

My Dearest Daughter by Z. A. Bhutto

My Dearest Daughter: **A letter from the death cell**



By: Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto

Reproduced in PDF form by
Sani H. Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP

Introduction

This book is based on a letter written to Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto by Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto from his death cell on June 21st 1978. Thanks to the Pakistan army whose moral and dignity was saved by him by bringing back 90,000 soldiers who surrendered in 1971 war in India, Shaheed Bhutto was kept in a cell separated from a barrack area by a 10 foot high wall which did not prevent him from hearing horrific shrieks and screams at night from the other side of the wall. One of Bhutto's lawyers made enquiries amongst the jail staff and ascertained that they were in fact Indian Prisoners of War who had been rendered delinquent and mental during the course of the 1971 war.”

Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was a visionary person, in one of his speeches he said that if he was killed, the Himalayas would weep; the geo-political scenario around Pakistan would change, and there would be military onslaughts on the Middle Eastern countries and may be a new map of this region is drawn.

He could see the outcome of the neo-colonial policies of the world imperialist powers and he was sure that after him, none of the leaders in the region would be able to provide resistance to the imperialist powers. Perhaps he was aware of this much earlier.

Thirty years later where we stand, dictatorship is deep rooted sometime on the stage and sometimes behind the curtain. They never allowed any democratically elected government in Pakistan to complete its term, the country is divided in lines of ethnicity, class and religion. Poverty level is forcing people to commit suicide due to economic reasons. Lawlessness is at its height, the country has come to a level where the Chief Justice of the country is seeking justice for himself.

A few months before his judicial murder, Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wrote a letter to his daughter Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto which is now in your hands in a book form titled "My dearest-daughter" in this book he discussed and analyzed the international politics and gave his

conclusion which, with the passage of time, have proved to be true.

Even those who criticized Bhutto, now openly admit that he was the man who launched a masses specific struggle and condemned the elite specific policies and programs. He was the first politician who shared fears and hopes of the underclass created by the nexus of the feudal and civil and the military establishment.

The imperialist powers got him killed by the judiciary manipulated by the imperialist stooge General Ziaul Haq because:

“Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the hero of Pakistan's national liberation revolution.

“He successfully united all most all the Muslim countries in one block against imperialist powers;

“He helped in streamlining freedom struggle of the Kashmiri people;

“He, as a great nationalist, struggled to make the Pakistani Federation stronger by ensuring constitutional rights to the federating units;

“He developed Pakistan into a nuclear power to provide better defense to Pakistan and to help the Muslim countries against Israel;

“He helped Muslim countries in war against Israel;

“He helped Muslim oil producing countries in using their oil as a weapon against imperialist powers;

“He provided moral support to all the third world nations fighting for their national freedom; and

“He turned Pakistan into a progressive nation state.

Many facts regarding the murder of Shaheed are still unclear on one hand Col. Rafi Uddin who was stationed at the prison gives a different account but many believe that Major General Rahat Lateef who was DMLA Rawalpindi Division at the time have tortured Shaheed Bhutto on the night of execution and that became a cause of death before hanging as he wanted to have signatures of Shaheed Bhutto on certain documents regarding the tragedy and fall of East Pakistan and the imposition of Martial Law in the country.

The tragedy happened when Shaheed Bhutto refused to sign and tore out the documents, and after exchange of hot word the General carried on his hidden desires and tortured Shaheed Bhutto in person. Mr. Yahya Bukhtiar, an advocate for Shaheed Bhutto is on the same frequency when he wrote in the foreword of this book," My dearest daughter" he stated, "His tormentors wanted to break his will and expected him to compromise his honor and principles in the "hope" of saving his life. They failed. Thank God they failed miserably. They under-estimated his courage and sense of honor and dignity. His consideration for morality and humanity were beyond their comprehensions. They were judging him with their own low standard. They failed to break his will, his optimism, romanticism-he was maltreated by those whom he trusted and by those who used to cringe and crawl to him for petty favor".

History has already judged him and as time passes, more information about him would come up and he would be respected by future generations as one of the top anti-imperialist freedom fighters and would live in the hearts of many people and his political philosophy would keep on influencing minds of the masses.

This book is been reproduced as a special birthday gift to Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto on her 54th Birthday and also on the 29th anniversary of the day it was originally written.

Sani H. Panhwar
Lawndale, California
June 21, 2007

Foreword

I am honoured to have been asked to write the foreword of this letter written by the late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto former President and Prime Minister of Pakistan to his “dearest daughter” Benazir from a “death cell“ in Rawalpindi Jail. The task assigned to me is a very painful one. Mr. Bhutto had been sentenced to death by the Lahore High Court on a charge of conspiracy to murder an obscure political opponent. I was appointed by him as his chief defence counsel in the appeal against the death sentence in the Supreme Court of Pakistan.

I failed to save my most distinguished client. I had a team of able and dedicated colleagues who assisted me in fighting for his life. In that process one of them, Ghulam Ali Memon, who was also a very dear friend, lost his life because he could no longer bear the heart breaking experience we were going through for almost a year – from March 1978 to March 1979. The Chief Justice who presided over the hearing of the appeal in the Supreme Court argued the prosecution case and justified the death sentence more strenuously from the Bench than the specially appointed prosecutor from the Bar. This is apparent from the transcript of the day to day proceedings of the Supreme Court.

Soon after his execution, a campaign was launched, which still continues, by his executioners and their henchmen that Prime Minister Bhutto’s defence was not properly conducted or that the appeal was argued on the wrong lines, otherwise he would have been acquitted. This was done with a view to show that General Zia-ul-Haq and his collaborators in this matter had not conspired for his physical elimination in order to perpetuate the General’s regime. The judgment – both majority and minority opinions have been published and the transcript of argument should also be available as these were also recorded verbatim. Those, particularly jurists, who take the trouble to read these may be able to judge as to whether the case was presented properly or not.

Impartial observers who studied the case have commented on the nature of the allegations and the evidence against Mr. Bhutto as

well as the mode of trial he was compelled to face Mr. Ramsay Clark, former U.S. Attorney General, who personally attended the hearing of the appeal for several days in Pakistan was reported by The New York Times (February 14, 1979) to have observed that injustice was done to Mr. Bhutto both in the High Court as well as in the Supreme Court. That the evidence against him “did not support a guilty verdict”. The Full Court consisting of nine Judges began to hear the appeal but two Judges, for reasons well known, were not on the Bench of the Court when the death sentence was confirmed by a majority of four against three. “Thus a possible five-four split decision in favour of acquittal and release was converted into a four-three decision in favour of conviction and death,” said Ramsay Clark.

After the death sentence was pronounced by the High Court The Economist London (25th March 1978) wrote: “The Chief Justice who heard the case was known to have a deep personal antipathy towards him. The Government controlled press poisoned the atmosphere in which the five justices considered the evidence with constant attacks on Mr. Bhutto’s character and record. Half of the case was heard in camera.”

“The quality of the evidence was highly questionable. The prosecution witnesses were a shady bunch. But the task set for the five justices by the soldiers who have ruled Pakistan since last July’s coup was quite clear: Mr. Bhutto must be removed.”

Prof. F.C. Crone of Copenhagen who also followed the proceeding of the Bhutto case in Pakistan wrote in Asia Week (May 5, 1978):

“The trial of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto cannot by any standard be characterised as fair. It appears that the coup generals see Bhutto’s death - judicial murder – as a logical necessity in removing a dangerous political foe. The cases were instigated when two months after the coup, it became obvious that Bhutto would win the proposed general election.”

