The Baily Star

Founder-Editor: Late S. M. Ali

Dhaka, Sunday, May 8, 1994 **Basic River Safety**

Pre-cautions Missing When the pathetic wailing of the cyclone victims still rends the air and it is being difficult to console their battered souls, the least one had expected was the launch disaster that occurred at Char Fasson in Bhola on Friday. But we seem lotted to such a jarring combination of unbearable tragedies. For, one may recall that on the day following the cyclone it was not bloated human figures that front-pages of newspapers were splashed with. Rather some bloodied, scarmarked deadbodies lay in a row as part of another news story — the telling toll of a road accident.

The point is whereas cyclone is a natural phenomenon, beyond the control of man insofar as its origin is concerned, accidents in our peculiar context have very largely been man-made and eminently avoidable. To what degree these can be of our own making has been sharply underlined by the launch mishap itself — as the latest reminder of blatant callousness about minimum safety regulations on river journeys. What business the operator had to take on board 200 passengers knowing full well the craft had capacity only for 40? This would be criminal offence even when the rivers are calm, not to speak of the Nor'wester season which plays havoc with the waterways. The mind-boggling thing is that the small launch which was overloaded four times its normal capacity started out in broad daylight for all to see yet none to stop it. There must have been routine presence of some Ansar, VDP or police personnel around but quite obviously their minds had been conditioned against saying no to the journey. We would also like to know whether the stipulation to post a couple of guards on board every river-craft has been withdrawn.

When the launch got caught in the surging waves it tilted dangerously under the weight of passengers who were so sardine-packed that they could not think of changing places to balance the craft. It capsized in that slanted position. One hundred and fifty adult passengers could swim ashore because the bank was nearby and there wasn't the usual turbulence of a Nor'wester as we know it. The panicked swimming exposes the absence of the safety gear called the life buoy which now-a-days is available in a very large variety. The inflatable rafts are quite economical. But for all we know, these are seldom kept in a river craft,

which is a standard requirement. Some years ago when unceasing river accidents

had impelled our boat engineers to put their heads together on the issue, they tossed ideas about redesigning the launches keeping in view our climatic conditions, passenger loading trends and shaoling of the river beds which is an additional danger. We are not aware of any follow-up. However, our chief concern for the present is that the stormy weather has begun in full fury requiring the safety precautions to be at our affordable best. We can surely make the launch operators abide by a maximum limit on loading passengers and the minimum requirement of carrying inflatable rafts inside river crafts. The worst offenders are perhaps small launches plying along busy but out-of-sight river lanes. So the corrective measures should essentially begin with them.

Ponchishe Baishakh

Rabindranath Tagore almost singlehandedly took his people out of the pit of medieval ignorance and prejudice and led them to the full glare of Twentieth Century modernism. It was something that Mao Zedong coined but could not bring about — a great leap forward — from provincialism

to internationalism, in Tagore's case.

It has become trite to catalogue the many areas of intellectual and aesthetic creativity - painting and music and the numerous genres of literature - that Tagore claimed as particularly fecund estates of his. His excursions into such an array of diverse disciplines yielded grounds that would form the essential foundations of our people's cultural endeavours well into the future centuries. The achievements in each of those — his art and his humanism — are to be celebrated by way of taking them all in, there being no use in glorifying the catalogue.

One limitation of that list of his forays into many familiar branches of knowledge and art history and grammar, philology and anthropology, aesthetics and prosody, political economy and a deep understanding of as well as enduring making of cultural entities, to say of only a few - is that this does not include what he came to mean to his people — specially to the people of the erstwhile East Pakistan and how did this affect

the state of that people.

Without Tagore there wouldn't possibly have developed the cultural resistance of the Bengali people in Pakistan — he was the point of precipitation in that. From that cultural resistance came the resolution of the crisis of identity of this region's Muslims through a rising realisation of the Bengali national spirit. The culminating War of Liberation was shot with the dreams and nostalgia of Tagore for our golden Bengal. On our banner in our long-drawn struggle to independence was writ large the name of Rabindranath.

