

## Boro Bounty Messed Up

HOW effectively we can spoil the advantage of a good harvest is driven home by the virtual derailing of the government's much-vaunted cereals procurement drive. On an upbeat note in the aftermath of a Boro boom, the government did not rest content merely with revising the GDP growth rate it very enthusiastically also launched a food gathering operation with a price support package for the farmers ostensibly designed to remunerate and reward them for the sizable crop their redoubled efforts after the flood yielded.

Against that overall optimistic backdrop the government seemed to forget that some forward planning and administrative preparations were essential to make a success of the food procurement drive, especially when some of the preceding ones had abysmally failed. That there was a Boro boom and the procurement prices were raised to an incentive level compared with those offered in the past, could not be sufficient guarantees for a success. On the contrary, in such conditions, the lure of money becomes all the more irresistible for those who wait in the wings to capitalise on the 'procurement business'.

Indeed, some latest field level studies reveal that, having been induced by the higher purchasing prices and the scale of procurement targeted, vested interest groups soaked up the surplus produce at the grower's level on the cheap. Then they sold the cereals at the procurement centres keeping the farmers completely at bay from the mainstream and thereby hijacking the benefits that were meant to be entirely the farmers'. Our Sunday's front-page report on the subject revealed how the game was being played by big millers, middlemen and even people's representatives to deprive the growers of their due. The procurement centre officials who are freely buying the commodity from these seasonal birds of businessmen are evidently playing into their hands. Why isn't there any stipulation on them to buy directly from the growers when the procurement price, to our understanding, includes a transport cost element? The farmers could be organised to come in a body to the purchase-centres and sell their produce there, something that would have been compatible with the government's vociferous claim to be the champion of peasant rights.

The procurement exercise is circumscribed by storage constraints as the government silos are brimming with previous stocks. That is another factor impeding the maximisation of benefits from a good crop. It is too late in the season to be building the desired number of godowns in the public sector now. Besides, the floods have come on requiring of us to fortify the existing ones in addition to moving the food to safer places. The private sector can be of some help to preserve the food under government surveillance.

In any case, it would be worthwhile for the government to issue a statement on food procurement and storage at this juncture.

## BJMB Benefit Fragmented

INAUGURATION of construction works for the 155-kilometre Bonapara-Nakia-Hatikumur road linking the Bangabandhu Bridge to the country's north-western districts appears to have breathed fresh air into industrial activities in the region. While potential investors have started exploring project possibilities, efforts have been under way to revive the laid-off local mills. In the context of such positive activism, the Natore Chamber of Commerce and Industry (NCCI) president's observation that "massive industrialisation would accelerate the pace of development in the region, removing unemployment problem within five to seven years" is definitely not an exaggeration. However, the road link, by itself, is not enough to expedite industrialisation in the north.

The three-hour time advantage the bridge is expected to provide the frequenters remains elusive as ever for the miserable condition of the Dhaka-Tangail highway. Besides being narrow, the highway is replete with cavities and potholes, thereby not only killing time but also heightening possibilities of fatal road accidents. Equally atrocious is the condition of quite a few diversion roads and box-culverts constructed as part of the access roads projects, as reported in an English-language news daily.

Moreover, there is the question of ensuring uninterrupted gas supply to the region, an essential ingredient for industrialisation. Installation of gas pipeline should be immediately underway. On the whole, a lot of works lie ahead.

Nevertheless, the construction of the road link is indeed positive start that needs to be followed up in all earnestness. The linkage should also pave the way for more EPZs, a necessity to attract more foreign direct investment. However, the government should take a more comprehensive approach in this regard, treating construction of road links, improvement of conditions of the Dhaka-Tangail highway and installation of gas pipeline as one single project. Otherwise, optimal benefit of the multi-purpose bridge will elude us.