The New York Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights in their Report on Violation of Human Rights in Pakistan

(August 1982) while referring to the harassment. I, as his counsel was subjected to during the hearing of the appeal wrote that despite that harassment, "Mr. Bukhtiar continued to vigorously appeal Mr. Bhutto's conviction and sentence. He was nearly successful. Of nine Judges, four upheld the conviction, three opposed it, and two were forced to withdraw from the proceedings."

These few' out of numerous similar opinion , have been mentioned not to defend my own conduct and manner of pleading the Prime Minister's appeal but to give an idea of the injustice done to him, to those who may not know the facts. I was convinced on the basis of evidence as well as my personal knowledge of Mr. Bhutto that he was innocent and had nothing to do with the alleged conspiracy. I believed him without the slightest doubt or hesitation when he wrote to me from prison after he was sentenced to death:

"I did not kill that man. My God is aware of it. I am big enough to admit if I had done it, that admission would have been less of an ordeal and humiliation than this barbarous trial which no self respecting man can endure. I am a Muslim. A Muslim's fate is in the hands of God Almighty I can face Him with a clear conscience and tell Him that I rebuilt His Islamic State of Pakistan from ashes into a respectable Nation. I am entirely at peace with my conscience in this black whole of Kot Lakhpat. I am not afraid of death. You have seen what fires I have passed through."

Yes, indeed, I am witness to the fires he went through, of the barbarous trial, the atrocious manner in which he was kept and treated in prison. A great and generous man with a very high sense of pride and honour, a former Head of State and popularly elected Prime Minister of Pakistan, he was maltreated by those whom he trusted by those who used to cringe and crawl to him for pretty favours. It is for this reason that it is a very painful task to write this foreword. If the selfish and power hungry coterie wanted to remove him from the political scene they could have done that on the night of the coup. That would not have been unusual. As he himself says in the letter while referring to the assassination of President Daud of Afghanistan:

“It happened in the thick of a revolutionary battle. It was in the logic of the moment. It was not a pre-planned, cold blooded and calculated judicial murder such as I am to be the victim of. There is a difference between what transpires in the heat of the moment and a sordid conspiracy lingering on for months and months.”

But I still fail to understand why he was subjected to so much agony, anguish and humiliation by the sadistic regime before he was “assassinated”? Why were they so mean and vindictive?

He perhaps answers that also when he continues: “However what is the purpose of such primitive vengeance? In this case it is selfish and retrograde. It is for the benefit of the coterie and not for the people of the country. If the people wanted my head I would bow without demur. If I had lost the confidence or respect of the people I would not want to live. The tragedy of the drama is that the very opposite is true

Elsewhere in the Letter he elaborates:

“In 1970 I went to every village of the Punjab and burst the balloon of this coterie to become the undisputed leader of the masses of the Punjab, just as I am the authentic leader of the rest of the country. This is way the coterie hates and despises me. I exposed them in their own back-yard. I made people of the Punjab catch them by the neck.”

“Even the P.N.A. friends of the regime have been deceived and hoodwinked by the Junta. They were used and exploited to perpetuate the regime and to ease the regime’s effort to get rid of me.”

He was a human being and also had his weaknesses as all human beings have, but he was an exceptionally brilliant politician and a very courageous man. Above all, he was an ardent patriot who loved his country, lived for it and died for it as a martyr. When the defeated military junta handed over the country to him after its dismemberment in 1971, he devoted all his energies with the single-minded purpose of re-building what was left of Pakistan. He was thus at peace with his conscience in that miserable death cell, as he tells Benazir:

“I got moving energetically on all fronts. Among the first tasks I turned to was constitution making with a democratic consensus on the vexatious question of autonomy. I revamped the economy. I introduced fundamental social and economic reforms. I settled the Bangladesh problem by recognition. I concluded the Simla Agreement with India without any secret clause or understanding and got over five thousands square miles of territory in Sindh and the Punjab back to Pakistan. I got the release of ninety thousand prisoners of war in honour and without threatened war trials, I held the Islamic Summit Conference in Lahore. I got America to lift the arms embargo. I modernized the Armed Forces. I put the country back on the track. The recovery was spectacular. My greatest satisfaction lay in giving the country an all party Constitution by democratic means. The Constitution of 1973 was the first unanimously approved constitution by a democratic Assembly to bless Pakistan with a fundamental frame-work based on Islam, democracy and autonomy. It was the voice of the people of the four provinces of Pakistan articulated in a Constitutional document by their chosen leaders.”

However, there still remains the basic reason for the overthrow of the elected government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto which cannot be ignored. This was the Nuclear Reprocessing Plant contract with France which the U.S. wanted him to cancel and he in the vital interest of Pakistan refused. He obliquely refers to it, in the letter while warning Benazir about the difficulties and risk that a self-respecting and patriotic leader of a Third World country has to face. He tells her:

“It is even more dangerous to be pro-West. One disagreement in defence of a national cause, and out goes the civilian leader by a coup d'etat. He gets replaced by a tin-pot military dictator who would not dare to disagree about anything, including the vital national interest of his country.”

The letter is a bird's eye view of the political situation prevailing in the world in 1978 as seen by Mr. Bhutto from his death cell. It is written by a man brought up in luxury like a prince, educated at Berkley and Oxford and call to the Bar from Lincolns Inn, London,

a man who held the highest political offices in his country for years. A man who was suddenly dragged by those he did so much for and trusted so much, including the prisoners of war, and was put in a dungeon like a common criminal and treated in the most deplorable manner. Life was made as uncomfortable for him as possible. He was kept in a dark and dirty cell 9 feet by 6 feet, in which he was locked up 23 hours every day for over a year and watched through iron bars round the clock by six pairs of visible and numerous invisible eyes. One hour a day was allowed to him when he would be taken out to a small and filthy courtyard to breathe in dirty (not fresh) air, see the sky and also consult his counsel and give instructions about the case or have his weekly meeting with his wife and daughter.

Sentenced to death and kept in miserable conditions, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto spent his time reading President Nixon's memoirs and any other books that he could get including the bulky "white paper" published by the regime during the hearing of the appeal to malign him and his government with utterly false and malicious allegations and to cause prejudice against him at home and abroad. He would make notes on margins of these books, he would discuss these calmly with his counsel after asking a few questions about the progress of his appeal or review application. He was a Barrister-at-Law and followed the daily proceedings of the case as reported in the officially supplied newspaper. He seemed completely oblivious about his own fate and impending execution, which I did not believe would be carried out (thinking as a lawyer) but which he thought would be carried out and often said so. One is simply astounded at his courage. How could he possibly concentrate on world problems including those of Pakistan and give his objective assessment with regard to each issue as is obvious in this letter. At times he is, no doubt, bitter and at times emotional. However, he seems to be more bitter about what is being done to his country and his people who loved him rather than to himself. He seems frustrated that he is forcibly deprived of the opportunity to fight the battle of the Third World as its leader, to get for its poor and down-trodden masses their due from their exploiters:

"The new international order has to emerge through the demands of a Third World Summit Conference. The answer to the North-South conflict, which is more serious than the East-West

conflict, has to be found honestly and with unimpeachable integrity.” He tells his daughter:

“The Western attitude needs to be changed towards Africa. The pride and the sensitivity of the “ugly Blackman” has to be understood. The diplomacy of lip service will not do.

The plunder of Africa with both hands must stop. It is not enough of a concession to sit next to an African in an omnibus. Africa has changed and it will keep on changing. The African people, tribal and backward though they are, will not tolerate indignity. This is how the Asian situation developed. This is how the situation will develop in Africa but more rapidly and more intensely.”

