

Death at Concert: Blame Whom?

by Mir A Zaman

In these days of increasing incidence of violence and violation of human rights, we have developed an intriguing indifference towards all these... Each and everyone of us seems to be resigned to fatalism, to hopes for some sort of divine intervention, to subconscious selfishness.

TWO more deaths. Two more young lives terminated before they could even begin to get the taste of life. Rimon and Imrul Moni Akhter were only in their teens. In their first year in college, they were good friends and had a lot in common. Both were good students and fared very well in the SSC examination. Rimon scored 855 and Imrul 825. Politics was not something they cared much about. They loved music and watching their favourite bands in concert was a dream of a lifetime for both. They didn't know, however, that concert would bring about their death and disconcert the lives of their families.

Nobody exactly knew when and how it started. It was a Friday. The open air concert at the Mirpur Stadium, organised by the Joy Bangla Sangskritik Jote to raise funds for the flood-hit, inspired tremendous response. Teenagers assembled at the bowl to watch Renaissance, LRB, Arc and Feelings, four leading music bands of the country, perform. The programme started an hour later than scheduled. But the impatience that resulted from the delay melted once Renaissance started playing. For the next few hours, it was music and mirth. The audience, largely of teenagers, sang, waved and danced to the music. Hardly had anyone imagined there were killers in the happy lot. But there they were, waiting to pounce.

Rimon and Imrul and their friends, some of them girls, went to the concert in a group. Inside the stadium, they had a quarrel with a few young men. Apparently, they were teasing the girls. Rimon, Imrul and

their friends protested. That was good enough a provocation. The 'insulted' lot waited outside to pay back and when Rimon, Imrul and their friends came out, they swooped on them, stabbing them repeatedly. Police were on duty but before they could even react, Rimon, Imrul and Russel, one of their friends, were on the ground, blood gushing out of their wounds. They were rushed to hospital. It was too late for Imrul and Rimon. Russel is critically injured, but will survive.

From now on, teenagers will be more difficult to persuade their parents into letting them go to concerts. Going to a concert would surely be bracketed in the parents' handbook of what they should not let their children do.

Violence at concerts is not a rare phenomenon. Even in the late 70s and early 80s when there were only a handful of music bands and almost all the concerts were held in auditoriums, not in open space, and the audience almost every concert featured scuffle at the ticket counters and at the entrance. Inside the auditoriums, the organisers had to sweat to keep things under control. There were the over-enthusiastic fans who, more often than not, would try to join the performers on the stage. Then there were the lover boys who would try anything and everything to get the attention of the girls. However, problems that arose were easy to handle and never led to serious trouble. Exchange of epithets, pushing and shoving were the limit. It hardly went beyond that.

As the trend grew in popularity, there were more music bands and, of course, more con-

certs. The once regarded mode of entertainment for the affluent became open to teenagers from every stratum of the society. Increasing number of concert-goers brought along increasing problems for the organisers. There were no longer only the lover boys or over-enthusiastic fans, drunk and doped hoodlums were there, too, ever eager to create problems, in one way or the other. In the mid-80s, a rather disconcerting practice began. Organisers of the concert employed 'musclemen' with illegal weapons to maintain order inside the auditorium, while police made sure hoodlums were kept in check outside. One method these machos generally employed to keep the trouble-mongers quiet was rather interesting. Quite like an American crime thriller, the 'peacekeepers' would walk straight to the person or the section of the crowd, trying to defuse the atmosphere, show him or them the weapon he was carrying and, more often than not, it worked like magic.

At times, the plans went haywire, though. One concert at the British Council auditorium in 1985 led to serious trouble. It all started when a 'stoned' music lover lost control and started hurling abuses at girls around him. When the 'peacekeepers' tried to inject some sense into him, he got worse. Now he was on the stage, calling anyone and everyone names. His shirt was torn and signs of scuffle was pronounced. Suddenly there were a few explosions of cracker inside the small auditorium and then came the 'real peacekeepers' one hand on the weapons tucked safely in the waistbands.

There was chaos all around, people running and tripping over in their bid to get out of the hall. Fortunately, there were some elderly people present, who had come with their daughters, and the man who triggered off the trouble was escorted out of the auditorium by one lady. Half an hour later, the show resumed, with majority of the audience gone. The British Council authorities stopped letting the auditorium for concerts. They had the taste of it.

