attacks conducted or inspired by bin Laden while he lived in the house, and these include many Pakistanis, as well as Afghans, Indians, Jordanians, and Britons. They are rightly subjects of American criminal law.

Read more <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2011/05/notes-on-the-death-of-osama-bin-laden.html#ixzz1LH6Ma3qE>

4) US Assistance to Pakistan

[Adapted from Library Research Paper 10/45, *The AfPak policy and the Pashtuns* (June 2010)]

On 30 September 2009 Congress passed *The Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act* (S. 1707), which tripled US non-military aid to Pakistan to US\$1.5 billion a year between 2010 and 2014. The legislation has a strong focus on strengthening democracy, promoting development and improving education in Pakistan. It also authorises military assistance to Pakistan, requiring that funds go mainly towards counter-insurgency and counter-terrorism efforts.¹ The conditions attached to non-military aid in earlier drafts of the legislation had been considerably watered down by the time the Act was passed, following protests by powerful elements within the Pakistani political and security establishment.² A joint [explanatory statement](#) by Senators John F. Kerry and Howard Berman stated:

The legislation does not seek in any way to compromise Pakistan's sovereignty, impinge on Pakistan's national security interests, or micromanage any aspect of Pakistani military or civilian operations. There are no conditions on Pakistan attached to the authorization of \$7.5 billion in non-military aid. The only requirements on this funding are financial accountability measures that Congress is imposing on the U.S. executive branch, to ensure that this assistance supports programs that most benefit the Pakistani people.

In January 2010 the Office of the US Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan published an [Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy](#), which provided the most detailed overview yet available of the concrete measures being pursued, with price tags attached, by the US Government, as it sought to implement the AfPak policy.³

Below is a list of activity headings, with an approximate US Dollar figure for the resources available for each initiative during Fiscal Year 2010 (that is, October 2009-September 2010) next to each heading.

Afghanistan

Deploying additional civilian expertise	\$400m
Rebuilding Afghanistan's agriculture sector	\$300m
Strengthening Afghan governance	\$1.8bn
Enhancing Afghan rule of law	\$400m
Supporting Afghan-led reintegration	\$100m
Combating the Afghan narcotics trade	\$1bn
Building an economic foundation for Afghanistan's future	\$2.5bn

¹ "House passes bicameral legislation increasing assistance to Pakistan, improving US-Pakistan ties", House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, press release, 30 September 2009

² K. Fischer, "The AfPak strategy: Reactions in Pakistan", Afghanistan Analysts Network policy briefing, March 2010, p6

³ In December 2010, following the death of Richard Holbrooke, Frank Ruggiero was appointed the new Special Representative.

Pakistan

An enhanced Partnership with Pakistan	\$2.3bn
Enhancing Pakistan's counterinsurgency capabilities	\$455m ⁴

General

Disrupting illicit financial flows to extremists	Not specified
Countering extremist voices	\$250m
Mobilising international support	Not specified

A plan for Reconstruction Opportunity Zones, first proposed by former President George W. Bush in 2006, under which duty-free access to the US market would be granted for certain goods, as part of the promotion of economic activity in the FATA and Afghanistan, also remains – despite prolonged Congressional delays – on the agenda.

In March 2010 the US and Pakistan resumed their 'Strategic Dialogue', which had been in abeyance since 2008, with a week of high-level talks in Washington. A further round of talks will be held in Pakistan later this year.

The AfPak policy is backed up by the continuing availability of funding sources for the Afghan and Pakistani security forces that pre-date it. For example, there are government-to-government arms sales and grants from the US to Afghanistan and Pakistan through Foreign Military Financing (FMF). Through FMF, funds are provided with which US military equipment, services and training can then be purchased. Both countries also benefit from Coalition Support Funds, which reimburse allies for the cost of counter-terrorist military operations. CSF reimbursements have been a major component of US financial transfers to Pakistan since 2001.⁵ These issues came up at the March 2010 'Strategic Dialogue', at which the US agreed to move ahead with the supply of further military equipment, including F-16 fighter aircraft, and to pay back Pakistan \$2 billion which it is owed to recoup the cost of military operations.⁶

The latest quarterly [Pakistan Assistance Strategy Report](#), covering the period to December 2010, was submitted by the US Government to Congress, was published in February 2011.

