

Bangladesh's Political Prospects: Building a Responsible Opposition

by Rehman Sobhan

To build a constructive opposition in parliament which sees itself as a government in waiting demands an acceptance by the opposition in Bangladesh that governments are, under our constitution, elected to office for five years unless they lose their majority on the floor of the house.

THE only way in which a poorly performing government may escape from its accountability before the electorate lies in the failure of the opposition to do its job. Whilst the onus of good government remains with the government in a working democracy, the opposition also has to establish its credibility as a constructive critic and as a prospective alternative to the government. It is Bangladesh's misfortune that the present role of the opposition in Bangladesh has prejudiced its standing as a credible political force in the eyes of the electorate. The country expected this opposition to hold the government of the day accountable both on the floor of the house and before the nation. In this process, voters expected constructive criticism of the government's performance as well as indications from the opposition of what they would do to ensure better governance when they came to power and why this was not done when they were in office three years ago. References to mythical achievements when the BNP or Jaty Party were in office assume that people have a short memory span and do not remember the power failures or the toll taking by Mastaans during their tenure.

Both the BNP and the Awami League thus have a stake in a working parliament. Thus, however much the Speaker may disfavor the opposition in Parliament, in a parliamentary system nobody can silence the voice of a strong opposition except the opposition itself. There is now no longer any news value in a walk-out and people take this for granted rather than investigate its ostensible reason. Unfortunately for the opposition, once they walk out of Parliament there is no alternative forum to ventilate their grievances on a regular basis. Thus, parliament, even if it is not televised, still remains the only forum where a government can be readily taken to task. It would have been much more useful for Khondkar Mosharaf Hossain to present his critique of the government's performance in the power sector in Parliament rather than at a press conference.

If indeed the opposition was going to make some really telling criticism of the government, all they need to do is to advise the principal news channels that they will have something newsworthy to say in the House, to ensure coverage. If this time in Parliament is used effectively by the opposition to take the government to task for their acts of misgovernance this can make the headlines. If however all that is on offer to the public are wild, unsubstantiated allegations, then this becomes repetitious and it is not surprising that it is not regularly reported in the press. No paper, even if inclined to the government, can afford to keep 'hot' news about debates on the floor of the house, away from their readers because this will lose circulation for the paper to rivals who will report these lively debates. There is no shortage of ammunition available to the opposition to take the government to task in parliament. For all the clichés about secrecy and confidentiality in government, Bangladesh remains a very transparent society where most information about any misdeeds can be retrieved by a determined opposition abetted by an investigative press.

Rather than present reasoned criticisms of the government all that the public have heard from the opposition, with some rare exceptions, have been intemperate attacks, of a generalised nature, presented in abusive language. This generates a reciprocal response from the front benches of the government, which sheds more heat but little light on the issue under debate. The public is thus denied both a meaningful critique of the government as well as a reasoned reply from the front bench. This arrangement is quite satisfactory for the government who are taken off the hook and do not really have to develop a credible response to their acts of misgovernance on the floor of the Parliament.

Looking at TV coverage of the debates in the Lok Sabha in India, the quality of the discussion there is often no less intemperate than that in our Jatyo Sangshad but most debates are permitted to continue, opposition is given time and government responses are not shouted down or faced with walk outs as an ongoing practise. I have personally never seen the point of the opposition walking out of parliament, whether it was the Awami League during the BNP tenure or today. People walk out of unrepresentative parliaments where the opposition is weak and ineffective. To avoid the need for such walk-outs many governments have been launched to perpetuate a tradition where a strong opposition can take a

government to task inside parliament. Both the BNP and the Awami League thus have a stake in a working parliament. Thus, however much the Speaker may disfavor the opposition in Parliament, in a parliamentary system nobody can silence the voice of a strong opposition except the opposition itself. There is now no longer any news value in a walk-out and people take this for granted rather than investigate its ostensible reason. Unfortunately for the opposition, once they walk out of Parliament there is no alternative forum to ventilate their grievances on a regular basis. Thus, parliament, even if it is not televised, still remains the only forum where a government can be readily taken to task. It would have been much more useful for Khondkar Mosharaf Hossain to present his critique of the government's performance in the power sector in Parliament rather than at a press conference.