Open air concert posed even more problems for the organisers. The twin murders would certainly trigger off intense debates on the ill-effects of band music on the young generation. The conservatives, who believe that it is just another mode of cultural aggression, will surely launch another verbal onslaught with renewed vigour. Many will blame the organisers for their failure to ensure adequate security while others will condemn the ineptitude of the law enforcers. A few days later, everyone will simply forget Imrul and Rimon, except their families and friends, until violence at another concert takes another couple of lives.

In these days of increasing incidence of violence and violation of human rights, we have developed an intriguing indifference towards all these. While the parents of Imrul and Rimon mourn the death of their sons, others, whose sons and daughters had been to the concert, are only happy that their family has remained intact. Each and everyone of us seems to be resigned to fatalism, to hopes for some sort of divine intervention, to subconscious selfishness.

India and Pakistan Puzzling Signals on Bilateral Relations

by Barrister Harun ur Rashid

An emerging new class of people in civil society are seeking to replace the old. It is good to see that a section of people in India and Pakistan can now see some breaks in the clouds through their intercommunication.

OFTEN there are traps aplenty in grasping the state of relations between India and Pakistan by the foreign diplomats who are not acquainted with the past history and culture of the Indian sub-continent. The diplomats of distant countries get surprised when the diplomats of India and Pakistan are having a cup of coffee together at the UN cafeteria immediately after exchanging war of words at a UN meeting. The surprise arises from their perception as to how Pakistan and Indian diplomats could be together, even enjoying a common joke after they exchanged virulent attacks against each other at a meeting.

The foreign diplomats may not be aware that if both the Indian and Pakistani diplomats come, of the Punjab province, they speak the same language and are rooted in the same culture. They share the same Punjabi songs and jokes. They are culturally and emotionally tied together as Punjabis. Even another Indian diplomat from South India will not be as close to a Punjabi Indian diplomat as he/she will be to another Punjabi Pakistani diplomat. I cite one instance to bring home this point. At an international conference a bus

was arranged for the delegates for sightseeing and the organisers were worried about the seating arrangements of Indian and Pakistani delegates because there were heated debates between them at a session of the conference. But they were surprised when they saw the Indian and Pakistani delegates not only insisted on sitting together but enjoying each other's jokes with loud laughter. The scenario puzzled and amused them.

I have recounted the above stories to draw the attention of the readers to two separate but seemingly conflicting events taking place during this month in India and Pakistan.

One is the largest military exercise by India on its territory not far from the border of Pakistan and another is the participation by 150 Indian delegates to attend a peace conference in Pakistan. It is reported that on 17 November Indian troops began 'war games' near Pakistan. The military exercise, the largest manoeuvres since 1987, brought together 26 ships, 26 naval aircraft, 15 air force jets and helicopters, a battalion of T-72 tanks and two submarines. Indian spokesman claimed that Pakistan was duly informed of this exercise and

exercises would continue through December. One may question the purpose of such a military show near the border of Pakistan at a time when India and Pakistan are coming to terms to normalise their relations.

While the military exercise is being engaged, more than 150 delegates from India were expected to participate in the session of the People's Forum for Peace and Democracy in Peshawar (Pakistan) on November 21-22. The Indian participants included trade unionists, academicians, lawyers, educationists, retired military officers and bureaucrats, social workers, journalists and MPs. According to a report the co-chairpersons of the Forum -Nirmal Mukherjee of India and his Pakistani counterpart I.A. Rahman said that there would be speeches in the Forum relating to the issues of nuclear and general disarmament, human rights, religious tolerance and Kashmir.

One may argue that India's military exercise so close to Pakistan appears to be an oddity while its nationals are scheduled to participate in a peace conference in Pakistan. Apparently the holding of such two events within such a short span of time reflects a mind

boggling if not bizarre dichotomy.

It can be argued that India's official organs continue to flex their military muscle to Pakistan while a section of India's civil society shows an olive branch to Pakistani people. One may perhaps conclude that the old government-civil society network appears to be dividing in both countries on the mechanism as to how the relations between the two countries are to be built.

A large section of civil society in both countries has consciously and avowedly recasting its policy towards each other because it has been realised that the Indian sub-continent is lagging behind the South East and North Asian nations and peace and stability is a sine qua non for economic progress and prosperity. This reflects that an emerging new class of people in civil society are seeking to replace the old. It is good to see that a section of people in India and Pakistan can now see some breaks in the clouds through their intercommunication. We wish them success.