Below is the text of the Executive Summary:

In December 2009, the U.S. Department of State developed a strategy for providing civilian assistance to Pakistan. However, over the past year of reporting on the civilian assistance program designed to carry out the strategy, progress has been difficult to measure. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the largest contributor to the assistance program, has not committed to a set of performance indicators to measure the success of its programs as traditionally required for proper

⁴ This does not include Coalition Support Funds. \$700m was also appropriated in the FY2009 Supplemental for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund.

⁵ K.A. Kronstadt and K. Katzman, "Islamist militancy in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border region and US policy", Congressional Research Service, 21 November 2008, p15-16

⁶ "Will the Pakistan-US relationship survive?", *Jane's Defence Weekly*, 14 April 2010. See also: "What strategic dialogue? US-Pakistani cooperation in Afghanistan", www.opendemocracy.net, 7 April 2010

project management. Moreover, the U.S. Embassy Islamabad has not identified a core set of development indicators by which to measure the success of the U.S. Government development strategy—including the efforts of USAID, the Department of State (DOS), and the Department of Defense (DOD).

For FY 2010, Congress appropriated \$1.514 billion¹ for the civilian assistance strategy. The U.S. Embassy reported that as of December 31, 2010, \$3.931 billion in FY 2009, 2010, and 2011 funds had been obligated. These funds support high-impact, high-visibility infrastructure; focused humanitarian and social services; and government capacity development. The funds also support shifting requirements and needs as determined by the U.S. Government in consultation with the Government of Pakistan.

Pakistan's unprecedented summer floods, which affected over 20 million people, constituted a major shift in funding requirements and needs. The U.S. Government response to the floods was rapid and significant and closely coordinated with federal and local authorities in Pakistan. As echoed in bilateral and multilateral meetings held during the reporting period, the United States remains committed to supporting the Pakistani people from relief to recovery and reconstruction. To demonstrate its commitment, the United States recently pledged an additional \$500 million in assistance funds.

Amid recovery and early reconstruction efforts, USAID reported an increase in awards to Pakistani institutions. As of December 31, 2010, USAID has made 76 awards totaling \$1.361 billion to governmental and nongovernmental Pakistani institutions. To overcome flood-related risks posed to the civilian assistance strategy, such as a loss of momentum in planning and implementing programs and potential damage to relationships established with Pakistani stakeholders, USAID has moved as expeditiously as possible reprioritizing activities and reallocating funds and has maintained contact with key counterparts to sustain important political relationships while programs remain on hold. To improve monitoring and oversight of its programs, USAID conducted preaward assessments of local implementing partners and expanded its regional offices. However, ongoing security threats impede effective implementation and monitoring of assistance programs.

Oversight entities have also taken steps to ensure that U.S. Government funds are protected against waste and theft. The DOS Office of Inspector General (OIG) established a field office in Islamabad, while USAID OIG expanded its field office in Pakistan. USAID OIG has vetted independent Pakistani accounting firms that will conduct financial audits of funds provided to Pakistani nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), provided financial audit training and fraud awareness briefings, and collaborated with USAID/Pakistan to establish a fraud hotline.

During the period covered by this report, October 1 through December 31, 2010, USAID OIG completed four audits, including performance audits of two livelihood development programs in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). The goal of both programs is social and economic stabilization to counter the growing influence of extremist and terrorist groups. The audits found the programs had made little progress in achieving the goal largely because of the hostile environment—the chief of party for one implementing partner was assassinated—but also because of a lack of baseline data and inadequate oversight, which resulted in questioned costs of \$767,841. Security issues and allegations of wrongdoing overshadowed and impeded program progress. USAID/Pakistan terminated its agreement with one implementing partner, the U.S.-based Academy for Educational Development (AED), after an ongoing OIG investigation revealed fraud stemming from false statements and claims, failure to perform in accordance with the terms of the agreement, and violation of statutory or regulatory provisions contained in the agreement.

The OIG investigation resulted in additional benefits for the United States. After OIG investigators substantiated corporate misconduct, USAID suspended AED from receiving new U.S. Government awards pending completion of the investigation. The AED board of directors accepted the organization's responsibility for the mismanagement of the USAID-funded program in Pakistan and required AED's president and chief executive officer and four other senior executives to leave the organization.

5) EU assistance to Pakistan

Extract from [FCO Country Profile](#) (last updated 1 April 2011):

The first Summit in June 2009 marked the beginning of a long-term strategic EU-Pakistan partnership. It recognised the critical importance of a stable, prosperous and democratic Pakistan to the member states of the European Union.