In a democratic system once an opposition embarks on a so called one point movement to oust an elected government they do damage to themselves and their electorate. Such an opposition moves away from playing their primary role of holding the government accountable for their regular acts of misgovernance. For this reason such moves are not welcome to the government because its numerous acts of misgovernance thereby pass unchallenged whilst the opposition is walking the streets seeking their resignation.

efforts to force an elected government to abdicate power have not been successful because their efforts lack political legitimacy. Such an opposition movement cannot therefore command the necessary public support on the streets for a move to force an elected government with a majority in the house, to resign. This means that the oppositions can only expect its own party workers to join a street movement to force the resignation of the government.

There is no indication that the present opposition in Bangladesh has the street power to force the present government to resign anymore than the Awami League workers, prior to February 1996, could force the BNP to resign. This is not, say, that some citizens may not participate in local or issue-specific street demonstrations such as lack of power or inadequate water supply. Such political protests are the legitimate staple of a political system. But such issue based public support should not be confused with moves to prematurely displace a legitimately elected government. Shaikh Hasina or Khaleda Zia are not military despots or fraudulently elected leaders such as Marcos but popularly elected leaders with a mandate to rule.

In a democratic system once an opposition embarks on a so called one point movement to oust an elected government they do damage to themselves and their electorate. Such an opposition moves away from playing their primary role of holding the government accountable for their regular acts of misgovernance. For this reason such moves are not welcome to the government because its numerous acts of misgovernance thereby pass unchallenged whilst the opposition is walking the streets seeking their resignation.

In the move from the parliament to the streets the use of the *hartal* as a form of protest is being both misused and overused. *Hartals* have lost their credibility as a weapon of political agitation and are largely observed because people do not want their vehicles to be damaged or to face the threat of street violence. Some salaried employees may quite enjoy *hartals* as a means of extending their paid holidays. This apolitical approach to *hartals* is recognised by the opposition who now call *hartals* to coincide with weekends or public holidays. The opposition's call of a *hartal* on 18 April meant

that many people could enjoy a weeks unscheduled holiday beginning from the evening of 13 April, taking in the Bengali new year on 14 April, taking one day's casual leave on Thursday, 15 April, using the weekend of 16-17 April and the *hartal* of 18 April. In the process Bangladesh enjoyed a third Eid vacation, courtesy of the opposition. In such a situation a *hartal* is not only harmful to those who want to work but it also encourages a non-work culture which is already compromising the productivity of the economy.

If the BNP thinks that observation of a *hartal* on 18 April was a symbol of political support for their cause then they must be unusually naive. Actually the opposition knows as well as anyone else that the *hartal* is now a blunt weapon which is far more damaging to themselves than to the government. In spite of this knowledge, to go an calling *hartals*, is thus a symptom of the opposition's political bankruptcy where they know they cannot invoke more effective political weapons to sustain their cause. In such circumstances the opposition should try to test the true efficacy of the *hartal* as a vehicle of popular protest. They should, for example, state that they are today calling a *hartal* to protest the deterioration of the law and order situation and that all citizens who share this concern should stay home as a symbol of protest. They should also make it clear that the opposition will not picket or obstruct those who want to go about their business. Such a *hartal* call would become a true referendum on the state of governance and the opposition could invest some time counselling the public to support such a *hartal*. However such mobilisations require a great deal of political effort and must be used sparingly to voice genuine public concerns rather than party-specific concerns if they are not to be devalued in the eyes of the people.

The opposition can use such street power as a tactical weapon of protest not as an instrument of regime change. Street protest thus needs to be subordinated to the parliamentary platform available to challenge the government's record. Once it is accepted that parliament is to be the principal political platform, the opposition should then sit down with the government and negotiate time for use of the floor of the house. To refuse to sit with

the government or the Speaker to negotiate more floor time in the *Sangshad* on the grounds that past agreements were not honoured will not get the opposition more visibility in Parliament. Politics being the art of the possible every gain for the opposition can come from negotiated agreements. Such agreements can be monitored by a body of mutually accepted citizens who can give weekly reports to the Speaker and press briefings on how the floor time was distributed between the government and opposition benches. They can also monitor TV coverage to ensure equal time to the opposition.

Similarly, the opposition should set out to make the Parliamentary Committees more effective. They can use the committees to demand placement of all official documents, before them. They can call in outside experts to give professional opinion on issues under discussion to hear views, independent of the government. They can even mobilise public support to make hearings of the Parliamentary Committees public as is the case in the US Congress. In such endeavours to make the Parliamentary Committees effective the opposition may draw upon the full support of civil society.