He wants to write in greater detail but is well aware that “time does not permit it.” Execution is awaiting him but Benazir has to be given the necessary instructions.

Although he considers his analysis as “melancholy” and made “in anguish” but “jails surrounding have not influenced my objectivity. I do not see the whole world in a death cell merely because I am in a death cell.”

His tormentors wanted to break his will, and expected him to compromise his honour and principles in the “hope” of saving his life. They failed. Thank God they failed miserably. They underestimated his courage and sense of honour and dignity. His consideration for morality and humanity were beyond their comprehension. They were judging him by their own low standard. They failed to break his will, his optimism, romanticism and even his sense of humour when he was only a few steps away from the scaffold. He concludes the letter:

“Africa will rid herself of maniacs. Africa will live to show that “Black is beautiful.” Africa is ancient but Asia is ageless. Her nimble and graceful beauty has adorned civilization from the birth of mankind. Latin America has become the crux of an international culture that links Andalusia to Arabia and the Caribbean. What beauty there is in the tap of her flamenco. Europe is glamorous and

adorable, so seductive that she is still beautiful after a number of face lifts.....”

He writes with confidence and is eloquent. He may be wrong in his analysis of a particular issue or issues but he is never in doubt. His love and affection for Benazir is overwhelming. He is confident that she has the talent, courage and vision to continue the mission which he is prevented from completing. Nehru in his letters from Jail to his daughter “Indu” did not burden her with the onerous task as Mr. Bhutto has done in his death cell letter to his “dearest daughter.” No doubt, she will live upto his expectations but the uphill task is unenviable. One can only wish her godspeed.

Yahya Bakhtiar

A letter from the Death Cell

My dearest daughter,

How does a condemned prisoner write a letter of birthday greetings to a beautiful and brilliant daughter fighting for the life of her father, being in bondage herself, knowing that her Mother is suffering the same suffering as herself? It is more than a matter of communication. How would the message of affection and sympathy pass from one prison bar to the other, from one chain to the other?

Nehru also adored his daughter. Nehru also sent her birthday greetings from jail. I have mentioned this to you before, either in the first or the second letter I wrote you and the other three from Jakarta in 1964 when you were a tiny tot in the Convent in Murree. Sanam-Seema was even younger. In that long letter I mentioned how Nehru had written letters to his daughter Indira from jail on the history of the World. Later, these letters were consolidated in the form of a masterful book called "Glimpses of World History". I believe the very first letter was a birthday greeting to his daughter Indu, as he fondly called her when she became thirteen years old. By the time I was twenty-three, I had read "Glimpses of World History" four times. Nehru was one of the most polished writers of English prose of our times. There was inspiration and music in his words.

From Jakarta, I warned you in that letter written fourteen years ago, that I was not emulating Nehru. I did not emulate him then nor am I following his example now. Of course now, like him, at the time when he wrote his letters to his daughter, I am in jail. This is the common factor. The other common factor is that I am writing to my daughter on her birthday. But the parallel is not all that close. Nehru was kept in jail by our alien rulers in some place with honour and respect. He was a freedom fighter, the great leader of the Indian masses, the Cambridge-educated aristocrat who had a trail of glory. He was not a petty murderer, an embezzler of the state, a nobody from a village of Larkana languishing in a death cell at the hands of his nation's ruling clique. There is a wide difference. His daughter was a thirteen year-old little girl who had made her contribution to the politics of that time by organizing what she has called "monkey

brigades". At that time she had not gone through the fire of politics good and proper.

But you are caught in the middle of a fire and it is the fire of a ruthless junta. It is bad and ugly. There is therefore a world of difference. The two are incomparable. The similarity, if any, lies in the fact that you, like Indira Gandhi, are making history. I can claim to know Indira Gandhi quite well, although I knew her father much better, as your grand-father better than I knew her father. I respect her qualities very much but I have not been one of her greatest admirers and I have said this before. True, she became the Prime Minister of India and remained in that high office for eleven years. She might well again become the Prime Minister of India. She was called a goddess when she seized East Pakistan. Knowing all these things, I have no hesitation in saying that my daughter is more than a match for the daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru, the goddess of India. I am not making an emotional or subjective evaluation. It is my honest opinion.

One thing you have in common: both of you are equally brave. Both of you are made of pure damascene steel. But where will your talent take you? Normally it should take you to the very top. But we are living in a society where talent is a drawback and suffocating mediocrity an asset. With the exception of your father, the Quaid-e-Azam and perhaps Suhrawardy, either charlatans or captains have run this country. Perhaps things will change with a struggle spearheaded by a militant youth. If things do not change, there will be nothing left to change. Either power must pass to the people or everything will perish.

Your grand-father taught me the politics of pride, your grand-mother taught me the politics of poverty. I am beholden to both for the fine synthesis. To you, my darling daughter, I give only one message. It is the message of the morrow, the message of history. Believe only in the people, work only for their emancipation and equality. The paradise of God lies under the feet of your mother. The paradise of politics lies under the feet of the people. I have quite a few achievements to my credit in the public life of the Sub-continent but, in my memory, the most rewarding achievements have been those which have brought smiles of joy to the weary faces of our miserable

masses, achievements which have brought a twinkle to the melancholy eye of a villager. More than the tributes paid to me by the great leaders of the world, within the four walls of this death-cell, I recall with greater pride and satisfaction, the words of the widow in a small village who told me “Sadko Warryian solar sain” when I sent her only peasant son on a foreign scholarship.

These are small things according to the big men but, to a small man like me, these are the truly big things. You cannot be big unless you are prepared to kiss the ground. You cannot defend the soil unless you know the smell of that soil. I know the smell of our soil. I know the rhythm of our rivers. I know the beat of our drums. The theories, the dogmas and the scripts stand outside the gates of history. The dominant factor is the aspiration of the people and the ability to seek total identification with it. Once the significance of the symphony is grasped, the lines fall into place, the dogmas and theories get legs to move in time to the majesty of that music. This does not mean that I am preaching pragmatism. There is a lot of expediency in pragmatism. I am trying to trace the roots of the problems, the genesis of the challenges, the cause of the struggle.

What gift can I give you from this cell out of which my hand cannot pass? I give you the hand of the people. What celebration can I hold for you? I give you the celebration of a celebrated memory and a celebrated name. You are the heir to and inheritor of the most ancient civilization. Please make your full contribution to making this ancient civilization the most progressive and the most powerful. By progressive and powerful I do not mean the most dreaded. A dreaded society is not a civilized society. The most progressive and powerful society in the civilized sense, is a society which has recognized its ethos, and come to terms with the past and the present, with religion and science, with modernism and mysticism, with materialism and spirituality; a society free of tension, a society rich in culture. Such a society cannot come with hocus-pocus formulas and with fraud. It has to flow from the depth of a divine search. In other words, a classless society has to emerge but not necessarily a Marxist society. The Marxist society has created its own class structure. The Marxists of Europe have deviated from communism by coming to terms with the existing class structure. Otherwise Enrico Berlinguer would not have

sought “the historic compromise” which, in truth, led ultimately to the murder of Aldo Moro.