The second EU-Pakistan Summit, held on 4 June 2010, built on the outcomes of the 2009 Summit to further deepen and consolidate the EU-Pakistan relationship. The EU and Pakistan agreed to develop a five year strategic engagement plan, and to greater coordination in the areas of development, trade, security and human rights.

In 2009 the EU remained the largest trading partner. EU exports to Pakistan totalled €3.9 billion and EU imports from Pakistan at €3.0 billion.

Full details, including the European Commission's [Country Strategy Paper for Pakistan](#), are available on the Commission's website.

6) UK assistance to Pakistan

Extract from [FCO Country Profile](#) (last updated 1 April 2011):

Relations between the UK and the people of Pakistan are warm and close, made even more so by the substantial number of Pakistani origin British citizens (some 1 million) who live in the UK. We are uniquely connected:

- Over a £1billion (120billion Rupees) worth of trade flow between our two countries each year
- Almost 10,000 Pakistanis studying in the UK
- 1.4 million journeys between Pakistan and the UK each year
- The UK is the second largest investor in Pakistan

Prime Minister Cameron and President Zardari agreed to strengthen UK-Pakistan relationship in London on 6 August 2010 through an enhanced UK-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue. This will lead to strengthened co-operation between the two countries in areas of global and regional peace and stability, people-to-people links, trade and investment, education, culture, and parliamentary. A joint statement released on 6 August 2010 by the Prime Minister and President Zardari is available on the [Number 10 website](#).

UK Development Assistance

If progress is made on reforms, as with other partners, the UK's aid to Pakistan will average £350 million per year over four years. Increased aid to Pakistan will be linked to progress on reform as the Government of Pakistan takes steps to build a more dynamic economy, tackle corruption and bring stability.

For further information on our aid programmes and activities, please visit the DFID Pakistan website at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Where-we-work/Asia-South/Pakistan/>

7) Selected press articles

Pakistan did its part

Asif Ali Zardari

771 words

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: The Washington Post

Page: A21

Copyright 2011, The Washington Post Co. All Rights Reserved

Pakistan, perhaps the world's greatest victim of terrorism, joins the other targets of al-Qaeda - the people of the United States, Britain, Spain, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Turkey, Yemen, Kenya, Tanzania, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Algeria - in our satisfaction that the source of the greatest evil of the new millennium has been silenced, and his victims given justice. He was not anywhere we had anticipated he would be, but now he is gone.

Although the events of Sunday were not a joint operation, a decade of cooperation and partnership between the United States and Pakistan led up to the elimination of Osama bin Laden as a continuing threat to the civilized world. And we in Pakistan take some satisfaction that our early assistance in identifying an al-Qaeda courier ultimately led to this day.

Let us be frank. Pakistan has paid an enormous price for its stand against terrorism. More of our soldiers have died than all of NATO's casualties combined. Two thousand police officers, as many as 30,000 innocent civilians and a generation of social progress for our people have been lost. And for me, justice against bin Laden was not just political; it was also personal, as the terrorists murdered our greatest leader, the mother of my children. Twice he tried to assassinate my wife. In 1989 he poured \$50 million into a no-confidence vote to topple her first government. She said that she was bin Laden's worst nightmare - a democratically elected, progressive, moderate, pluralistic female leader. She was right, and she paid for it with her life.

Some in the U.S. press have suggested that Pakistan lacked vitality in its pursuit of terrorism, or worse yet that we were disingenuous and actually protected the terrorists we claimed to be pursuing. Such baseless speculation may make exciting cable news, but it doesn't reflect fact. Pakistan had as much reason to despise al-Qaeda as any nation. The war on terrorism

is as much Pakistan's war as as it is America's. And though it may have started with bin Laden, the forces of modernity and moderation remain under serious threat.

My government endorses the words of President Obama and appreciates the credit he gave us Sunday night for the successful operation in Khyber Pakhtunkhawa. We also applaud and endorse the words of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that we must "press forward, bolstering our partnerships, strengthening our networks, investing in a positive vision of peace and progress, and relentlessly pursuing the murderers who target innocent people." We have not yet won this war, but we now clearly can see the beginning of the end, and the kind of South and Central Asia that lies in our future.

Only hours after bin Laden's death, the Taliban reacted by blaming the government of Pakistan and calling for retribution against its leaders, and specifically against me as the nation's president. We will not be intimidated. Pakistan has never been and never will be the hotbed of fanaticism that is often described by the media.