The opposition must, above all, realise that one day they may be back in power. If they ever come back to power, they do not want to lay the basis for reciprocal behaviour by the future opposition which would lead us into another cycle of political confrontation beginning from the first day they take office. There are political allies of the BNP who obviously have no hope of every coming to power so they can afford to provoke the BNP to lead street agitations because these parties have no stake in sustaining a working democracy. Indeed next time round if there is a BNP administration those parties now on the streets with them could join the principal opposition party in calling *hartals* against a BNP government.

Long and painful experience indicates that both the Awami League and the BNP have a mutual interest in building and sustaining a working political system where political contestation is located in the parliament and not on the streets. If the opposition does not do its job in parliament, it is not just doing damage to themselves but to the government whose misgovernance is not exposed to serious challenge and can thus continue uncorrected. This should not encourage the opposition to keep to the streets in the false belief that this will encourage further misgovernance. Such agitations remain unwelcome to a population who would like to see a government taken to task for misgovernance but would prefer to have this done without having their daily life disrupted.

To build a constructive opposition in parliament which sees itself as a government in waiting demands an acceptance by the opposition in Bangladesh that governments

are, under our constitution, elected to office for five years unless they lose their majority on the floor of the house. Once the opposition accepts that it is not only unfeasible but also inappropriate to displace an elected government their approach towards using parliament will change and we may hope to build an effective parliamentary culture. There is enormous public support for an effective parliament which will back all moves by an opposition in this direction. There is little support for an opposition which opposes street politics over parliament and brings to politics of the street into parliament. This awareness by the opposition of their role in politics is essential to the future of parliamentary democracy in Bangladesh.

In turn, responsible behaviour by the opposition in parliament demands reciprocal gestures by the government. Equal time on the floor and coverage on TV to the opposition must be ensured. The other day, watching Doodardhan on the occasion of the *hartal* call of 18 April, I heard Somnath Chatterjee, leader of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in the Lok Sabha, speak for 45 minutes, where he made a trenchant attack on the BJP during the course of the recent no-confidence motion. I would like to see similar time given to the opposition on BT. The government has to recognise that the opposition is also integral to the parliamentary process. It has to take their views into account in framing legislation and not just pay lipservice to this process. The Awami League regime should therefore initiate the tradition of making the Parliamentary Committees effective and should even consider inviting

opposition members to chair some Committees if not all of them, as is the practise in the Lok Sabha. All business of the parliament should be determined in consultation with the opposition. Such gestures, may not be immediately reciprocated by the opposition but nonetheless need to be made with sincerity by the government, who have the larger stake in the viability of the parliamentary process. It would, in turn, be damaging to the opposition to fail to respond to positive gestures by the government to improve the working of parliament.

The government can test the sincerity of the opposition and establish its own commitment to making parliament effective during the forthcoming budget session by referring the 1999/2000 budget to the Finance Committee of Parliament, after a first reading on the floor of the house. Independent professional experts should be invited to assist the work of this Committee. Saifur Rahman and his opposition colleagues should be given maximum opportunity to make constructive suggestions on how to improve the budget and Mr. Kibria should incorporate any constructive suggestions from the opposition in the final budget. This would reflect a clear advance over the futile rhetorical exchanges which characterise the budget debate where no real scrutiny is made of this important piece of legislation. Many more gestures of this nature could be initiated by the government to make parliament effective but this will require generosity of spirit and an awareness that a working parliament is the most important resource for promoting good governance.

A Death in New York

by Aniruddha Das

Many New Yorkers acknowledge that the increased police presence has made the city safer. But at what price? Cases of police abuse are becoming more frequent, and when they go unpunished by the Mayor's office, residents fear for their future safety.

It is, perhaps, every immigrant's dream of success. You come to New York to make a living, you work hard, and then one day your name is on every New Yorker's lips. Television personalities talk about you non-stop. Your parents arrive from their native country (no hassles at the US Embassy!) at the invitation of New York. On arrival at the airport, they are met by hundreds of well-wishers and dozens of television cameras — microphones pushed forward to catch their every word. They are escorted from the airport by a motorcade. They then sit in a crowded town hall listening to complete strangers talk about what a wonderful, nice boy their son is. Djalio's boss, Shahin Chowdhury says: "He was a jewel. I will never forget him."

A dream? For Kadiadou and Saikou Djalio of Guinea, all this came true last week, but with a tragic twist. They had come to New York to pick up the bullet-riddled body of their son Amadou Djalio — shot to death by the New York city police in a case of mistaken identity. An unarmed man shot 41 times, 19 of those bullets entering his body, for the crime of being Black. The police claim that Amadou Djalio was mistaken for a suspect. But, as columnist Angela Ards pointed out, Amadou resembled the suspect "in the most generic sense: eyes, ears, a nose, a mouth, male, black, young."