Two decades after our emergence as a sovereign people, as we realise we haven't done capitally with our freedom and that many things still impede our way to becoming a nation fit to survive in the space age, can we not turn again to

Tagore? Through a synthesis of western materialism with Oriental mysticism, of enlightened scientific attitude with the truths and beauties reached through creative art of the deep understanding of the human condition that anoints his literature with the insistence on a diamond-hard character antithetical to wastage and a prodigal way of life, of the insight into communal and national prejudices with the ideas leading to the total welfare of the society and of the whole of humankind. The most that he will do to give us a well-earned entry into the Third Millennium is through generating in all of us a new and overwhelming consciousness of nature and his emphasis on the individual - his or her unfettered liberty, growth and fulfilment and a ceaseless striving for perfection.

He was ahead of his times when he lived, he is still ahead of the times more than fifty years after his death. Perhaps in the next century we shall be able to march in step with him. Before that we shall be needing to do much by way of education and social organisation and economic restructuring - borrowing not in mean measures from his ideas.

Chiro Nutanerey Dilo Daak Ponchishe Baishakh

Richard M Nixon: Some Reflections on His White House Years

death on 22 aril has attracted considerable attention in Bangladesh. Warm and effusive obituaries and editorials have been written about him. Admittedly, as an elder statesman, Nixon comm anded some international attention. Given the super power status of the United States any former president of that great country will naturally get some press coverage in Bangladesh. But can we as Bangalees ever forget his role in our Liberation War? In any case, was he really a colossus on the world stage? What was his role in the Vietnam War? What about the Watergate Scandal? How is he rated by the American people? After all he is the only president in American history who was forced to resign his high office in disgrace.

Let me say at the outset that was living in Washington DC when Nixon was in the White House. I was also living in New York in the early sixties when Nixon, after his défeat by John Kennedy, had taken up residence in that city. I had the opportunity to observe his actions and policies from a close range. Indeed my wife and I met him in a diplomatic reception when he spoke to us. He was kind and charming. When he learned that I was working in the Pakistan Mission to the UN he declared to us, with deliberate emphasis. that he was a friend of Pakistan. I used to recall this remark during the traumatic days of 1971. Somehow I was convinced that Nixon really meant what he said to us. He was indeed a friend of Pakistan and his actions throughout 1971 provide ample confirmation. But before going into his role in our Liberation War, let us take a look at Nixon the

American people are naturally the best people to judge their presidents. Obviously many of them admire Nixon's tenacity. But what sort of a man was he? This is what the Newsweek magazine wrote. "In his relentless pursuit of 51 per

NTIL 1912 Rabindra

cent of the voters. Nixon ended up on so many sides of so many issues that his life reads like America after the Second World War, hustling here and there, excessive and fickle, yet endlessly resilient. He chased communists, then he embraced commu nists....There was nothing constant about Nixon, except his hunger for power and his insecurity about holding on to it an insecurity that became his undoing." Referring to the Watergate scandal, the magazine wrote, "Respectful eulogies will not erase the sordidness of Watergate. Nixon and his White House gang lied, cheated and obstructed justice... While the memory of Nixon strolling the beach in wingtips may be amusing, he was a divisive figure in national life - a manipulator and a polarizer." J Anthony Lukas in his book "Nightmare: The Underside of the Nixon Years", provided a sorry catalogue of lies. bald crimes and sheer contempt for democracy that extends far beyond Watergate and the cover-up. Writing in the New York Times, Frank Rich, a noted commentator said. "The faults that defined the Nixon character include hypocrisy, paranoia, cynicism, spitefulness and self-pity." These are not my words! An American president had to say. in self defence, "Well, I am not

a crook. A lot has been said about Nixon's Vietnam policy. He won the election on the promise to end the war but he continued it for over four years. His secret and illegal bombing of Cambodia proved disastrous for that poor country. He could neither control nor even understand the social turmoil caused by a war which the American youth regarded as unjust. Let me again quote Frank Rich of the New York Times; he said, "When four anti-war protesters were shot and killed by Ohio Guardsman at Kent State University, the president who had promised in the 1968 campaign to bring us together and get us

promptly out of Vietnam re-

sponded not with sorrow or regret but inhuman vindictive-

Some people in Bangladesh still seem to think that Nixon's China policy was the work of a genius and a historic achievement. It is now being increasingly recognised that by 1970 the rift between China and Soviet Union had reached the point of no return. Their dispute had many ramifications which included ideological as well as border disputes. In fact, as the Soviet Union and India drew closer China felt isolated and threatened. Geopolitical compulsions were thus driving China towards the United States, the only power

in the first place, is no longer regarded as the bold breakthrough that it was considered at Mr Nixon's White House time." History can be quite ruthless in clearing away the cobwebs that clever publicists create!