The writer is Former Bangladeshi Ambassador to the UN in Geneva.

Why India Still Balks at Signing CTBT

by Harold A Gould

How to guarantee that have-not or partially nuclear-have states who face real nuclear threats from members of the Big Five or their surrogates can be protected from nuclear intimidation during the last stages of the disarmament process. Without a solution to this problem, all talk of a viable CTBT will remain just that -- only talk.

UNITED States leadership effort to achieve nuclear non-proliferation, embodied in the CTBT, has rested on one fundamental premise. It is that once every state with the technological wherewithal to produce atomic weapons has taken the pledge of abstinence, the five powers (the US, Britain, France, Russia and China), currently already in possession of such weaponry, would commence a process culminating eventually in complete nuclear disarmament.

In the end, therefore, all nations would theoretically end up on a level playing field, free from the threat of thermonuclear intimidation by a rival state.

The refusal of three nations (India, Pakistan and Cuba) to sign the CTBT so that its ratification by all of the signatories could proceed (a precondition for the taking of this step) left the treaty dangling precariously on the edge of the precipice. The nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan in May of this year pushed it over the brink, in its present form, at least.

Up to this point the proponents of the CTBT had convinced themselves that the mechanism they had fashioned to make the world safe from nuclear destruction was, like Mary Poppins, practically perfect in every respect. No one in their right mind, it was implied, could in the end refuse to listen to reason and not put their signature on it. India, in particular, might nominate against it. But in the end she would see the error of her ways and come around. When that didn't happen and India (followed by Pakistan) rudely upset the apple cart, a wave of recrimination and peevish retaliation ensued.

But the reason why the CTBT and ancillary agreements didn't wash was not because re-

calcitrants like India threw a monkey wrench into the works. The CTBT got derailed because it was fundamentally flawed from the start. Its most avid votaries were so identified with it in its existing form that they refused to see this. They simply swept those flaws under the rug and then dared anyone to call attention to them. When anyone did, as India did, the penalty was vilification.

The first flaw lay in the demographics. The US government and various non-proliferation think tanks (such as the Stimson Centre) together managed to induce a large number of states that had no credible chance of going nuclear in the first place to pledge, under the rubric of the CTBT, that they would not do so. This created an illusion of unanimity far in excess of reality which made the few states, whose strategic circumstances gave them real reason for having reservations about aspects of the CTBT, vulnerable to accusation that they were out of step with the good guys.

The second flaw emanated from American hypocrisy. The architects of non-proliferation practised a double standard which made a mockery out of their non-proliferation professions. While pressuring India to fall in line with the purported international consensus, they winked at Israel's and (for a time) South Africa's surreptitious possession of the bomb. They procrastinated and sought to circumvent the imposition of sanctions on Pakistan for its relentless pursuit of the bomb as long as Islamabad fitted into American strategic calculations vis-a-vis Afghanistan. They refused to punish the Chinese for providing the technology transfers that facilitated Pakistan's nuclear weaponsisation because it would inhibit corporate America's gold rush

into the China market.

It wasn't that India's decision to go nuclear, and Pakistan's follow-up tests, violated the sanctity of an agreement made and heard by a council of political saints. The real crime was that it blew the lid off the consummate hypocrisy that had all along pervaded the great powers' (and especially America's) approach to non-proliferation.

What India knew that deterred each of its recent governments (not only the current hard-line Bharatiya Janata Party) from signing the CTBT and finally going for testing was this treaty's real bottom line. It is that the five states possessing fully developed nuclear arsenals have no intention of dismantling them in any foreseeable time.

Interestingly and ironically, it was President Bill Clinton's first Secretary of Defence, William Perry, who made this bottom line clear at the very moment when both Congress and the administration were pressuring India to 'trust' assurances that universal nuclear disarmament would promptly follow once she signed the CTBT. At a press conference on December 8, 1996, Perry declared, "I do not favour unilateral reduction (of nuclear weapons) or ignoring the nuclear forces of other countries." He was speaking of the first START accord and what might follow with START III. America, he was saying, wanted to make sure that it was the last state to totally disarm. It feared that being next-to-last would leave the United States vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by whichever country held the last card. For if that last state reneged, America could end up like Sampson after he got his haircut.