Amadou was a suspect because he was Black. The police thought he had a weapon because he was Black. Amadou was shot to death because he was Black. This is the final, grisly consequence of a city police system that has institutionalized racism, that has created a larger-than-life stereotype of every Black male as a potential violent criminal: "Everyone's Worst Nightmare". Amadou Djalio was a 22-year-old West African immigrant who lived in the Bronx. He studied English and Computer Science in Singapore and Thailand before coming to America. A devout Muslim, he worked twelve hours a day selling videos to earn enough money to finish his bachelor's degree. On February 4, as he was standing in the vestibule of his own apartment, about to open the door — four undercover police, members of the "elite" Street Crimes unit, approached him. What happened next is unclear, but when the dust settled, the four officers had fired a total of 41 times, at an unarmed man. Somehow, 22 of the 41 shots missed their target, though the officers aimed into a space not larger than a telephone booth. Of the 19 bullets that hit Djalio, 11 hit him in the legs, 5 pierced his torso, 1 hit the right arm, 1 went through his chest and 1 entered through his back.

New York is frequently cited as a model of success against crime. New York city's crime situation was once so out of

control that the city took over the popular imagination as the definition of urban chaos — spawning films like *DEATH WISH* and *ESCAPE FROM NEW YORK*. In 1999, New York is a very different city, with crime down to levels not seen since the 1960s. This success against crime helped win Mayor Giuliani his re-election in 1997. But this victory against crime has come at a terrible price for poor Black and Latino New Yorkers who are frequent targets of the police. The Civilian Complaints Review Board recently reported that:

- In 1993, there were 3,580 complaints about police brutality. By 1998, this number had risen by 39 per cent to 4,975.
- The largest amount of complaints related to "invasion of privacy" — regarding searches of apartments, personal body searches and damage of property during a search.
- Between January and June of 1998, there was a 58 per cent increase in police beatings, 27 per cent increase in "drag/pull" allegations and 30 per cent increase in the use of the painful pepper spray against suspects.

A disproportionate number of victims of these often brutal police methods are people of colour living in the poor neighbourhoods of the city. One day last month, on the subway going home, I witnessed a first hand demonstration of "racial profiling". Suddenly, our train was stopped at Greenwich Village. A loudspeaker announced the train was being detained while the police investigated a crime report. A few minutes passed. A group of three police officers came to our carriage. Scanning the seats, they motioned to the one young black teenager sitting across from me. Looking up from my newspaper I looked at the boy — he was wearing the fashion made popular by hip-hop bands and "urban" designers. Big puffy jacket, baggy pants, and wool cap. Was this enough to qualify for a police checkup? Apparently so! Before my astonished eyes, the police led him on to the platform and started doing a body search. After doing a 5 minute search, the frustrated officers asked for ID and spent another 5-minutes speaking on their wireless. Finally the young man was allowed back into the train. His face betrayed no sign of emotion, nor did he look at any of us. I looked around the train at the other African-American passenger, an older man with grey hair. On his face was a look of sadness, but not surprise. I suppose he had seen it happen many times before.

In many cases of police abuse, no action is taken to punish the offending officers. In 1996, Amnesty International issued a report reviewing 90 cases of police brutality in New York. The report was savagely attacked by Mayor Giuliani as "exaggerated". A Bronx judge recently acquitted Officer Francis Livoti — who choked Latino teenager Anthony Baez to death during a routine arrest. When another officer, with seven civilian complaints against him, shot a homeless man at point blank range, the Mayor called it an "ambiguous situation". In 1997, two officers shot 24 times at an unarmed Black man sitting in a car. A Brooklyn grand jury returned a verdict of "not guilty" against the officers. Recently, police fired seventeen times at 16-year old Michael Jones, mistakenly thinking that his toy gun was a real firearm. The Mayor later issued a statement blaming the lack of "adult supervision" for the incident. Last year, Haitian immigrant Abner Louima was mistakenly arrested outside a nightclub and brutally beaten by a group of four police officers. During the beating he was allegedly sodomized with a toilet plunger. Although an investigation has begun, no action has yet been taken against the officers.