Radical religious parties have never received more than 11 percent of the vote. Recent polls showed that 85 percent of our people are strongly opposed to al-Qaeda. In 2009, when the Taliban briefly took over the Swat Valley, it demonstrated to the people of Pakistan what our future would look like under its rule - repressive politics, religious fanaticism, bigotry and discrimination against girls and women, closing of schools and burning of books. Those few months did more to unite the people of Pakistan around our moderate vision of the future than anything else possibly could.

A freely elected democratic government, with the support and mandate of the people, working with democracies all over the world, is determined to build a viable, prosperous Pakistan that is a model to the entire Islamic world on what can be accomplished in giving hope to our people and opportunity to our children. We can become everything that al-Qaeda and the Taliban most fear - a vision of a modern Islamic future. Our people, our government, our military, our intelligence agencies are very much united. Some abroad insist that this is not the case, but they are wrong. Pakistanis are united.

Together, our nations have suffered and sacrificed. We have fought bravely and with passion and commitment. Ultimately we will prevail. For, in the words of my martyred wife, Benazir Bhutto, "truth, justice and the forces of history are on our side."

The writer is the president of Pakistan.

HOW COULD THEY NOT HAVE KNOWN HE WAS THERE?

1384 words

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: Daily Mail

Page: 9

(c) 2011 Associated Newspapers. All rights reserved

COMMENTARY BY MICHAEL BURLEIGH Author and Historian

Pakistan has long denied any knowledge of the whereabouts of Osama Bin Laden. The country's Interior Minister Rehman Malik told visiting U.S. politicians in 2009 that 'he had no clue' where the terrorist leader was - adding that he didn't think he was in Pakistan, but perhaps Iran, Saudi Arabia or Yemen.

He even suggested that Bin Laden had died some time ago - killed in airstrikes on the Tora Bora mountain cave complex in Afghanistan shortly after 9/11.

Now that Bin Laden is dead, those denials - from a government which has been playing a double game on terrorism for years - have shifted to feigned amazement.

'It was quite surprising that he was in Pakistan,' General Hamid Gul, former head of the country's Inter Services Intelligence agency (ISI), declared yesterday.

Pakistan's High Commissioner to London was similarly 'surprised' that for five years or more Bin Laden may have been intermittently living just an hour's drive from the Pakistani capital of Islamabad.

What's more, Abbottabad - a city of 120,000 people - is a closely monitored Pakistani military base and home to three army regiments, a unit of its Medical Corps and a military academy.

Given that Bin Laden's large compound was just several hundred metres from the academy, it seems inconceivable that at least some senior Pakistani members of the military or government did not know of his presence.

Absurdly, the Pakistani army chief of staff, General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, addressed cadets at the city's academy last month, confidently announcing that Pakistan had 'cracked' the forces of terrorism. Even as he spoke, the Taliban were just launching bomb attacks in Karachi.

Pakistan's government was quick yesterday to claim co-responsibility for the raid on Bin Laden. But the truth is that this is self-serving nonsense.

U.S. intelligence has spent the past six years trying to identify and then track a key Bin Laden loyalist - whose name was supplied by a detainee at Guantanamo Bay - who eventually led them to the terrorist leader's hideout.

The Americans are adamant they acted alone. A senior U.S. official said: 'We shared our intelligence with no other country - not even Pakistan.'

That is hardly surprising, since Washington rightly feared that treacherous elements in the ISI or Pakistani government might have tipped off Bin Laden and helped him relocate to the more congenial tribal badlands.

Whatever public face both countries choose to adopt, relations between the U.S. and Pakistan are now at an absolute nadir.

Traditionally, Pakistan has been a U.S. ally since the Cold War, but the events of 9/11 gave this relationship added urgency - not least because Pakistan had been a strong supporter of the Taliban in neighbouring Afghanistan as it tried to shore itself up against its old enemy, India.

The control of Afghanistan, mainly through the Taliban, has been an article of faith for all Pakistani governments. Should India and Pakistan ever go to war again, eastern Afghanistan

would give Islamabad the strategic depth from which to counter their much larger and stronger neighbour.

But under pressure from the U.S. - and in return for billions of dollars in aid - Pakistan joined President Bush's 'war on terror'. This helped America step up its operations in Afghanistan, using Pakistan as a military base to direct its attacks.

However, much American aid has fallen into the wrong hands and has been corruptly diverted into industrial and commercial enterprises and huge property empires owned by senior army commanders and politicians. Fighting terror has been low on their priority list.