## Pak Cricket in a Bind

THE Pakistan Cricket Board (PCB) ad-hoc committee chairman slapped a temporary ban on three senior cricketers including Wasim Akram, captain of the national team. The ban comes in the wake of a long-drawn controversy and enquiry into allegations of match-fixing against some top Pakistani cricketers. Also banned are former captain Salim Malik and his brother-in-law Ijaz Ahmed. The order, though apparently softened by the label 'temporary', could well spell the end of the illustrious career of Wasim Akram and that of his two colleagues. The chairman of PCB Mujeeb Rehman said that until investigations into corruption charges were completed they would not be available for selection but there is no definite indication as to when investigation will be completed and its finding made public. It could prove redundant if the players reached the age of superannuation.

The players, however, have always denied their involvement in such nefarious activities. When Mark Waugh and Shane Warne alleged they were offered money by Salim Malik to lose a match, fingers were raised against the Pakistan captain but the complainants themselves admitted having taken substantial amount in lieu of supplying information on weather, pitch and overall bearing of the visiting Australian team to complete strangers. They later apologised to the ACB and the ICC also covered them up for four years. Allegations against the Pakistani trio are very strong and there should not have been any smoke without fire.

The PCB should act quickly and decisively and close the issue beyond any doubt for the greater good of the game.

IN my last comment on July 11, 1999 under this column I said, "President Clinton may like to use the remaining period of his presidency to establish peace in the Middle East. With the changed situation peace appears within reach but to grab it President Clinton will have to run an extra mile..... The world will be there to acclaim the success. Let M-E peace be the last, glorious star of his presidency. All peace loving people feel encouraged to see that both Prime Minister Barak and President Clinton have agreed to work together to achieve comprehensive peace in the M-East in 15 months time i.e. the remaining part of the presidency. After brief meetings with President Mubarik, President Arafat and King Abdullah II, Prime Minister Barak's six-day visit to Washington was the most important part of his peace initiative. Indeed this visit was very vital to unfreeze the icy relationship that developed during Netanyahu's time. Indeed, President Clinton was eagerly looking forward to it as indicated by his very frank remark — eager as kid with a new toy to receive a new partner Prime Minister Ehud Barak. Though President Clinton's remark raised some criticism in Israel, this only reflected his enthusiasm for taking the peace process forward with Prime Minister Barak who is 'not Netanyahu'. There were several interpretations of his remark but he could have never meant offering that "new toy" to his new partner to lull him into easy play. Ehud Barak is not at all new in the game.

However, Clinton wanted to have one to one match with his new partner Barak away in the woods — the famous Camp David where another important match was played years ago that led to the peace deal between Sadat of Egypt and Begin of Israel. The match during overnight stay at Camp David produced interesting results both won and both were happy. Barak wanted less intrusive role by the US administration in the peace process; Clinton had no problem with it. He said, "The best peace process is one where critical decisions are made with the parties that have to live with it." These political pronouncements are undoubtedly for domestic consumption — what happens on the ground is entirely a different matter and generally beyond the control of both the leaders. The US-Israel relationship is so deep that Israel cannot go without the US. The US administration also largely depends on Israel for the reasons of domestic politics and also for strategic reasons and superpower politics in the Middle East and beyond.

Barak knows that land is important but peace is still more important for his people as there could be no security without peace. The contract for 50 new F-16E fighter planes worth \$2.5 b from the US may further strengthen Israeli army but cannot guarantee peace and security to its people. Israel is virtually a superpower in terms of its military arsenal in the region but could not guarantee security to the Israelis in the northern region against Hezbollah's rockets. Therefore Prime Minister Barak rightly embarked on the peace mission. He has to negotiate a peace deal with those people with whom his people will have to live. Here again it has to be a Camp

THE Middle East, beset by conflict and suspicion for decades, is in the throes of euphoria. For once, appearance meshes with reality. An unprecedented opportunity for a breakthrough toward Middle East peace beckons. The optimism coincides with the advent of Prime Minister Ehud Barak. But it is no derogation of either the quality of the new Israeli leader or his extraordinary electoral triumph to emphasize that he represents a culmination rather than an entirely new departure.