This continuing pattern of violent police behavior has had significant impact on the psyche of New Yorkers. Twenty-seven year old Floyd Coleman told the NEW YORK TIMES, "Even when it's cold, I try not to wear my hood. Especially at night, because you're going to get stopped." The hood is not just race, but also class — with residents of poor neighbourhoods, the most likely victims of police searches. Coleman works with young children in Youth Ministries for Truth & Justice — only five minutes away from the street where Amadou Djalio's life ended. He said: "It makes me want to cry. Here I am steering young people in the right direction. And we have cops approaching us for no reason. I feel like we're in prison."

Alexie Torres, director of the youth centre, added: "We hear that they're doing this to protect us and take care of the community. In the process of helping reduce crime, sometimes there is a long-lasting sense of something else in a generation of young men. You're breaking their spirit. You're breaking their will."

porters. "You can kill a man with just one bullet. It doesn't take 41 bullets to kill even an elephant." Randy Wrencher of Jamaica, Queens said mournfully. "It could have been me. The cops could walk up to me, thinking I'm somebody else, and before they let me pull out my ID, I'd be dead."

The killing, following the beating of Abner Louima, has sent chills down the city's immigrant population — especially New York's 84,000 African immigrants. In addition to being Black, those from Francophone Africa sometimes speak poor English, which makes them more vulnerable in encounters with police. Guinean businessman Silla Siddique told the NEW YORK TIMES, "We are afraid, we are afraid. I want to go back before somebody kills me." Another Guinean businessman, Mamadou Jawara, said police repeatedly stop him outside his home in Staten Island, and officers sometimes tell him to "Go back to Africa." Particularly poignant is the story of Djalio's friend Dr. Balde Ngere. Initially he had migrated from Guinea to France. But French racism was so extreme that he finally immigrated to America five years ago to find refuge. Now with his friend Djalio dead, he asks, "Where do we go now?"

Many New Yorkers acknowledge that the increased police presence has made the city safer. But at what price? Cases of police abuse are becoming more frequent, and when they go unpunished by the Mayor's office, residents fear for their future safety. Led by Reverend Al Sharpton, scores of New Yorkers have voluntarily been arrested in front of police headquarters to protest the shooting. Those arrested included former Presidential candidate Jesse Jackson and former Mayor David Dinkins (New York's first African-American Mayor). A Brown Grand Jury has indicted all 4 officers, clearing the way for a trial. Meanwhile, the State Attorney general's office has opened an investigation into the overall conduct of the NYPD.

Black activists like Reverend Al Sharpton have vowed to keep up the pressure until justice is served. Many believe this incident will act as a lightning rod to bring much needed reform to the Mayor's office and the NYPD. During the tenure of Mayor Dinkins, the Crown Heights riots between African-Americans and Hasidic Jews became a symbol for the incompetence of the Mayor's office. Using Dinkins' record of inaction during the riots, Giuliani defeated him to become the new Mayor. Many residents hope the Djalio killing will be Giuliani's Crown Heights — galvanizing voters and activists who are tired of overzealous and needless target and harass people of colour.

Shame, Once More

Mahfuzur Rahman writes from New York

Once believed, partly under the influence of Marxist thinking, that one need not worry about leadership. It would naturally emerge from the tensions of society. The 'people' will ultimately choose the 'right' leaders. Probably the catch is in the 'ultimately', or in the long run, when, let us remind ourselves, we are all dead. But now I feel we are living on borrowed time.

A few months back, at the Annual Bangladesh Sammelan in New York, someone uttered three words that have been haunting me ever since: *behave like adults!* These words were not addressed to any particular individual but were hurled at a group of young Bengalees. And who do you think hurled those devastating reprimand? An American security guard at the Madison Square Garden where the conference was being held. Someone probably with little formal education, but enough maturity to know how an adult should behave. And exactly who were those people he was taking to task? They were participants at a seminar on the political situation in Bangladesh. A speaker at the seminar had said something that some in the audience did not like while others did. There was an uproar, abuses were hurled, and things were fast moving to fistfuffs, when the security guards stepped in.

That ignominy, however, pales against events being played out at national scale in Bangladesh. And we seem to have a history of it. Let us begin with history. Remember the days when we got our independence from the British? We were reminded then by our new rulers not to rock the boat of the "infant state". That sobriquet sounded even better in Bengali: *Shishu Rashtra*. The citizens, by implication, were mature adults. But that also was rather strange. Who was an infant state consist of fully mature citizens? And then how about the events that led to the partition of India? Were the leaders of the subcontinent all acting responsibly, which is after all the sign of political adulthood? Can one fail to sympathize with Annada Shanker Roy when he talks about some of the *budo khoka* (old juveniles) who led the independence movement?