Meanwhile, Pakistani leaders and the army have come to bitterly resent the U.S. trying to dictate the country's foreign policy - despite Islamabad's manifestly lax attitude to terrorism, of which there are numerous examples. Significant Al Qaeda players, notably 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheik Mohammed in 2003, have previously been detained alive and well in Pakistan.

More outrageously, the Afghani Taliban high command - who previously sheltered Bin Laden - are called the Quetta Shura (or council) precisely because they are allowed to deliberate in the western Pakistani city of Quetta. Three of the four 7/7 bombers were of Pakistani origin. One, Shehzad Tanweer, is said to have spent several months at a madrassa, or religious school, in Lahore in 2004 - which led to reports that dozens of British-born Pakistani Muslims were returning to their home country for similar religious indoctrination.

Mohammed Sidique Khan, ringleader of the London bombings, also received telephone advice from terrorists in Pakistan just days before the attacks.

And two weeks ago, Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the U.S. joint chiefs of staff, publicly upbraided General Kayani for doing nothing to stop another Islamist terrorist group - the Haqqani network - from criss-crossing the Pakistani border with Afghanistan to kill U.S. and Nato forces.

No wonder David Cameron so controversially spoke out against Pakistan's record on combating terror during a visit to India last year, saying nobody was in 'any doubt' there were terrorist groups operating in Pakistan - and calling on the Islamabad government to do more to 'eliminate them'.

But Pakistanis are also aggrieved at what they perceive as the ramping up of military operations from their country.

Under President Obama, the number of CIA drone strikes (controlled from an airbase in the Pakistani province of Baluchistan) has risen from 35 in 2007 to 120 last year. Although the Pakistani government tacitly sanctions these operations, publicly it denounces them; targeted assassinations even of Islamist terrorists can cause outrage among a Pakistani public prone to anti-American hysteria.

Then there was the Raymond Davis affair in January, which has also heightened tensions between the two states. One night in Lahore, this tough-looking 36-year old CIA contractor was shadowing a female CIA agent meeting a member of the Taliban. He had several passports, guns and a make-up kit in his car.

When three robbers - who may have been set up by the ISI, Pakistan's equivalent of MI6 or the CIA - attacked Davis, he shot two of them dead, while a U.S. colleague in another car ran over and killed the third culprit.

Apprehended by the Pakistani police, Davis avoided trial - and a possible death sentence - only after the U.S. paid a substantial amount of blood money to the robbers' grieving families.

When Lt General Ahmed Shuja Pasha, the head of ISI, visited Washington last month, he demanded that the U.S. remove up to 335 CIA personnel from Pakistan, as well as freelance contractors like Davis, while handing over command and control of the drone strikes to Pakistan's armed forces. Since the Americans have no faith in the Pakistanis, there was no chance that they would do either.

Beyond these questions of sovereignty and willingness to combat terrorism is Obama's desire to get U.S. forces out of Afghanistan as rapidly as possible - for it is essentially a war he inherited.

But he has lost faith in Pakistan's ability to help crush Afghani terrorism, partly because so many of Pakistan's intelligence agencies and army officers are in cahoots with the Taliban.

On the other hand, a rapid U.S. exit from Afghanistan is the last thing the Pakistani government would want. It would not only spell the end of the military aid America has poured into Pakistan, but leave Afghanistan either in anarchy or highly susceptible to India's stealthy influence.

Indeed, were it not for the fact that Pakistan now has a larger nuclear arsenal than Britain, the U.S. would dearly love to wash its hands of its involvement there.

With the death of Bin Laden, the U.S. may well decide it has bigger fish to fry and redirect its lethal attentions to the lesser Bin Laden wannabes elsewhere - chiefly in Somalia and Yemen.

If I were the Yemeni Al Qaeda chief, Anwar al-Awlaki, I would ponder nervously the enormous resources, skill and patience that went into eliminating Osama Bin Laden, who is currently feeding fish in the Bay of Bengal.

Amid Skepticism, Pakistan Calculates Its Response

By CARLOTTA GALL and ERIC SCHMITT; Carlotta Gall reported from Islamabad, and Eric Schmitt from Brussels. Reporting was contributed by Ismail Khan from Peshawar, Pakistan; Waqar Gillani from Islamabad; Salman Masood from Abbottabad, Pakistan; and David Rohde and Pir Zubair Shah from New York.