For 25 years, Israel has traded land for peace — sometimes reluctantly, always ambiguously — because the *quid pro quo* for its territorial sacrifice consisted essentially of revocable assurances. Nevertheless, Labour's Golda Meir gave up forward positions in the Sinai and on the Golan heights for limits on the military forces confronting each other across the new dividing lines. In his first term as prime minister, Labour's Yitzhak Rabin exchanged the Sinai passes for in effect — the main elements of the end of a state of war with Egypt.

In 1979 Likud's Menachem Begin accepted the 1967 Egyptian/Israeli border and vacated the Sinai, including Israeli settlements, to achieve formal peace with Egypt. In 1991 Likud's Yitzhak Shamir participated in the Madrid peace conference that included representatives of the Palestinians.

In 1993 Labour's Rabin and Shimon Peres concluded the Oslo agreement that is the core of the existing peace process with the PLO. And Likud's Benjamin Netanyahu overcame his party's long-standing opposition to the land-for-peace approach when, in last October's Wye agreement, he conceded at American insistence another 13 per cent of the remaining West Bank territory in return for strengthened security guarantees — thereby accepting the principle of territorial partition and ultimate Palestinian sovereignty. In one of history's ironies, Netanyahu, now denounced as a superhawk, may one day be remembered for having made possible the national consensus that enables his successor to undertake the final struggle toward peace.

Israel has moved in this trajectory because every prime minister — whatever the initial misgivings — concluded that there was no alternative in the face of the casualties imposed by the Intifada, the drain of southern Lebanon and the impossibility of achieving a conclusive military victory against the far more numerous Arab

## To the Editor...

### Why on everything?

Sir, In my opinion, scientists and researchers of proven integrity and expertise should remain confined to only their own fields of specialisation. But these days, I find a growing tendency among the foreign based Bangladeshi scientists and researchers to write on other topics in which they have no proven expertise. Their sources of information are also not impeccable. A case in point is the write-up "Heavenly Freedom At Midnight" written by Dr A H Jaffar Ullah (The Daily Star, July 17, 1999).

Mostly uninformed about the current situation obtaining in Bangladesh and relying on second hand or third hand sources, I wonder why the author decided to choose the topic. He is neither a 'peace worker' nor connected with any recognised world association engaged in 'conflict resolution'. He should have first done his home work.

P. Gomes  
61/1 Subhas Bose Avenue  
Dhaka-1100

## ME Peace in 15 Months!

*It is quite evident that Ehud Barak has created a positive and friendly environment for peace negotiations. Even President Assad of Syria whose country has been technically at war with Israel for the last 30 years, has not only shown his eagerness to work out a peace deal with Prime Minister Barak but has already "initiated four measures designed to gain confidence of Israel and the United States".*

David match where both parties must win. He cannot afford to leave the other party dissatisfied; the deal has to be something that all will have to accept and agree to live with.

Here comes the question of mandate. Fortunately Ehud Barak carries the mandate of his people — mandate to negotiate peace with security. Israeli people trust Barak who was Israel's security chief. He was also Israel's most decorated soldier and he knows what security means for the Israeli people. If

taken by Arafat and other Arabs, Arafat has already requested President Ahtisaari of Finland, the President of EU to play his role in the peace process.

It is quite evident that Ehud Barak has created a positive and friendly environment for peace negotiations. Even President Assad of Syria whose country has been technically at war with Israel for the last 30 years, has not only shown his eagerness to work out a peace deal with Prime Minister Barak

gerness to join the peace negotiations. President Assad's eagerness is based on two considerations. He feels that he can strike a deal with Ehud Barak to get back his Golan Height though there appears some difficulties with the interpretation of the stage of negotiation that the last Labour government reached. Assad, however, knows that he would have to agree to leave for security purposes an appropriate strip of the edge of the Height that overlooks Israel in the hands of the international peace keepers who are expected to be there till full confidence between two people is established. The other consideration is that a peace deal with Israel is likely to ensure President Assad's son as his successor.