When I was Foreign Minister, a German diplomat told me in Islamabad in 1965 that Africa was like a sheet of ice with a thick layer of oil on it and that, it would remain in that position for a long time. The description sounded impressive. A native like me could not question the appreciation of a diplomat coming from the Master Race and that too, the brother of the most renowned scientist who had migrated to the United States to build missiles. I told him that I respected his appreciation but that, in my humble opinion, Africa, dark and dreary, neglected and ridiculed, would come to the centre of the world stage in less than two decades. This is what has happened. But the struggle being waged in Africa is not primarily a struggle between Communism and Freedom. It is a struggle for the resources and raw materials of that vast and fabulous continent. The difference is that one side has identified itself with the aspirations of the people of Africa. The other side has failed to do so despite the heroic but futile efforts of Andrew Young. Originally, I did not take Andrew Young seriously. I must now admit that he seems to have grasped the essentials of the problem of Africa from the other side of the prism. But Andrew Young is already getting isolated. He will either get knocked out or get neutralized by an Establishment which, like the Bourbons of France, refuses to learn.

In this connection, but in the context of Asia, Selig Harrison has recently written another penetrating book called “The Widening Gulf”. It is on Asian Nationalism and on the need for the United States to understand the phenomenon in its widest perspective. On the chapter dealing with Pakistan, on Page 273 of the book he says: -

“Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who was later to initiate close ties with Peking as Foreign Minister, began to extricate Pakistan from the anti-China assumptions of the alliance as early as November 1962, when he told the National Assembly that Pakistani friendship with Peking was an “Independent factor” and that ‘even if the Kashmir dispute is settled amicably, we will not join India against China’. The Western objective of joint defence for the Indian Sub-continent presumed a hostile China, he said, but it might be that the answer for both India and Pakistan lies in finding some sort of equation between ourselves

without jeopardizing our friendship with China. If we both pursue a correct policy, the question of joint defence will not become relevant. In an interview soon afterwards, (Rawalpindi 10, December 1962) Bhutto first set forth the concept of a Pakistan – American identity of interest with respect of China that was to figure significantly in his policies and that he was to elaborate to me frequently in subsequent years. (Bhutto reaffirmed his expectation of a Sino- U.S. détente in an interview at Larkana on December 20, 1967 and later in “Myth of Independence”, page 21). In the short run, he acknowledged, Sino-Pakistani ties would be damaging to Pakistan - American relations, but before long China and the United States would patch up their differences, probably in the early seventies. China merited Pakistani friendship, in any case, as a champion of Asian self-respect and self-reliance widely admired in Pakistan.

This rationale not only was compelling in itself, he said, but also would acquire added magnetism if the India-China rivalry were to intensify, leading to an implicit mutuality of security interests between Pakistan and China. Bhutto was correct in his calculation that the Sino-Indian conflict would intensify, and the Sino-Pakistani relationship soon became essentially an India-focused relationship, culminating in Peking’s ultimatum to New Delhi at the height of the 1965 war and in substantial Chinese military aid.”

Earlier on page 27 of this book, Selig Harrison writes:- “The Muslim League leaders responsible for the creation of Pakistan in the first place had based their appeal almost exclusively on religion because they represented narrow feudal economic interests. It thus followed naturally that successive regimes largely ignored social equities until Zulfikar Ali Bhutto made his efforts to salvage something from the ruins in the wake of the Bangladesh war.”

The object of quoting Selig Harrison’s “The Widening Gulf” is to show that if in 1962 I could accurately anticipate the future trend of Sino-American relations, I would know even more about my own country and its future role in the Sub-continent and the region. With the same purpose, I have recalled my conversation with the German diplomat in Rawalpindi in 1965 on the future of Africa.

Asian nationalism comprises various elements. The concept is both dynamic and evolutionary. It is certainly not static. It no longer means "Quit India". The banyan tree of Asian nationalism has many branches. It throws her shade over a vast ground. It defies a classical or rigid definition. The disastrous mistake the United States made in Vietnam was to over-simplify the concept of Asian nationalism. In the mosaic of Asian nationalism, made up of ancient cultures and ancient religions, is communism a part of Asian nationalism, or is Asian nationalism subordinate to communism? The simple answer is that it depends on the historical position of each country. In some countries it is and in some it is not. There are certain countries in Asia where the question has not arisen in its practical form.

What is modern communism? Is it the communism of the Soviet Union, or the communism of China, or that of Tito and Castro? Is it the communism of Vietnam or Cambodia or the national communism of Angola? Is it Euro-communism? If it is Euro-communism, is it of Italy's "historic compromise" or of Spain's which has unhinged itself from the dogma of Leninism? If the communism of Asia is in the process of a metamorphosis, that of Africa is still more so. Concern has been expressed over the presence of Cubans in the troubled lands of Africa. I do not say that the concern is without cause, I would not pass such a sweeping value judgment. Parallels are never quite exact. Accepting this limitation, I would offer an analogy by referring to the massive and invaluable support rendered by China to Vietnam in its protracted struggle against Western military intervention. In less than three years after the end of that war, relations between Vietnam and China appear to be strained.

If such a situation can develop in South-East Asia, the presence of Cubans in some parts of Africa need not necessarily be interpreted as a permanent catastrophe. Whether true or false, stories are circulating of differences between the Cubans in Addis Ababa and the Ethiopian junta. Fundamentally, the articulation of communism in Africa is being achieved not so much by the presence of Cubans in Angola or Ethiopia but by the refusal, or rather ambivalence, of the Western powers to come to genuine terms with the legitimate aspiration of the African people. The military intervention in Zaire, for instance, might gladden the hearts of the "Kiplings" of this generation, but in the long run, it has done more to crystallize the influence of

communism in Africa than all that Castro is capable of doing on the continent.

I am not justifying the policies of the Soviet Union or of Cuba in Africa. I am elucidating principles. The principle is that any power which identifies itself with the legitimate aspirations of the African people and assists them in the determination of their rightful destiny, cannot be easily condemned on the basis of global alignments or selfish interests. If, for instance, a single Cuban or Soviet citizen, whether a scholar or a technician, set foot on the soil of Eritrea, I would consider it to be an outrageous calumny and denounce it with all the force at my command. Eritrea is waging a genuine struggle for independence. Neither the East nor the West can deny that Ethiopia has no right to hold Eritrea in bondage, that the annexation of Eritrea to Ethiopia was a naked act of conquest. We have to take sides with the right side. We cannot take a pre-determined position on the basis of clientage.

In the conceptual sense, the mind of Africa is less made up than that of Asia. But as in Asia, the dominant force in Africa is nationalism and equality. The extent of the colour of communism in this heterogenous and tribal concept of nationalism depends more on the mode of the response of the West than on the presence of the Soviet Union and Cuba or East Germany on the African continent. The Western attitude needs to be changed towards Africa. The pride and the sensitivity of the “ugly black man” has to be understood. The diplomacy of lip service will not do. The plunder of Africa with both hands must stop. It is not enough of a concession to sit next to an African in an omnibus. Africa has changed and it will keep on changing. The African people, tribal and backward though they are, will not tolerate indignity. This is how the Asian situation developed. This is how the situation will develop in Africa but more rapidly and more intensely.

The time for condescension and pompous patronage is over. The common man of militant Africa will not crawl and lie prostrate before the foreign exploiter as did the Ashanti royalty in 1896. In the emerging dawn, Africa will overcome the legacies of colonialism and tribalism to build an honourable and dignified future for her beaten and battered children.