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: The New York Times

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan -- The discovery of Osama bin Laden by American commandos close to the Pakistani capital dealt a devastating blow to the Pakistani military and its intelligence service and set off a fevered round of speculation about how Bin Laden could have been hiding virtually under their noses in a small city that housed military garrisons.

It was amply clear on Monday that the Pakistani military was experiencing a gamut of shock and embarrassment. Pakistan's official statement, slow in coming, was clearly calculated to put the best face on a moment that threatens to reset relations with the United States.

But the United States' preoccupation with Pakistan -- a nuclear-armed state with rising levels of militancy -- revolves around more than Bin Laden, important as he was, and officials on both sides may seek to avoid a sharp turn toward hostility.

Not least, the United States would like Pakistani cooperation in the continuing fight against terrorism and in ending the war in Afghanistan at a moment when Bin Laden's capture was bound to alter the debate about whether the United States should withdraw from a costly nine-year war.

American officials stopped well short of accusing Pakistan of sheltering Bin Laden, but they strongly indicated that they would want answers about the extent of the network in Pakistan that allowed Bin Laden to live and hide in apparent comfort for so long.

"It's inconceivable that Bin Laden did not have a support system in the country that allowed him to remain there for an extended period of time," John O. Brennan, the president's top counterterrorism official, said at a White House briefing on Monday.

"I am not going to speculate about what type of support he might have had on an official basis inside of Pakistan," he added. "We are closely talking to the Pakistanis right now, and again, we are leaving open opportunities to continue to pursue whatever leads might be out there."

At a Pentagon briefing in Washington on Monday, a senior Defense Department official said, "We have no indications that the Pakistanis were aware that Osama Bin Laden was at the compound in Abbottabad," the city where he was killed, about an hour's drive from the capital.

Similarly, a former senior C.I.A. official who closely followed the hunt for Bin Laden said he had heard of no evidence that Bin Laden was being protected by the Inter-Services Intelligence, Pakistan's spy agency. He called speculation on the subject premature.

"I would be very surprised if he was under ISI protection," said the former official, who spoke on condition of anonymity. He said that the ISI probably knew the identity of the owner of the large compound where Bin Laden was discovered, but not that Bin Laden was hiding there. He said many religiously conservative Pakistanis had a favorable view of Bin Laden.

But others were deeply skeptical, noting that Bin Laden was hiding virtually next door to a military academy.

Some said that at worst, rogue ISI officers or former officers might be involved. But others saw a darker conspiracy.

"Someone knew," Maj. Gen. James R. Helmly, who was the top American officer in Pakistan from mid-2006 to mid-2008, said in a telephone interview from Georgia, where he is now retired.

"Whether it's in the top echelons of the ISI is anyone's guess," he said. "But if someone is building a big ostentatious project like that, and if it's like where I live, people are going to say, 'I wonder who's living there?'"

Some American counterterrorism officials said it was almost inconceivable that Pakistan's security services would be in the dark about the residents of such a compound. "It would be a major intelligence lapse by Pakistani military and police not to know what was going on there," said Seth G. Jones, a senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation who until February worked on Afghanistan and Pakistan issues for United States Special Operations Command.

Pakistani analysts expressed puzzlement that while the Pakistani government had issued a statement acknowledging Bin Laden's capture, the military and intelligence service were strangely silent.

"If Bin Laden's presence was not known to Pakistan's security agencies when he was located close to important military installation, it will be viewed as their incompetence or overconfidence," Hasan Askari Rizvi, a military analyst in Lahore, said in an e-mail message. "If they knew about his presence but did not take action, this will raise questions about the agenda of Pakistan's security agencies for fighting terrorism. "

Some senior American military and counterterrorism officials said that the Obama administration could use the moment to prod Pakistan to take more aggressive actions against militant groups within its borders.

"It has the potential to further sour relations or, for the United States, it could be an opportunity to leverage this for more cooperation," said Juan Zarate, a top counterterrorism official under President George W. Bush. "The Pakistanis are cowed and chagrined."

A Pakistani security official confirmed that Pakistan was informed only after the raid was over, and said that the helicopters used in the operation would have flown so close to the ground that they could evade radar detection. The compound had not been under Pakistani surveillance, he said. He spoke on condition of anonymity in accordance with the rules of his agency.

The security official seemed grateful at least for American officials who noted that Pakistani intelligence cooperation had contributed to the operation, and indicated the relationship would continue despite growing distrust between the C.I.A. and the ISI.