For Prime Minister Barak it would be a great success as peace with Syria would bring peace with Lebanon and would greatly facilitate the negotiating work with the Palestinians. Undoubtedly there are several very difficult issues with Palestinians. Though Palestinian State is a foregone conclusion the issues like its nature, size, contiguous border etc will involve serious negotiations. The most important and sensitive issue is Jerusalem as extreme sentiments of both the parties are attached to it. Here the "braves" must exhibit their bravery not to fight on the issue but to show maximum flexibility to come to an acceptable solution. It will not at all be easy but a solution is a must for peace and security in the region.

East Jerusalem and the rest



### Spotlight on Middle East

Muslehuddin Ahmad

Barak cannot deliver security to Israelis, no other Israeli leader will be able to do so.

Prime Minister Barak has extended his peace net not only to all parties to the conflict but also to all possible "facilitators" — the US and the EU. While returning from the US Prime Minister Barak stopped at the UK to meet Prime Minister Tony Blair and asked for UK's support. He said, "I believe that Britain can have a leading role within the EU in supporting the peace process." This is a new turn in Israel's foreign policy as under Netanyahu Israel was virtually opposed to any direct role by the EU in the peace process. Barak's policy seems to be in line with the approach

but has already "initiated four measures designed to gain confidence of Israel and the United States", as put by an Israeli analyst Ron Ben Yishai in his comment on July 20, 1999 in *Yediot Achronot*. The four confidence-building measures are: (i) Assad's statements reflecting his confidence in Ehud Barak, (ii) Syrian military instructed Hezbollah to stop unilateral shooting and acts of violence in South Lebanon, (iii) Syrian officials asked the Palestinian rebels including Hamas members living in Syria to stop all terrorist activities from Syrian soil which will undoubtedly make the US happy and (iv) several conciliatory statements from Damascus expressing ea-

## Peace Hopes in the Middle East

by Henry Kissinger

*As the peace process approaches its final stage, America's role will be no less important for being more subtle. A former chief of staff, Barak is unlikely to be less conscious of the requirements of Israeli security than his predecessors. In any event, Washington is not in a position to draw final lines or to stage-manage indefinitely a series of tactical compromises.*

neighbours. And if Israel is perceived as the obstacle to peace, the indispensable relationship with America is at risk. Hence Rabin's comment to a diplomat who congratulated him on having been converted to the peace process: "Committed, not converted," replied the gruff soldier.

The Arab countries have gone through a similar evolution. Treating Israel as essentially illegitimate, too many Arab leaders have considered recognition of the Jewish state as the sole *quid pro quo* required of them. The PLO has insisted on borders that it had never accepted before the 1967 war, and has lately even been arguing for the 1947 UN partition plan that would reduce Israel to vestigial, unsustainable limits. Only last year — half a century after Israel came into being — did it manage to remove the clause in its charter calling for Israel's extinction by procedures provided in that very charter.

But the hard-liners are now increasingly isolated. Egypt and Jordan have concluded formal peace treaties. The remaining hold-outs are learning that they have in fact no realistic alternative. The Soviet Union has disappeared as a major arms supplier and Russia is in no position to provide convincing diplomatic or military support. The Gulf states have made clear that, while prepared to give the Palestinians economic assistance, they will not go to war over West Bank issues. Syria's Hafez Assad wants to minimize turmoil in the region as he seeks to arrange a succession for his son. All this accounts for the unprecedented conciliatory sounds emanating from Damascus and the more cooperative public attitude of the Palestinians. Nevertheless, the new atmosphere is not

toward final peace in his second term as he occasionally asserted in private conversations. But in the process, he so strained his relations with his American interlocutors — who did not like his thinking in the first place — as to defeat his design. Israel has a duty to insist that it remain the ultimate arbiter of the elements of its security, but its leaders must never forget that working relations with America are themselves a key element of their country's security.