Some people in Bangladesh did not consider it quite proper to write critically about a dead man. I respect their sense of propriety. But when I come across apologists for Nixon's policies I feel that a reply must be given and truth must be told. One noted columnist, writing in The Daily Star, has claimed that "there is really no hard evidence that President Nixon and Dr

ON THE RECORD

by Shah AMS Kibria

which had the political, economic and military strength to give the support that China felt it needed. Nixon simply responded to an opportunity which was knocking at his door. China was ready for American embrace. Who does not know that the enemy's enemy is one's friend? Indeed in retrospect it is hard to understand why Nixon and Kissinger had to resort to such tortuous and indirect means of communication when in reality a whole lot of channels were open to them. Christopher Van Hollen, who was Deputy Assistant Secretary in the State Department in 1971, said in an article in the Asian Survey. "The Chinese had a strong independent interest in forging the US connection as an offset to the Soviet Union, and it seems unlikely that a more distant US-Pakistan relationship would have significantly affected the evolving US-Chinese ties." Stephen S Rosenfeld, a noted columnist, writing in the Washington Post said, "The detente with the Soviet Union, including the opening to China that helped incline the Kremlin to detente

Kissinger 'actively' opposed the birth of Bangladesh." Hard evidence? Let me quote from Christopher Van Hollen's article; he wrote, "During the Indo-Pakistan war over Bangladesh, Anderson's (Anderson was a well-known Washington columnist) columns carried excerpts from secret White House meetings at one of which an exasperated Henry Kissinger warned government officials that he was "getting hell every half hour from the President that we are not being tough enough on India." The President "does not believe we are carrying out his wishes," Kissinger complained. "He wants to tilt in favour of Pakistan." Anderson later won a Pulitzer Prize for his journalistic coup. The 'tilt' was never a secret. Those of us who happened to be living in Washington at the time knew about it from journalists and diplomats. At the time it was common knowledge that it was the White House which had taken a negative position on our struggle. Most of the profes sional American diplomats were fully supportive of our demand for independence.

They were certainly sympathetic to our cause. Neither Nixon nor Kissinger expressed any sympathy for the suffering people of Bangladesh. We all knew that despite assurances to the contrary. US arms continued to be supplied to Pakistan even when it was clear to all that these arms were used by the Pakistani occupation forces against the unarmed civilian Bengali population. Indeed a credibility gap was created about State Department claims about arms embargo when the New York Times reported in late June that Pakistani freighters had sailed, or were about to sail, from US ports with arms. Would it be reasonable to argue that the supplies of arms to our enemies did not amount to 'active' opposition to the birth of Bangladesh! One cannot introduce all

the hard evidences about Nixon's hostility towards the Bengalis in this short article but we can perhaps take a quick look at the movement of the 7th Fleet into the Bay of Bengal. Why was this massive force, armed with nuclear weapons, despatched towards our shores? It has been claimed by Kissinger in his book 'The White House Years' that it was really sent to defend West Pakistan against an all-out Indian attack. Christopher Van Hollen had the following comments: There is no indication that the Enterprise deployment had any immediate political or military impact on events in South Asia. although,... it may have had adverse longer-term repercussions in terms of US interests. The eight ships comprising Task Force 74 did not arrive in the Bay of Bengal until December 15, the day before the fall of Dacca to Indian and Mukti Bahini guerrilla forces; they arrived with the transparently false cover story of helping to evacuate the less than 50 American still in Dacca. Since the task force was some 1300 miles from West Pakistan, and the US had not clearly signalled New Delhi that its deployment had any relationship

to events in the west, the Indians apparently concluded that the United States was trying to inject itself into the military picture in East Pakistan at a time when Indian arms had clearly prevailed." A 1978 study by the Brookings Institution (a prestigious research institution in Washington DC) on US armed forces, examined the deployment of the Enterprise and concluded that "it is important to emphasize that Soviet and Indian support for a cease-fire was not the result of US military pressure generated by Task Force 74." So why did the Task Force steam up the Bay of Bengal? It was certainly not coming for a tea party! Its menacing move at a crucial moment of the war was designed to intimidate both India and the leaders of emerging Bangladesh. Didn't the Razakars celebrate in Dhaka when reports about the 7th Fleet's impending arrival started to circulate?