Yet, in the face of this candid snippet of realpolitik, the United States continued to

pooh-pooh India's reluctance to forgo a nuclear option as long as China retained hers and Pakistan remained on the threshold, thanks to Chinese complicity and American permissiveness. Under these circumstances, India's situation would be equivalent to that next-to-last state in the overall disarmament regimen. Israel always has an implicit nuclear umbrella guaranteed it by virtue of its special relationship with the United States. Pakistan enjoys the protection of its Chinese patron and India would be standing out there completely alone.

What does this tell us about the prospects for the CTBT becoming a real instrument of nuclear disarmament? Clearly it explains why in the end the talks between US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee's special emissary Jaswant Singh are proving to be inconclusive. It explains why Vajpayee continues to insist that India will agree to nothing unless a disarmed India is protected from the dark shadows of Chinese and Pakistani blackmail.

Finally, it tells us that, a genuine agreement leading to total nuclear disarmament has got to find a way around the present bottom-line impasse: how to guarantee that have-not or partially nuclear-have states who face real nuclear threats from members of the Big Five or their surrogates can be protected from nuclear intimidation during the last stages of the disarmament process. Without a solution to this problem, all talk of a viable CTBT will remain just that -- only talk.

The writer is Visiting Professor of South Asian Studies at the University of Virginia, USA.

For a Better Public Policy

by ABMS Zahur

Because of political instability policies run for shorter times. Thus proper evaluation of any policy is not possible. We have to be more tolerant and appreciative about others' thinking and deed for the sake of development of democracy, peoples' welfare and good governance.

PUBLIC policy is carried out by authorities in the name of the people. Some public policies, however, affect very few people. Certain private policies, on the other hand, affect everybody (such as a hotel restricting entrance of a particular group of people). The only distinguishing feature of public policy is that it is carried out by the authorities. The authorities are those who have the chief means of physical force in the country at their disposal. In Bangladesh the authorities are those who occupy parliamentary, executive and judicial offices provided for in the constitution. So public policy is what is done in their official capacity by the president, prime minister, other ministers, judges, magistrates, courts and by all members of offices, boards, committees, commissions, councils, tribunals, bureau, directorates, services, forces, organisations or whatever they are called who work under them.

Though there may be some murky areas in which it is difficult to call certain policies private or public, there is hardly anything we do as private citizens that is not regulated in some way by government regulations and legislation, government financial aid subsidies, a growing range of activities. Even when an area of activity is left entirely in private hands the very act of leaving it alone can be a deliberate policy of the authorities. Yet a distinction remains between carrying out courses of action for the authorities by working for them and merely acquiescing in the constraints that those courses of action impose on one's activities. Although that distinction may be of decreasing practical significance it continues to mark the dividing line between public and private policy.

It is not correct to say that all the action that affects something are found emanating from a department or other body with a corresponding title. The country's policy towards foreign countries for instance comprises much more than the actions taken by the ministry of foreign affairs. It also includes certain activities of the ministries of finance, civil aviation, commerce, industry etc.

Policy analysis as an interdisciplinary science calls for the skills of historians, lawyers, political scientists, economists, sociologists and psychologists among others. Special interests, people's preferences are to be taken into account. An intimate knowledge about the formal institutions of government, the statutes, regulations and other official documents, informal relationships, the behind-the-scenes manoeuvrings and the unofficial compromises that widen or narrow the gap between announced intentions and actual actions is necessary. It calls for the most accurate measurement of such things as the costs and benefits of different sections of the community or other alternatives compared with others. And it benefits from combining an awareness of enormous variety of alternatives theoretically available to policy-makers with an appreciation of how practical considerations and local conditions affect the appropriateness, desirability and feasibility of all such alternatives.