When US-Israeli tensions turn this confrontational, the peace process is in jeopardy. Such a state of affairs compounds rigidly by all parties as Israel digs in, waiting for the storm to blow over and Palestinians wait for America to impose their maximum demands.

The recent Wye agreement is a case in point. It represented a compromise between the Palestinian demand for more than 20 per cent of the disputed territory as an entrance price into final status talks, and the Israeli offer of 10 per cent. The ultimate compromise of around 13 per cent eased tensions temporarily, but in the absence of a definition of either security or peace, it failed to allay ultimate concerns. Many Israelis saw it as part of a process to push them back, step by step, toward the indefensible '67 borders. And some PLO radicals may have viewed the entire process as an exercise in substituting American pressure for their own need to make concessions.

To elicit genuine Israeli flexibility, there needs to be an understanding between Washington and Israel about both the extent and the limits of Israeli withdrawal — such as existed in the first disengagement agreement in 1974 that launched the entire peace process. Such coordination is not a special favour to Israel. It is the precondition to persuade the Palestinians that we can deliver what we promise and to reassure the Israelis that we will not push them beyond what they see as their vital security interests.

As the peace process approaches its final stage, America's role will be no less important for being more subtle. A former chief of staff, Barak is unlikely to be less conscious of the requirements of Israeli se-

curity than his predecessors. In any event, Washington is not in a position to draw final lines or to stage-manage indefinitely a series of tactical compromises. At the same time, the Palestinians will have a right not only to statehood but to the greatest degree of territorial contiguity and conditions of life compatible with their dignity.

The challenge to American diplomacy to leave space for the kind of conceptual breakthroughs that were the essence of the Sadat and Rabin/Peres initiatives — within which the parties, with American help, can work out the details. The challenge to Israel is to transcend the trench warfare that has characterized its recent approach to the peace process and develop a far-seeing scheme.

The challenge to the Palestinians is to recognize that progress requires compromised and not only rhetoric; that simply accepting the Jewish state is not a sufficient concession; and that, unless the PLO modifies some of its positions, especially on borders and the control of terrorist stations on Mount Hermon and adjoining ridges. A similar challenge found a solution in the Sinai negotiations by placing them technically under American, and later UN, supervision.

At this stage, however, what is most needed are not negotiating expedients but a conception of the objectives. If the Clinton Administration can give an impetus to a definition of the ultimate destination of the Middle East peace process, it will leave a breakthrough toward peace as one of its legacies.

Courtesy: July 24 issue of *The Dawn of Pakistan*

## Art

### Buchwald's COLUMN

### Object of His Affection

SINCE the Supreme Court ruled that a woman may sue if she believes she has been harassed, men have been wary of making moves that would bring them in front of a grand jury.

Delilah Fresco recently came into my office. She was about to shake hands with me when I asked her to leave the door open.

"Legally," I said, "I can't touch you with a 10-foot pole."

"I'm just playing it safe in case this visit turns out to be an abusive one. What can I do for you?"

"I came to you because I have a problem. I'm in love with Charles Kildair, and he is in love with me."

"What's the problem?"

"He won't touch me. He's afraid I'll accuse him of sexual harassment. Charles's brother is a lawyer and he advised Charles to play it safe."

"How can Charles show his affection for you if he won't touch you?"

"I asked him the same question and he said that he would do it verbally, and I could reply in kind."

"I assume this is not satisfactory."

"Well, it leaves a lot to be desired. A girl likes to get kissed once in a while if she's in love. I offered to sign a statement saying that I wouldn't sue him if he held me in his arms at the movies."

"And what came of that?"

"Charles's brother said it wouldn't suffice if someone reported us to a special prosecutor."

"I said, 'If Charles really loves you, he would take a chance — even if it means 10 years in prison.'

"I don't know how much passion he would put into kissing me if he knew it could lead to perjury."

I told her: "This is a tough case. People have to show affection for each other if they are in love. That's what all the songs are about. Have you spoken to your lawyer about this?"

"Yes. He advised me not to make the first move on Charles. If Charles wants to kiss me, we