Nixon will be judged by the American people in the context of their own perceptions about him. History will judge him in due course for his achievements as a global leader. We, the people of Bangladesh, cannot take a detached view to his role in our struggle for independence. The Liberation War was without doubt the greatest event in our history; it is also our ' greatest achievement. During this crucial period in our history this powerful man was, for his own reasons, hostile to us. There can be no doubt that he actively supported our ene-

Let me conclude this article by quoting once again the Newsweek; it said, "His impact on history, from the vantage point of 20 years, is surely no better than mixed. His accomplishments in domestic affairs, in the end, bordered on the negligible. His foreign policy successes, now that Soviet communism is dead, seem as dated as the cold war. Watergate may yet be his monument, and it is evidence of a moral myopia that afflicted him all his life.

Gitanjali and Rabindranath: Some Episodes by Mohammad Amjad Hossain the same happiness in some of

nath Tagore was virtually unknown in the Western World. Publication of Gitanjali in English brought laurel for him. It is interesting to note that much of his English Gitanjali was written at Kuthibari of Shelaidah where he went to recuperate from illness. He made further translation of his Bengali poems while on long sea voyage to England. Gitanjali is not a whole translation of Bengali Gitanjali. English Gitanjali, in fact, draws upon ten different books including 51 poems from Bengali Gitanjali. In all 212 poems are included in English version Gitanjali. It was published by Macmillan Company on behalf of London Indian Society in 1912 while

In 1912 Rabindranath paid his third visit to England to establish contact with British literary circle. On arrival in London Tagore handed over his manuscript to his friend William Rothenstein who sought comments from English poet W B Yeats. Yeats found these free verses "exquisite in style as in thought". Yeats read out on 7 July, 1912 some of these poems at a select gathering of people at the drawing

Rabindranath Tagore was on a

tour of America.

room of Rothenstein, which included, among others. Ezra Pound, May Sinclair, C F Andrews. It was followed by another session at a restaurant where poets, writers, artists and other intellectuals participated. Following this session a brief account of Tagore's genius appeared in the Times of London. This was possibly the first report on Tagore in Western media.

Introducing Gitanjali Eng-

lish version, poet W B Yeats commented "(the poems) have stirred my blood as nothing has for years..... moved because we have met our own image, as though we had walked in Rossetti's Willow Wood or heard, perhaps for the first time in literature, our own voice as in dream. He is the first among our saints who has not refused to live, but has spoken out of life itself and that is why we give him our love." I would like to quote what Rathindranath Tagore. eldest son of the poet, wrote about the English version of Gitanjali "it was the utter simplicity of the language. The English translation subtle in its artlessness, which I believe, moved Yeats so strongly. I have

a feeling that the English translation reflects in some strange way the spirit of those days that he spent in Shela idah. It is as though the poems were reborn in another garb; they were not mere tran-

While convalescing at Shelaidah Tagore translated most of the poems. Peaceful pastoral surroundings of the river Padma and visits by a vaishnavi (a female devotee of vaishnay sect) must have created an impact on Tagore in selecting poems for English Gitanjali. It may be noted that the vaishnavi had been reflected in Sadhana and other writings of Tagore. Tagore himself gave an explanation of writing Gitanjali in English when he wrote to his niece Indira Devi on 6 May 1913: "I did not undertake this task in a spirit of reckless bravado. I simply felt an urge to recapture through the medium of another language the feelings and sentiments which had created such a feast of joy within me in days gone by." In Gitanjali feeling of joy and sorrow of the life are

written by Miss May Sinclair from Rathindranath Tagore's book On the Edges of Time: "Dear Mr. Tagore, It was

am quoting below a letter

impossible for me to say anything to you about your poems last night, because they are of a kind not easily spoken about May I say now that as long as I live, even if I were never to hear them again, I shall never forget the impression that they made. It is not only that they have an absolute beauty, a perfection as poetry, but that they have made present for me forever the divine thing that I can only find by flashes and with an agonizing uncertainty. I don't know whether it is possible to see through another's eyes, I am afraid it is not; but I am sure that it is possible to believe through another's certainty."