What is the position in Western Europe? The youth of Western Europe, the activists of that great civilization, have gone beyond communism. In other words, communism has been left behind. For this reason, among others, perhaps in some fundamental respects, the situation in Western Europe is more serious than it is in Africa or Asia or Latin America. Western Europe must first save herself in the orthodox sense, before she seeks to save Africa by paratroop diplomacy. Capitalism is critically ill in Western Europe. The limits of growth have been surpassed. Keynes and Hayek have become obsolete for the Western nations. The internal contradictions are reaching a breaking point. The modern generation is fed up with the status quo. At one point, the young had placed their hopes in the communist parties of Western Europe. But the communist parties of Western Europe, oscillating far too long between "to be or not to be" have thoroughly disillusioned the living thoughts of the young and of the working classes. There is growing scepticism over the role of Euro-communism as a viable and vibrant alternative to decaying capitalism. Euro-communism has been electoralized and thereby neutralized as a revolutionary force. Its decline has affected the political influence of the Soviet Union in Western Europe but not the position of revolutionary thought as such. That thought is taking more militant shape. The youth and the romantics feel the oppression and the suffocation of the State more acutely. They hanker for a new alternative to fulfil the romantic and revolutionary expectations of an impatient and imaginative generation. They are fed up with the plastic age. They are disillusioned with the promise of Euro-communism. They feel that the so-called tactical compromises of Euro-communism with capitalism have led to a strategic retreat. They are not prepared for the strategic retreat. They would much rather leap forward into the dark.

The favourite slogan, the one that caught on during the May 1968 fete in France was "it is forbidden to forbid". There is nothing to forbid the youth of Europe to reject both communism and capitalism. What will they build in the absence of both systems? Will their concept of building a new structure with a new philosophy mean willful self-destruction? This sounds insane but the youth of Europe is not insane. If the nation-state structure controlled by two Super-powers is inevitably leading the world to a neutron explosion, if the

universal explosion is to come at the dictates of others, it might be more self-respecting to pre-empt alien orders with voluntary self-annihilation on a smaller and therefore more humane scale. Positive action creates its own motivation. Its momentum shapes a plan unconceived at the time of the spark. The heart says there is a truth to be discovered and the heart takes the decision. When Genghis Khan set out with his small cavalry from a remote village of Mongolia, did he then envisage that he and his progeny would penetrate deep into Europe, Russia, China and India and also provide a system which would last for generations to come?

History provides many examples of men who have set out with the avowed purpose of destroying but have built instead. It also provides examples of those who have set out to build but have destroyed instead. The young men and women of Sorbonne, of Heidelberg and of Trente, though of course not of Oxford and Cambridge, have a flame in their hearts. Time alone will tell if this flame will give new light to the World, or if all lights will get extinguished.

The situation in Western Europe is more complex and complicated than it is in Asia and Africa. In Africa, the power game is in its embryonic stage. In Asia it has come to a settled transition. In Europe it has reached its apogee. Yet, strangely enough, Europe is more concerned about Africa. This does not mean that I am taking a complacent view. It only means that I am not alarmed. During the Second World War President Roosevelt said that "we have nothing to fear but fear". The fear of communism is more fatal than communism itself. In Western Europe, orthodox communism has been bypassed. In Asia on the whole, except for China, it has been absorbed by the broad springs of nationalism. In Africa it is being fathered by a new form of militant colonialism and not essentially by big Castro's little Cuba. Even so, it has not taken a definitive expression. For a few more years, it would remain a revolving door, a game of musical chairs.

What concerns me about the Middle East is not the challenge of communism as such. Any plausible system can work in countries with limitless opulence at the disposal of a tiny population. When I say any plausible system I mean the traditional system adopted and run

sensibly by an enlightened and patriotic leadership. The immediate danger to the oil states is the danger of adventurism posed by military juntas in the neighbouring states. By military juntas I mean the outright military rule of the selfish generals and not a progressive party dictatorship in which the military acts as the disciplined and subordinate sword of the revolution. The ambitious generals of those oil-soaked countries might like to emulate the generals of neighbouring countries and have fun and games. This is one threat. The other threat is from a surprise and lightning military action by Israel to capture the oil wealth of the Middle East. Do not rule out this possibility. The more obdurate the Prime Minister of Israel becomes the more imminent becomes this threat. Besides, it must be remembered that Israel possesses nuclear weapons. Military dictatorships in the Middle East and in the surrounding region, would lead to the quicker disintegration of the nation-state system in states with sub-nationalities. This might in turn result in the ultimate control of communist power.

The Shahinshah of Iran was absolutely right when he commented in early June 1978 on the final consequences of the turmoils in Iran. Either a monarch sits on the Peacock Throne of Persia with constitutional reforms if necessary or the Peacock Throne will be put in one of the many Museums of Iran. In the last analysis, the alternative to monarchy in Iran is neither the mullah nor the military junta. It is the Tudeh Party. What about liberal democracy? Iran does not have the traditions of liberal democracy. It might work under a monarchy vesting democratic powers in a Parliament but it would come tumbling down soon without a supervisory control. In the first place, the greedy generals would take advantage of the so-called chaos of democracy. After that, the generals would quarrel among themselves over the spoils. This would lead to a conflict between them and the people. The Tudeh Party would step into the vacuum to salvage the wreckage just as Napoleon emerged to salvage the wreckage of France or, more aptly, Lenin, the wreckage of Russia after the collapse of the Czars or, more recently, Mao Tse-Tung, the wreckage of China after the downfall of the Middle Kingdom inherited by General Chiang Kai Shek.

Latin America has been under the tutelage of the United States for a long time. Before that, the colonialism of Spain and Portugal was

brutal. Latin America was not allowed to grow according to her genius. The tree of democracy was not planted in its warm Latin Soil. Except for a comical experiment by Napoleon the third to establish monarchy in Mexico, the tradition of monarchy did not exist. It was a vast continent of emotional and volatile people without the traditions of indigenous monarchy or democracy. Latin America became the continent of tin-pot military dictators who replaced the external colonialism of Spain and Portugal by their own brand of internal colonialism. The absence of democratic traditions facilitated their tyranny. Most of them, or all of them, were suppliant of the United States. Anyone among them who got different ideas was either removed or assassinated. The degrading conditions produced a Castro in 1958, and these legacies have strengthened the position of Castro in Latin America. Little Cuba has become a thorn in the flesh of a Super-Power and a nightmare in Africa for the mighty nations of Western Europe. Latin America is poised for big changes. The change will be bloody and violent. It will be a struggle between the people and the juntas. Obviously, the people will triumph. There will be intervention but it will only make the struggle more bloody and more bitter and ensure the total victory of the people.

While looking for sensible solutions for Africa, it would be equally advisable to apply an enlightened approach to Latin America. This is the time for that sensible and self-effacing approach. Afterwards it might be too late. It is good that the Panama Canal treaties, for whatever they are worth, came in the nick of time, otherwise the consequences would have been harmful for a long term modus vivendi. Undoubtedly, Fidel Castro is the creation of the condition of Latin America. It would, however, be equally valid to say that he is a product of the policies of the U.S. towards Latin America. It would be more accurate to say that he has succeeded in blowing his cigar's smoke rings more and more round Latin America, and now Africa, owing to the refusal of the United States to change her basic attitude towards Latin America and to have a visionary and contemporary attitude towards Africa. Both continents require an attitude of equality and generous partnership.

Eastern Europe is making imperceptible and perceptible adjustments. An increasing cynicism towards communism as a monolithic ideology in the cast of Stalin has developed. Even Albania

is not as committed as she was a few years ago. Tito gave his cynical smile thirty years ago. Ceaucescu is busy building bridges between the East and the West and between the East and the East. The Ostpolitik of Brandt has opened new vistas, unforeseen and unacceptable two decades back. The new relationship has far from crystallized but on the whole, for the time being, it stands shakily supported by the Helsinki Accord.