One of the goals of political science is good government. There may be two main approaches for checking the question of good governance — the political performance approach and the policy performance approach. Under the political performance approach the examination is of the policies and appropriateness of the political system, representative, responsible, efficient, effective, democratic, egalitarian, open, united, free, fair, self-correcting, pluralistic, stable, decentralised and so on. The policy performance approach has concentrated on the causes of action actually adopted by government in policy areas. This approach needs analysis of the extent to which the policies are appropriate, efficient, effective, necessary, comprehensive, coordinated, fair and so on. None of these approaches is, however, adequate for evaluating government when used on its own. To help resolve such dilemmas an all-embracing approach to the question whether or not a country is well-governed is needed; an approach which forces us to examine not only the interconnections between policies and politics, but also the interconnections between both of them and the social and economic features of the country concerned. The model of such an approach may be visualised as consisting of the three areas of politics, public policies and the social and economic variables, all linked together by cause and effect arrows in both directions, or work back through the arrows in the other direction to discover mainly the following determinants:

- public policy can have a direct effect on politics;
- public policy can have a direct effect on society and the economy in the way it affects traditions, ideas, resources, scientific and technological innovation etc;
- politics can have a direct effect on public policy;
- politics can have a direct effect on society and economy;
- social and economic factors can have a direct effect on public policy.

Before policy-making begins the authorities usually perceive a need for action. It must not be imagined that all needs, problems and opportunities exist in the community. That a need, problem or opportunity exists is a subjective interpretation of objective state affairs. Thus, the authorities do not easily agree about what should be the public policy agenda.

The narrowing down process is also affected very much by what information advice reach the policy maker and what is kept out. Policy about policy making may or may not ensure that a number of alternatives are formulated. Investment of energy and money by the authorities in investigation is formidable and increasing. The number of surveys, censuses, statistical summaries, court reports, inquiries and research publications is testimony to that. The authorities acquire a mass of information about public policy which they either do not publish or else release only at times suitable to them. Besides perception and investigation, other steps in the policy making process include formulation, legislation, referendum, execution and adjudication. The total process may be long or short. The actions that go to make up a policy may be coordinated with each other and

with other areas of public policy.

The policy making process can be evaluated against two criteria — political and efficiency. The political process could be described as democratic, authoritarian, elitist, federalist, pluralist and so on and points to such matters as the quantity and quality of information brought to bear, amount of search engaged in etc. On the basis of his own evaluation one can propose the alternative policy making process.

A policy can begin, end, continue or change. In many areas what is done is the same as or similar to, what has been done for sometime. Though sometimes a whole new course of action is initiated from the scratch, many such new policies are little more than marginal deviation. In each policy area one should try to assess the consequences of the courses of action that have been adopted and to ask in particular who has benefited and who has lost.

Whether a policy has been approved or not depends very

much on one's assessment of its consequences. Most public policies result in either distribution or redistribution of the things that people value (such as freedom, status, security etc). Election results may show how the people have reacted to a particular public policy, though what politicians claim to be the main issue in an election, what the voters profess to be mainly concerned with and what in fact affects the voters' vote may be different things. Other impact data can be extracted from such things as departmental annual reports, census returns, government budget figures and the economic and welfare statistics of all kinds. It is no wonder that the authorities often have acted in the dark, or that opinions differ so markedly as to the value of public policies.

The quality of processing of public policy needs appreciable improvement. So far processing of all public policies is mainly done by bureaucracy. This has resulted in adoption of ad hoc measures in intricate problems. Because of political instability policies run for shorter times.

Thus proper evaluation of any policy is not possible. We have to be more tolerant and appreciative about others' thinking and deed for the sake of development of democracy, peoples' welfare and good governance.

The writer is a retired Joint Secretary of the Government of Bangladesh.

Jail Me Again If You Wish, Says Professor

Cheikh Saad Bouh Kamara is the winner of the 1998 Anti-Slavery Award for his efforts to stamp out the practice of hereditary servitude in his home country of Mauritania. Gemini News Service reports on how Kamara's efforts are gradually making the Mauritanian government more sensitive to international opinion. Mike Crawley writes from London.

WHEN he was imprisoned for two months earlier this year, Cheikh Saad Bouh Kamara's response to the Mauritanian government was, "Thank you. When you put me in jail, you make me more famous."

Kamara's fame continues to grow now that he's free. The 54-year-old sociology professor received the 1998 Anti-Slavery Award in London on 18 November for his efforts to raise awareness of slavery in Mauritania.

These efforts were the real reason behind his jail stint, which began in January when he was arrested at his home in the capital Nouakchott after one of his colleagues gave an interview about slavery to a French television crew.

Kamara was charged and convicted of belonging to an illegal organisation. He and four others were sentenced to 13 months in prison.

An outcry came from many Mauritians, but more importantly for the government, also from foreign leaders and international organisations. Two months after their arrest, on the same day that an appeal court upheld their sentence, Mauritania's president released Kamara and the others.