In March 1913 Ezra Pound commented on Gitaniali which appeared in fortnightly Review of London. He found "the same sort of common sense in he first part of the New Testamet,

OPINION

the Psalms". The Times in its literary supplement of 7 November 1912 gave compliment in the following words: "As we read his pieces we seem to be reading the Psalms of a David of our own times".

In 1913 when Rabindranath Tagore was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. British press gave prominent coverage to it. His literary works in English which Tagore rendered by himself were received with equal enthusiasm in British media. The media in fact showed continued interest in his writings, paintings and travelogues. Until about 1919 Rabindranath was followed and reported by the media. Following his renunciation of Knighthood in 1919 in protest against massacre in Amritsar and when he applied his standard of 'humanist and political integrity' to the world at large, many in the west were outraged and the media became disenchanted. This was reflected during visits by Tagore to London in 1920, 1921 and the last one in 1930. The visits were sparsely reported. Only a

few national dailies published obituary when Rabindranath died in 1941. The British media seemed

to be motivated by political. economic, cultural, religious or social considerations. The media was not free from bias or prejudice as demonstrated by its irrational ravings towards Rabindranath Tagore whose message of universal brotherhood, heavenly mysticism and beauty transcended all fron-

It would be perhaps worth to note that the same publisher, who brought out English Gitanjali, did not dare to publish the selection of some outspoken short stories of Rabindranath, being prepared for publication in English, after Amritsar massacre because of the risk of being charged with sedition under British laws which was in force. Rabindranath was less read and discussed in the west following his renunciation of Knighthood, his fiery nationalist speeches and songs in protest. But one could sense reawakening in Tagore's works in the west as has been gathered from the speeches of the researchers on Tagore's works who attended a two-day session in Dhaka on 8-9 April, 1994.

Letters for publication in these columns should be addressed to the Editor and legibly written or typed with double space. For reasons of space, short letters are preferred, and all are subject to editing and cuts. Pseudonyms are accepted. However, all communications must bear the writer's real name, signature and address.

Politics and the nation

Sir, If Bangladesh really wishes to flourish as a prosperous and developed country, she must take drastic measures to reduce political malice from among the Bangladeshis. True, every political party reserves the right to actions for increasing their popularity in order to gain people's votes and support for establishing them in power. But political action should under no circumstance be detrimental to national interests, unity, sovereignty and brotherhood. It would be evident that the present trend of political activities is actually encouraging hatred, jealousy and 'political racism' among the people and dividing the nation into political groups.

If I am not wrong, the present extremism of the national political parties has contributed enormously in the creation of student unrest and indiscipline in the educational institutions. At present, students studying in the same class are not friends as 'classmates' but friends under their respective political 'ism'. Similar is the case with work-

ers of mills and factories. The national level political leaders irrespective of their political affiliation have a sacred responsibility to perpet-

uate patriotism, moral and social values among the people, especially the younger genera-

tion, the student community. May I sincerely appeal to our esteemed political personalties to guide the nation as a whole on to the correct path?

Zahid, Dhaka

Indo-Bangladesh Friendship Treaty

Sir, I'm afraid I found Mr S A M S Kibria's reply to Mr Salahuddin Quader Chowdhury on the issue of the Indo-Bangladesh Friendship Treaty (Letters, 24 April) a little confusing. Mr Chowdhury had pointed out, in his article of April 17, that there were hardly any internal or external enemies of Bangladesh when the treaty was signed expect for the Razakars who had been more or less immobilized. To this Mr Kibria responded by saying that far from being defeated and immobilized the Razakars were extremely active. He asks: "Did not these forces kill the Father of the Nation in August 1975 and bring back the Razakars in the centres of Bangladesh polia tics?" Further, he points out, that the late Shah Azizur Rahman, who pleaded for Pakistan and against Bangladesh, was made Prime

Minister in 1979. Even today,

Mr Kibria declares, the Razakars are occupying some of the highest offices in the country and even sit in

It seems then, from his own

Parliament

statements, that the Razakars have had an unbroken run of success in Bangladesh from barely three years after the Treaty was signed. Since they struck first at Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, Razakars have consolidated their position and are everywhere. And all this during the period that the Treaty was in force. How then does he claim, as he does in his earlier article as well as in his letter, that the Treaty "served its purpose" of safeguarding Bangladesh from its enemies? It may have saved us from external conquest (though I cannot take seriously his reference to the US Seventh Fleet) but certainly on his own admission, it has not saved us from the