The relations of and the relations between the Super-powers are influenced by spheres of influence, by the concept of strategic encirclement, by the balance of nuclear terror and by a harlotrous relationship marked by periodical fits and rages. It is quest for domination and control of the invaluable resources of the Third World. We will remain pawns in the game, mere playthings so long as we are proud of being pawns and so long as we relish the role of being playthings.

There was a time when an American Secretary of State almost left my dining-table at 70 Clifton, when I told him that his country's foreign policy towards China was myopic and illogical. Recently, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the National Security Adviser to President Carter went to China and spoke as if an entente was developing between the United States and China. While Mr. Brzezinski says nice things to please the leaders of China, the Secretary of State Cyrus Vance says equally sober if not such nice things to the Russians about another agreement on SALT despite what has been called Russia's "obtuseness" in Africa. I might be unintelligent but I have not been able to comprehend the moral meaning of strategic weapons. The invulnerability of the U.S. silo-based Minuteman missiles appears to be threatened by the increasingly accurate Soviet missiles capable of destroying the Minuteman before it could be put into motion to retaliate. The Americans are engaged in the search to replace or supplement the Minuteman force. The critics of SALT think that alternatives as the Cruise missile, the hand-mobile MX, the Trident 11 submarine missile and a follow-on bomber to the B-52 are prejudiced by SALT and by the cancellation of the B-1. This mean that the chances of extending the three-year protocol to the SALT treaty, depends largely on further Soviet concessions.

Whatever the definition of strategic weapons, it is problematic whether the Soviet Union would make additional concessions on the second SALT agreement and also abandon the thrust of her policies in Africa. At the same time, the Soviet Union and China are engaged in a dialogue which is sometimes very hot and sometimes not so hot. Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany appear to be getting weary of a tantalising situation. Both these countries can afford to show a measure of their irritation. It cannot be assumed that the Federal Republic of Germany would in all circumstances rule out a firmer and more comprehensive understanding with the Soviet Union on the European issue. The same can be said for Japan and China in so far as the relevant theatre of Asia is concerned. Finlandization is the jargon used to describe this propensity in the power politics of today's alignments.

I repeat, the situation is in a state of flux. There is détente on one side. On the other side, a host of new contradictions have arisen, both regional and global, both inter-se and intra-se. They carry profound political, military and economic implications. Some analysts would say that a new cold war is on the anvil, others would go further and say that the Third World War has begun in the terms of this era. Heaven knows, but all is not well with the world. Thus, the slogans of yesterday remain like the songs of yesterday. They are heard, they are used and they still excite emotion as would "Some Enchanted Evening" or "Strangers in the Night" for an old man like me. But my blood will not be warmed by them as it used to when I heard one in Berkley in the 1950s and the other in Geneva in the 1960s. Expressions such as the Spirit of Bandung, Non-alignment and the Free World still evoke emotions but the warmth of the radiance has gone because events have overtaken them. There is little point in getting into tantrums over the invisible hand of neo-colonialism when the naked hand of modern colonialism is showing itself in different parts of the world. This does not mean that Non-alignment has exhausted itself. Non-alignment has exhausted itself no more than capitalism and international monolithic communism have exhausted themselves; no more than the old cold war has really ended, no more than the Berlin Wall has been demolished.

The British have an uncanny method of resolving a crisis. They rarely over-react to it. The Sir Francis Drake response to the

approach of the Spanish Armada, is the spirit which basically continues to dominate the British outlook on her internal and external troubles. It is good politics to desist from over-reacting or going for the over-kill. Andrew Young was critical, but sometimes the solution to an external crisis does lie in bidding farewell to it. The British also have a talent for coining new phrases like devolution when the old phrases like federation become a fixation. Who knows, within the decade, Britain might become a federation with the House of Lords replaced by a federal Senate. The miracle of the Federal Republic of Germany was the miracle of the hard work and discipline of the common man. Overcome by the paranoia of another defeat, the German masses were determined to turn defeat and humiliation into victory and honour. It was a revanchist recovery. The German people, having achieved the praiseworthy objective, want to relax a bit. The youth of Germany is beginning to frown upon the spartan discipline of hard work. A section of the younger generation sees more virtue in relaxation if not laziness. This section of the younger generation is seeking merit in place of the contempt their elders showed for British "lethargy". The French already believed in taking it easy.

How will the development of such traits fulfil the requirements of Western Europe's derelict system, especially with the colonies disappearing? Will the deepening crisis within Western Europe and the United States lead to a militant form of colonialism as was recently suggested by President Gaddafi after the Foreign Legion operation in Zaire? Is it possible that this last desperate attempt to control the resources of the Third World would come by means of military intervention on behalf of puppet regimes in the Third World? I wonder. Nonetheless a modern pattern of diplomacy with a new set of rules has definitely been taking shape since the Ramadan war of 1973, and has been brought into focus by the steep and sudden rise in oil prices. From that take-off point, the world economy has been in a state of acute crisis and disequilibrium. The North-South dichotomy has become wider and no solution is in sight. The palliatives of the Paris Conference of UNCTAD or the U.N. special session is to be followed by a conference in Bonn of the seven main industrial powers in the coming month. Prime Minister Callaghan of Britain has stated that an effort will be made to get an accord between the North and South. Judging from past experience I doubt if anything worthwhile or

substantive will result from the Bonn Conference in July 1978. It will turn out to be as barren a conference as the past conferences. The will to come to an adjustment is lacking. Besides the major industrial powers feel that their own economies are in such acute difficulty that they would much rather begin charity at home. This is where they miss the point. The Third World does not want charity. The Third World wants its due.

The Second World War ended with the beginning of the cold war confrontation. The cold war confrontation was replaced by détente. We witness at the moment a rising tide of disappointment with détente. President Carter's press conference in Chicago in the end of May and his more recent speech at Annapolis would indicate that the international power game is shifting into a position of quasi-confrontation or quasi-détente, depending on the emphasis given to it. In my book "Myth of Independence" I visualized this development. It might well lead to the demolition of existing assumptions, and the recasting of priorities. The structure of bilateralism that I had sedulously preached for the Third World and formulated for Pakistan might have to be re-examined. Non-alignment's diminishing value during détente might be partly rehabilitated in the quasi-confrontation or quasi-détente milieu. On the other hand, the alignment might be rejuvenated.

When I was in charge of the destiny of Pakistan, towards the middle of 1976 I made my initial observations on the main forces at work on the global stage. I returned to this on a number of occasions in 1976 and 1977. I told my countrymen that essentially there were three formidable forces at work, sometimes competing, sometimes conflicting, sometimes co-operating, sometimes coming into confrontation. These forces were religion, communism and nationalism. These three ideals were influencing the minds of men and nations. I told my countrymen that instead of becoming a lone crusader in shining armour, it was in the supreme interest of regional and world equilibrium to take advantage of their converging points to harmonize them and avoid exacerbating their points of conflict and collision. Furthermore, I made it plain that the art lay in playing this role without weakening or compromising the allegiance to one's own ideology. It meant more than "live and let live". It meant more than focusing attention on the grey rather than on the black and white. You

cannot take the straight road to Jerusalem and find peace merely because Jerusalem is a holy city. The problem of Africa is not solved by paratrooping into its heartland on C-141 aircraft.

Mao Tse-Tung had an obsession to create a new man, a new Chinese who would uphold in perpetuity the banner of revolution. The twice-eclipsed Teng Hsiao-P'ing is engaged in creating that new man. He has gone further. He has made a commitment to complete the colossal task by the end of this century. Those who are overwhelmed by the fear of an impending doom are the harbingers of that doom. Those who nervously cling to the status quo as if it were immutable, hasten the collapse of the status quo. The imponderables in the situation are growing and the computerized certainties diminishing. What do you fall back upon? I fall back upon the people and on their instinctive responses. The people lead and the people are led. The leader must know the aspirations of the people and on the basis of those aspirations, give the people a bold direction. A deception in this contract is most fatal.