Then in strode a Field Marshal who also thought just about everybody except himself was an infant who had messed up the affairs of the infant state. He was particularly fond of us Bengalees, and would tell his West Pakistani brethren to "Ask them [that is, the Bengalees] over and entertain them even if it is over a simple cup of tea." [Mohammad Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters*, p. 27] Not many protested such crawling condescension and many did in fact come for tea and biscuits and sat before him, on the edge of their chairs.

In the end it became a bit too much. Somehow Bengalees recovered their lost sense of shame. Ayub Khan became part of the congeries of history as did other like him. We finally became masters of ourselves. Freedom exacted a horrific price but we paid it. We had finally found our footing as a nation. Now was the time to start the work of nation-building.

Things did not quite turn out that way. We made a mess of it. This part of our history is too recent and too sordid to bear repetition. And if we were to describe it in one word, that must be 'shame' with a capital 'S'. And much of that has been brought on us by our leaders. But that leaders are also products of society will simply not do.

Once believed, partly under the influence of Marxist thinking, that one need not worry about leadership. It would naturally emerge from the tensions of society. The 'people' will ultimately choose the 'right' leaders. Probably the catch is in the 'ultimately', or in the long run, when, let us remind ourselves, we are all dead. But now I feel we are living on borrowed time.

Failures of our leadership are all too many. The country had a difficult beginning and some of the economic and so-

cial problems that it has accumulated over the years are truly daunting. Not to be able to tackle them all is not necessarily a matter of obloquy, the shame lies elsewhere. It lies in the lack of a sense of responsibility, like that a foreigner saw in us at the *Bangladesh Sammelan*. That is shameful for any individual. The shame is far greater when leaders bring it upon the nation.

That shame reached its apex, I thought, when the feuding national leaders brought the country to the brink of disaster in 1995-1996. They hardly seemed to care. So who cared? In an unconscionable throwback to the past, some leaders in fact almost evoked the *Shishu Rashtra* image. "Stop it. You are ruining the country," they pleaded. But who were these leaders? They came from other countries. Commonwealth leaders, American ambassadors, British emissaries and so on. They were here to tell our leaders to act responsibly. To behave like adult politicians. Not much came out of these comings and goings. In the end, after many lives had been sacrificed in the turmoil, education of our children suffered more damage, an enormous man-days of work lost, and confidence in the future further eroded, an election was held, a quite fair one, and a change of government took place. The mild euphoria that followed the change, alas, did not last long.

But we thought that the worst days of shame, of foreign leaders telling us not to rock the boat, were behind us. How wrong we were! We were destined to see a repeat performance.

The current impasse between the ruling party and the opposition brings to mind the situation that prevailed only three years ago. The opposition vows to remove forcibly an elected government for its alleged fail-

ures, even though it needs to wait only a short while for election to be held, making a change of government possible. The opposition's weapon of choice is the same as the weapon used by the government party when in opposition: *hartal*. The Bangladesh Nationalist Party and its strange bedfellows seem poised to match the record of *hartals* that the Awami League set three years ago. Their leaders are behaving more and more like sulking kids who have lost their marbles.

In comes our foreign mentors, suggesting once again that our leaders have not grown up. Many foreign leaders have expressed extreme concern that the political turmoil had been seriously hurting the country's economy. In order not to be seen as condescending, they call themselves "development partners". (That indeed is very decent of them). They have, by nature, had long discussions with the government and opposition leaders in order to break the present political deadlock. According to press reports, they have not been able to convince the feuding parties to pick up their marbles and play according to the rules of the game.

So we were wrong about the earlier foreign efforts to instill a sense of responsibility into our leaders as the height of national shame. We now have achieved a new high. In a bizarre twist — as if we needed this too — both government and opposition leaders are now proclaiming that they do not really like foreigners to interfere in domestic politics. This would have sounded right if they had told the "development partners" beforehand that they did not wish to talk about domestic politics, rather than expressing resentment after the event.

Now they protest too much. The author is an economist and a retired United Nations official.

Garfield



James Bond



ALL RIGHT HERE'S YOUR FISH — TAKE IT!



Y'KNOW, FOR A MINUTE THERE, JIM, I ALMOST HAD THE FEELING YOU WERE TRYING TO LOUSE UP THIS FISHY HUN?