"The operation depended on intelligence input," the security official said. "The mere fact that the cooperation has been acknowledged means the relationship will survive," he said.

Certainly events after the operation indicate a level of cooperation. Intelligence service personnel took charge of Bin Laden's remaining family, including women and children, and were questioning them for further intelligence, a security official said. Members of the military removed a crashed helicopter from the scene.

The Pakistani military remained silent, although it has been outspoken over drone attacks in Pakistan's tribal areas and has denounced operations in which American military forces have crossed into Pakistan's territory.

Indeed, with Bin Laden's death in Pakistan, officials here have lost much of their hard-fought bargaining position as they demand that the United States reduce its use of unmanned drones to attack targets in the tribal areas, and cut down the number of undercover agents and C.I.A. operatives in Pakistan. That target seems to be out of reach now that the United States has shown the importance and accuracy of its covert operations in Pakistan, analysts said.

"There is lot of confusion in Pakistan that how to react to this operation," Mr. Rizvi, the military analyst, said. Over all, politicians will be happy but they will not express it publicly because they are afraid of a backlash from Islamist sympathizers, he said.

The discovery of Bin Laden, after years of Pakistan denying that he was hiding here, will also put more pressure on Pakistan to cooperate further and find more Qaeda members in Pakistan, he said.

"Now Osama's presence close to military installations in Pakistan raises whether this operation was with the involvement of Pakistani security agencies and whether Pakistan knows his presence," Mr. Rizvi said, adding, "If no, it is a question of incompetence, and if yes, then it shows Pakistan was playing a double game."

'Secret shield' for Bin Laden from Pakistan

By Sara Dixon

183 words

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: The Daily Express

Page: 7

(c) 2011 Express Newspapers

OSAMA Bin Laden was being secretly protected by Pakistani security forces, leaked US government files allegedly revealed yesterday.

Wikileaks documents show American diplomats were aware Bin Laden was eluding capture because he was being tipped off about potential US operations.

The claims will further undermine trust in Pakistan's willingness to join the international fight against Al Qaeda.

Last year David Cameron told Pakistan it could not "look both ways" on terrorism. He warned: "It is not right to have any relationship with groups that are promoting terror."

Warning At the time, the Pakistani government issued a strongly-worded rebuttal.

The US was warned in 2009 by the government of Tajikistan of potential security leaks. It claimed that "many" inside Pakistan knew where Bin Laden was.

The Tajik file reportedly stated: "Whenever security forces attempted a raid on his hideouts, the enemy received warning from sources in the security forces."

The Pakistani authorities claim they did not know Bin Laden was in the country and were not told about the US operation.

Why do we give £650m to haven for terrorists?

By Martyn Brown Political Correspondent

480 words

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: The Daily Express

Page: 7

(c) 2011 Express Newspapers

FRESH anger erupted yesterday over Britain's £650million aid gift to Pakistan after it emerged that Osama Bin Laden had been living there.

David Cameron sparked dismay last month when he announced the massive handout on the eve of tax rises and benefit cuts in Britain.

The Prime Minister also promised the Pakistani security services, which are widely blamed for funding and arming the Taliban highly sensitive military technology to combat roadside bombs. The gesture came after Mr Cameron sparked a diplomatic rift last year when he accused Pakistan of "looking both ways" on terrorism.

But the act of financial goodwill was met with anger last night in the wake of the Al Qaeda leader's assassination.

Tory MP Philip Davies, who criticised the aid payment when it was announced in April, said: "It is extraordinary to give £650 million of taxpayers' money to a country that at best is facing both ways and at worst harbouring the world's worst terrorist."

Extremism The huge cash injection by the Department for International Development will make Pakistan the UK's biggest recipient of overseas aid.

The package is designed to get four million of the 17 million children who currently receive no schooling into the classroom.

Pakistan spends just 1.5 per cent of its national income on schools but is placing billionpound orders for six Chinese submarines and 36 fighter aircraft. Mr Cameron defended the payments at the time, saying: "If Pakistan is a success we'll have a good friend to deal with.

"If we fail we'll have all the problems of migration, of extremism - problems that we don't want to see, so it's in our interest that Pakistan succeeds."

The cash will come on top of the existing £140million annual aid commitment to Pakistan and means Britain will be sending about £350million a year over the next four years. Three months ago, the Government announced an extra £1billion for India over the same period.

Britain's overall foreign aid budget is on course to rise from £7billion this year to about £11billion in 2015.