I have written more than once on the need for a modus vivendi. A modus vivendi cannot be indefinite. It cannot be a permanent solution to a critically dynamic situation. It is a temporary imperative, not a temporary expedient. We badly need to gather our thoughts and clear our minds. We need a political ceasefire without conceding ideological territory. We need a ceasefire to bury dead thoughts and to overcome fatigue. The modus vivendi has to be honourable and above board. Both sides have lost or, should I say, neither side can win. During the ceasefire a combination of existing forces might create a new order or a new equation between existing forces. Whatever the formula, it cannot be evolved on the battlefield of the old or new cold wars. The new international order has to emerge through the demands of a Third World summit conference. The answer to the North-South conflict, which is more serious than the East-West conflict, has to be found honestly and with unimpeachable integrity. Genuine disarmament will not come on its own or by platitudes at special sessions of the United Nations on disarmament, although, I was among the first to propose such a conference eighteen years ago. It was then that I stated that no serious effort towards disarmament could be made without the participation of China and France. Eighteen years later, I maintain

that the conference is being held too late. Once again, events have moved faster.

Under the shelter of disarmament conferences held in ornate chambers and addressed by world leaders, a fetishistic armaments competition of a megalomaniac magnitude is taking place. The scale is frightening and unprecedented. Let me illustrate by giving a few salient features of this fetish:

- i) In 1970, the nations of the world were spending about \$200 billion a year on military arms. Since then, the total has doubled to \$400 billion or more than a billion dollars a day.
- ii) The size of regular armed forces in the world has increased to 23 million in 1978, 2 million more than in 1970 and 7 million more than in 1960.
- iii) The major industrial nations are now exporting military weapons worth \$8 billion a year to the poor developing countries – almost three times as much as in 1970 and four times as much as in 1960.
- iv) Since the beginning of the 1970s, the United States and the Soviet Union have increased their stockpiles of nuclear warheads from 8,000 to 14,000 and other nuclear powers – Britain, France, China, India and probably Israel – have another 500 deliverable nuclear weapons.

So far, with all the tensions and the proxy wars, nobody is yet the winner, nobody yet the loser. If we continue to dilly-dally, there will be no winner. Everyone will lose. Alright, that is also a solution. The question is have the leaders of the world prepared the people of the world for such a solution? The time for conferences and quasi-solutions or for making suckers out of the hewers of wood and the drawers of water has passed. The waving of the red flag to those colour blinded by centuries of poverty will not frighten anyone any

more. Internal settlements such as those in Rhodesia are an insult to our militant but legitimate aspirations.

The second military intervention in Zaire within two years to stop the Mobutu junta drowning in the sea of surrounding discontent is being justified on a number of fatuous grounds. The cause of intervention is so weak that for once, the Gallic logic of the French has proved to be unconvincing. It has been repeatedly stated that any alternative to Mobutu is better than Mobutu. This strange tin-pot dictator has been saved twice by foreign military intervention from the retribution of the people. Still he had the audacity to declare recently that he would reject any Western attempt to insist on a clean up of Zaire's rampant corruption or on reforms on human rights as a condition for the aid he is receiving. "The answer is no, a categorical no", said General Mobutu. "I do not interfere in the cases of prisoners in Sing Sing.... Why do you accept they can interfere in my internal affairs?" These are the repulsive double standards of the generals and the juntas which have irrevocably alienated the people. Hardly has the stink of the massacre of white and black evaporated from the air of Kolwezi, while the foreign legionaries are still mopping up the revolutionaries in the copper-rich province of Shaba on behalf of Mobutu, when Mobutu deems it fit to condemn foreign interference to get rid of corruption and defend human rights. Everyone is judged by the company he keeps. It has not been said in vain "tell me who your friends are and I will tell you who you are". Let there be a modus vivendi without capitulation to re-structure the world order on the basis of new and equitable values. This is the last chance, if indeed the last chance has not already slipped through our fingers.

Let me return to the Sub-continent and to Asia within the scope of this broad frame-work. Our biggest problem is not the population explosion or poverty. Nor is it the lack of technology. The answers to these complicated problems can be found if we are to mobilize our people and give them correct direction. Our people will be mobilized if they are made full partners and if they are made to participate fully. To harness the untapped energies of our people and to give them an abundant share in the wealth and a promising stake in the future, it is necessary to have the proper system and the proper ideas. The GNP rat-race and IMF stand-by credits will not do. It is stupidly inadequate. The problem is the same on our miniature scale as it is on the world-

wide scale. Only the solutions reflect historical and geographical variations. The most dangerous threat to our real solutions comes from military juntas relying on the whip-lash of martial law. Can a parallel be drawn between this form of military junta and an international political junta? The difference is that the international political junta is more intelligent and circumspect than the brutal and untutored military junta. The temptation to say they are exactly the same might be irresistible but it would be a gross exaggeration to take such a forensic position. Of course there are superficial and inconsequential similarities since both are exploiters, since both constitute the ruling clique. But fundamentally speaking, the analogy is not rationally valid.

The Asian scene is dominated by an almost all-embracing form of nationalism. The most delicate aspect of this nationalism is not the place of communism in it. The most delicate aspect is the place of sub-nationalism within its framework. The problem has arisen afresh and more intensely not only in Asia, but also in Europe and Canada, and obviously in Africa. In Western Europe, it has manifested itself in the United Kingdom and in Spain to give only two examples. In Eastern Europe, the most prominent example is to be found in Yugoslavia. In Canada it is in Quebec. This is a unique development. On the one hand the world is shrinking through the communications explosion and other means. The spirit of collectivism is getting stronger. The tendency towards integration and regional collaboration is accelerating. We see this in the form of the European Common Market, in the call for a Parliament of Europe, in the shape of OAU and ASEAN, in the creation of the Islamic Secretariat. On the other hand, the ethnic and linguistic ego is determined to assert its identity within the spirit of collectivism.

At one time, it was thought that a federation would resolve conflicting claims. A federation is still the essential answer to sub-nationalism but in some places it is proving to be inadequate. Perhaps here also, the urge has outstripped the solution. In some places the solution has come prematurely and in others, belatedly. It has also been badly applied or dishonestly applied. The result is that confidence in the federal solution has been shaken. But still there is nothing more inimical to the pacification of sub-national sentiment than

domination by a military junta. It is in this atmosphere that the worst fears of sub-nationalism materialize. The frustrations of the sentiment reach a high water-mark. If sub-nationalism is the most acute problem of Asian nationalism, it follows that military rule is the worst enemy of Asian nationalism. It deprives the people of participation. This hurts the ego of the sub-nationalities the most. It denies the people the right of representation. This alienates the sub-nationalities the most. It is during this period that the sub-nationalities begin to feel cheated and deceived. It is during this period that the sub-nationalities begin to think that their freedom, their right of self-determination was fraudulently arrested by false promises which made them join the larger entity. In concrete terms, the decisive aspect of the relationship lies in autonomy and in the quantum of autonomy.