Razakars. Also, how can he say, at the end of his letter, that the situation is different now? I see it as worse. At the time the treaty was signed the Razakars may have been active, but they did not occupy the highest offices in the land. It seems to me that more than ever we need a Treaty with a world class power (may be like India) to keep us safe at this time. He feels safer, he says, because "the people are vigilant." Unfortunately, it is these same

I await with interest Mr Kibria's kind clarification of my confusion — perhaps in one of his numerous articles, for I'm afraid he may not care to reply to a lowly private citizen. Private citizen

Razakars to the Parliament!

people who have elected the

The essential purpose of the resolution was to bring home to world opinion the seriousness of the human rights situation in Kashmir. This objective was achieved as India under world pressure agreed to open up Kashmir to foreign

It was in consultation with friendly countries that Pakistan decided not to press the Geneva resolution.

A Motivated Article

Pakistanis are envious of Prime

Minister Narasimha Rao's

pragmatism and they want

both Benazir and Nawaz to tear

Kuldip Nayar has indirectly

praised the strength of Indian

institutions and its political

system. But he has cleverly

omitted to say how the world's

biggest democracy is denying

democratic freedom to the

Kashmiris and committing

gross human rights violation in

uated in his article that

Pakistan has lost the friend-

ship of China and Iran. At the

same time he has narrated the

story of Mirza Aslam Beg sug-

gesting that Pakistan should

sell atomic secrets to Iran for a

price equivalent to Islamabad's

foreign debts. He has also dis-

closed that Nawaz Sharif in

order to win US support

against Mohtarma Benazir

Bhutto leaked the story to

Washington which earned him

Kuldip Nayar is in the habit

of spreading sensational sto-

ries about Pakistan's peaceful

nuclear programme. It may be

recalled that the Pakistani

journalist through whose good

the hostility of the army.

Kuldip Navar has also insin-

While criticising Pakistan,

a leaf out of his book.

the valley.

The Daily Star Dhaka in its by Khalid Khan Khral issue of April 22, (1994) published a syndicated article by Kuldip Nayar has not only stressed that everything in Kuldip Nayar, which was also carried by an English daily of Pakistan is topsy turvy but has Lahore under the title made bold to say that many

"Pakistan: a fractured society". As an Indian journalist, he ruthlessly comments on various aspects of Pakistan's internal and external situation. But he attributes the whole thing to journalistic circles,

whom he quotes at random. The underlying motive to Kuldip Nayar's article is betrayed in its opening sentence. Quoting a Pakistani politician the article equates the shelving of the resolution on human rights violation in Kashmir at Geneva, with the fall of Dhaka in 1971.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The analogy is fallacious, illogical and ridiculous, to say the least.

Pakistan agreed not to put the resolution on human rights violation in Kashmir at Geneva to the vote on the assurance of friendly countries that India had agreed to allow the ambassadors of Muslim countries and observers belonging to various international organisations to visit Kashmir.

observers whose entry was previously banned.

offices Kuldip Nayar gained access to the nuclear scientist Mr A Q Khan and published a controversial interview with him is now Mian Nawaz Sharif's Information Secretary Is it at the instance of his

Pakistani journalist friend that Kuldip Nayar has published another story whose purpose on the one hand seems to convince the world that Pakistan has already made an atomic bomb and on the other to tell the world that some circles in Pakistan are in favour of selling nuclear secrets to Iran. Kuldip Navar has also cleverly suggested that Nawaz Sharif lost power not through the democratic process but through

manipulation by the Army. The underlying meaning of Kuldip Nayar's article is highly damaging to Pakistan's na-

tional interests. Kuldip Nayar has also tried to create the impression that it is because of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's policy on Kashmir and the nuclear programme that Pakistan has lost the friendship of its close friends. This is totally wrong. None else but the Speaker of Iranian Parliament, Mr Ali Akbar Nategh Noori, nailed the canard when during his recent visit he reiterated Iran's support for Pakistan's principled stand on Kashmir and the nu-

You can befool some people for some times but you cannot befool all people for all times. The people of Pakistan from Khyber to Karachi are solidly united under the leadership of Prime Minister of Pakistan Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto and will foil all conspiracies against the national interest.

clear issues.

(The writer is Federal Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Government of Pakistan. This piece was made available to us by the Pakistan Embassy in Dhaka.)