The Department for International Development is one of the few Whitehall departments protected from spending cuts.

International Development Secretary Andrew Mitchell said earlier this year: "Britain will be much tougher in the way it delivers aid, ensuring it reaches more people in the poorest parts of the world."

However, he has slashed the number of nations receiving aid from 43 to just over 20.

Mr Mitchell has already announced that aid programmes for Russia, China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Serbia and Moldova will be scrapped.

But some countries, including Ethiopia and Zimbabwe, will receive much more cash.

Did Pakistan help the US? Behind the scenes, the truth really matters

Anatol Lieven

783 words

Publication date: 3 May 2011

Source: The Times

Page: 18

© 2011 Times Newspapers Ltd. All rights reserved

Osama bin Laden may have chosen Abbottabad for its climate. After all, that was one reason why Major James Abbott chose the place in 1853 as the British administrative centre to govern the newly conquered population of the Hazara district, and as a military base to guard against Pashtun tribesmen and Islamist extremists to the north.

For bin Laden was not the first anti-Western Islamist leader to base himself in these hills. In the 1820s, Syed Ahmad Barelvi, a radical Muslim from British India, moved there to lead a jihad against the British and Sikh rulers of Punjab. Betrayed by his local followers, he was killed in battle, but his memory remains an inspiration for jihadis in Pakistan and beyond.

It was Abbottabad's climate and its wooded hills that also attracted Pakistani's military institutions, including the elite academy a few hundred yards from where bin Laden was killed. This presence raises the key questions about bin Laden's death: did Pakistan's military intelligence service (the ISI) know that bin Laden - or some big terrorist figure - was hiding in that house? And if so, did they help to tip off the US?

After all, in late January, Pakistani intelligence arrested Umar Patek, a leader of an Indonesian terrorist group affiliated to al-Qaeda, in Abbottabad. The Pakistani authorities later announced that they had been led to Patek by a local al-Qaeda facilitator, Tahir Shahzad, who worked for the Pakistani postal service in the town. Either Shahzad or Patek may in turn have led to bin Laden. Given all this activity, it seems inconceivable that the Pakistani military did not receive some warning of the raid, even if only at the last moment.

Credible details about Pakistan's role may emerge in leaks from Washington over the coming weeks and months, but are very unlikely to come from Pakistani sources. This is because Pakistan has been playing, not a two-faced, but a four-faced role when dealing with extremism.

The first pair of faces concerns the role of the US. As revealed by WikiLeaks, the Pakistani Government publicly condemned US drone attacks on Taleban and al-Qaeda targets in Pakistan's tribal areas while welcoming them in private conversations with US officials. The reason is that the drone campaign is detested by the Pakistani public but welcomed by the Government and army commanders because it has killed many of their enemies.

This balance was disturbed in recent months by a dramatic increase in the number of CIA operatives in Pakistan, and especially the action of one of them, Raymond Davis, in killing two civilians in Lahore in January. This and a US drone attack in March that killed a particularly large number of civilians led to Pakistan curtailing co-operation with the US until the wave of agents was withdrawn.

But the basic security relationship with the US remained unchanged. This is founded on the second pair of Pakistani faces: the soft face that the military and the ISI turn towards the Afghan Taleban, and the hard one that they turn towards international terrorists. The top leadership of the Afghan Taleban has been granted shelter, if not support, in northern Baluchistan, and the US has desisted from using drones to attack the region to kill Mullah Omar and his chief lieutenants.

The US has only done this because it is reasonably pleased with Pakistan's performance in regard to international terrorism. A number of al-Qaeda operatives have been arrested in Pakistan, including, most significantly, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. Pakistani intelligence has also helped fellow Muslim countries in their fight against terrorism.

It is obvious why Pakistan would want the US to be responsible for killing Osama bin Laden. For them to have killed or captured him would have been a hideous embarrassment that would have infuriated ordinary Pakistanis - most of whom believe that 9/11 was a CIA/Mossad plot.

In public, both countries are talking of general co-operation while being vague on the detail. But behind the scenes, the truth really matters. If the Pakistanis did give help in tracking down bin Laden, then this will create genuine gratitude in Washington. If, on the other hand, US intelligence believes that the ISI knew of bin Laden's presence but said nothing, this would be a truly dreadful blow to US-Pakistani relations. We will learn more in the coming months - but not on the record.

Anatol Lieven's book, *Pakistan: a Hard Country*, is published this week Pakistan has been playing a four-faced role, not a two-faced one