"If they prefer to send us back into jail, we don't mind, they can put us in jail," says Kamara.

It wasn't his first time in a Mauritanian prison. In 1994, Kamara helped a team of delegates from Amnesty International and FIDH — the International Federation for Human Rights — when they came to Mauritania to write a report. As soon as they left, he was arrested and jailed for four days.

"It's very interesting to go to jail," says Kamara with a genuine smile. "You meet a lot of people whose cases are fascinat-

ing. Among the people he met was a former student; the man in charge of the jail. Kamara sees plenty of his ex-pupils in even higher positions of power, such as the cabinet and top levels of the administration, but he doesn't want to join them. At various times, he has had the opportunity to be a minister but has refused, arguing that even within the government, the leaders would not let him to do things he wants to do, rendering him powerless.

He prefers to work from the outside: "Reinforcing civil society is the best way to help in Africa."

Mauritania is an Islamic republic, with virtually 100 per cent practising the religion. Its population is almost equally divided among three ethnic groups — the so-called white Arabs, black Arabs and black Africans — and it is the white Arabs that dominate power.

In 1989, after incidents of Arab-African violence, the government expelled some 70,000 black Africans. At the heart of this move was control over the southern part of the country where the Senegal River forms the border. Arab agribusiness interests wanted more access to the recently irrigated valley lands. Thousands of people languished for the better part of a decade as refugees in Senegal and Mali.

Despite this, Kamara says the racial divide in Mauritania is not the cause of slavery. He says slavery is practised by all of Mauritania's ethnic groups and is a political, economic and democratic problem.

Slavery goes against the tenets of Islam, which makes it a touchy issue for an Islamic republic. The government officially abolished the practice in 1981 and denies its existence today, but Kamara and outside researchers have shown that it continues in Mauritania.

Slavery was practised for generations by the people of North Africa. It began to diminish under the French colonisation in the 20th century, but the French did little to stop the practice among nomads in Mauritania.

Today, slavery continues through heredity: the children of slaves are born slaves. And because the government denies its existence, it does almost

Mauritania
winner of 1998 Anti-Slavery Award

Religion: Islam
President: Maouya Ould Sid'Ahmed Taya
Population 2.2 million

Black Arab 33%
Black African 35%
White Arab 30%

nothing to stop the practice.

That job is left to people like Kamara.

The son of a black father and Arab mother, Kamara's views on justice were formed at a young age. In 1955, when Mauritania was still a French colony, he was 11 years old and was told he couldn't sit an exam for early secondary school entrance because he was African; he would have to wait. The Algerian war was also a vivid turning point. He couldn't understand why the French wouldn't give it independence.

He spent 12 years studying and teaching in France, and says: "My education in the so-

cial sciences helped me to ask a lot of questions," Kamara returned to Mauritania in 1978. That was the year in which economic hardships and Mauritania's ill-advised attempt to occupy Western Sahara led to widespread protests. Five coups followed in the next six years.

Maouya Ould Sid'Ahmed Taya seized the presidency in 1984 and has stayed there since, with the help of army support, press censorship, rigged elections and a tight rein on groups like the Mauritanian Association for Human Rights, of which Kamara is president.

"For the government, we are very dangerous because we are

independent," he says. "I'm sure the government in the future will think a lot before arresting human rights activists because they know we have strong networks with other human rights agencies and the press."

Kamara has little faith that politics will bring about change for the better in Mauritania. He doesn't believe the promises of the country's opposition parties and says they care more about power than human rights.

After an opposition party was formed in 1992, he says: "I saw very quickly that these people, if they take power, will do exactly the same as the party in power."

He says Mauritania's civil society isn't strong enough to stop governments from abusing power. Still, he sees reasons for hope.

In the past two years, the number of human rights associations has exploded to more than 30 from just two, and the participants are not just intellectuals, but farmers and labourers as well. In April, the government established an official commissariat for human rights. Kamara approves of this move and of the person chosen to head the agency.

The World Bank is funding reform of the justice system, which — although designed to give foreign investors the kind of legal infrastructure they demand — Kamara believes will make for fairer trials for all Mauritians.

"Democracy is a very long process," says Kamara. "In Mauritania, it's a process that's perhaps at its beginning."

The writer is a Canadian journalist working in London for Gemini News Service on a fellowship from the International Development Research Centre.