If there is a satisfactory settlement to this issue the settlement functions equitably, the threat to Asian nationalism disappears or gets minimized. By and large nationalism in India thrives on an autonomous structure. Military rule destroys autonomy in one sweep like locusts destroy the standing crops in one wave. The denial of self-assertion angers the sub-nationalities. Instead of integrating through autonomy, they begin to seek disintegration by waging a struggle for separation. Hence, denial of autonomy does not lead to the consolidation of national unity but to its destruction. Homogenous states like Japan are an exception. China also has found its own solution to the problem of her sub-nationalities. It is through the party ideology and autonomy. Burma was a fabulously rich country. It was studded with rubies and raw materials. Burma used to export millions of tons of rice every year. Today Burma is riddled by an all-encompassing crisis. President Ne Win is a freedom fighter and an exceptionally intelligent individual, but he kept Burma under a junta for a very long time and the result is not a happy one. I say this with remorse because Ne Win has been a personal friend, he showed a manifestation of his friendship in January 1967, when the junta of Ayub Khan was hounding me. I am only making an objective appraisal to show how junta rule ruins a country. The problem in Indonesia was tackled sagaciously by Soekarno through political skill and political achievements. The problem however still exists in Indonesia.

President Soekarno was the founding father of Indonesia, he united an archipelago and made it into the Indonesian nation. He gave his people a common language and the roman script. President Soekarno emancipated the women. He liberated West Irian in the teeth of opposition from a NATO Country and Australia. He was the co-sponsor of the Bandung Conference. He gave dignity to the Indonesian people and importance to Indonesia as a leading nation of Asia. Soekarno was not a communist but he developed cordial relations with the Soviet Union and with China. At the same time, he held the United States in high esteem and had warm affection for President John F. Kennedy. In spite of these known factors, his close relations with China were displeasing to those who thought that China was a perial and a menace. Since it was a sin to be on friendly terms with China, the sinner had to disappear from the scene. A massive propaganda campaign against Soekarno was unleashed. The usual stories began to circulate. The Indonesian economy was in a mess. The rate of inflation was unbearable. Soekarno was a Chinese stooge. He was leading Indonesia to disaster. A civil war was on the threshold. Indonesia had to be saved. Indonesia was saved by General Suharto and his junta in 1966.

What is the situation in Indonesia in 1978, twelve years after the country was saved by General Suharto and his junta? In the words of General Abdul Haris Nasution, who helped Suharto to oust Soekarno:

“The social conditions here are like a volcano. The situation is so explosive that a small incident could give way to big trouble.”

Indonesia, a fantastically rich and fertile country is importing more than two and a half million tons of rice. The country's vital petroleum resources are beginning to run out. There is more unrest and discontent, more corruption and mismanagement, more repression and student agitation than during the most critical times of Soekarno. Pertamina, the State Oil Company ran a debt of 10.6 billion and threatened the economic survival of Indonesia. Such things did not happen in Soekarno's day, although Soekarno was accused of messing up Indonesia's economy. The campuses of Indonesia's universities were never occupied by the army when Soekarno was President of Indonesia. During the presidency of Soekarno the Indonesian armed forces were used to liberate West

Irian, to support the confrontation with Malaysia, and to come to Pakistan's support in the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965.

During the junta rule of Suharto, the Indonesian armed forces have been turned against the people, the youth of Indonesia and the journalists of the country as well as intellectuals. General Hartono Dharsono, a disillusioned general and a distinguished diplomat spoke this month of the reasons for the recent protests:

“The key reason is dissatisfaction with the leadership's economic policy, which is too GNP-oriented and does not consider the equal distribution of wealth. There is also corruption and lack of democracy. I am really worried about the way the armed forces have behaved themselves recently. The army's most recent attacks on the students – who were totally unarmed – were the obvious result of a new hard-line policy. The army claims to be from and for the people, but such action will only make it more distant and disliked by the people.”

With the downfall of socialist Soekarno and the assumption of power by free enterprise-minded Suharto, foreign investment was supposed to pour into Indonesia. The position after twelve years of Suharto's stable authority is that foreign investors are looking outside Indonesia. One foreign banker in Jakarta complained:

“There is no logic in Indonesia. I am fairly pessimistic about future foreign investments – and about the country itself.”

More corruption, more unemployment and more discontent than in Soekarno's period. For all the tall talk of controlling inflation and increasing the GNP, agricultural and industrial production has not risen, even if it has not fallen. The foreign investor is getting out. The economy is in a greater mess. The students are in an angry mood. The intellectuals are frustrated. The people have begun to despise their own army. The national pride which soared in Soekarno's days has reached a low ebb. Political and economic discontent can turn into an outright rebellion at any moment. Communism is stronger in Indonesia than ever before.

I have no personal dislike for Suharto. As a matter of fact in April 1966, when I was a guest of President Soekarno in Jakarta, on the request of Adam Malik, I played a modest role in persuading President Soekarno to abandon his plans to enter into an open confrontation with General Suharto for the sake of Indonesia and to prevent a second bloodbath. President Soekarno told me at his dinner in the presence of Adam Malik that only I could have prevailed on him to change his mind. After the dinner Adam Malik told me that the people of Indonesia would forever be grateful to me for prevailing on President Soekarno to change his mind, otherwise, an unprecedented bloodbath would have followed. I acted in good faith. But the position at present in Indonesia is not comfortable. The junta has ruined one of the richest countries in the world.

The similarities between the situation in Indonesia and Pakistan are striking. The difference is that Pakistan is among the poorest countries in the world. If in twelve years a junta can all but destroy one of the richest countries in the world, you do not need much imagination to foresee what a junta can do in a year's time to one of the poorest countries. Both Indonesia and Pakistan are in Asia. Both are Muslim countries. Both are run by a junta. Both juntas have replaced popular leadership. Both the popular leaders were reputed to be pro-China and socialist in outlook. Both believed in the power of the people and in the glory of their countries. This is why I have dealt with Indonesia in some detail, without meaning to offend President Suharto. Eight years after Soekarno's death, Suharto has been compelled to recognize the man he overthrew by a coup as the hero of Indonesia. Does the junta in Pakistan want to kill me for posthumous recognition?

Sub-nationalism exists more seriously in Malaysia but in Malaysia, political efforts are being applied to overcome it. We come to India. In India the federation has held together for a number of reasons. There was a federal settlement to the problem of unity in diversity through the Indian Constitution of 1952. Except for the year and a half of the Emergency imposed by Mrs. Gandhi in 1975, India has functioned under democratic rule with full participation of the people. On the whole, provincial autonomy has been respected. The military has not to this day injected itself into the politics of India. The Indian leadership has been fairly intelligent in respecting this sensitive issue.

The Indian masses, particularly the Hindus, have a veneration for territorial nationalism. Gandhi once observed that if the Muslims were wiped out from India, Islam would still prevail in other countries but if Hindus were wiped out from India, Hinduism would perish. The unity of India is linked to the survival of Hinduism and autonomy. It is a religious duty for the Hindus to keep India united. The theme of Bharat Mata and the venom over the vivisection of Mother India flows from these sentiments.

The unity of India is dependent on the existence of many big and small provinces. One province does not cast its shadow over the rest of India. Nor does one province have a virtual monopoly in the armed forces, or the civil service or over the economy. From 1947 until 1971 the so-called threat from Pakistan was exploited to consolidate Indian unity. After 1962, the threat from China was added to the challenge to Indian unity. After 1977, the way to strengthen Indian unity has been to exploit Indian chauvinism by claiming nuclear status and dominant power over the Sub-continent. Indian leaders also try to make propaganda on what they call “the failure of Pakistan”. They compare and contrast Indian democracy with the dictatorship in Pakistan. Besides, with all its limitations, India has made considerable economic progress. She has become self-sufficient in food-grains. These are no mean achievements.

But with all the achievements. I would still say that the threat to the unity of India has not disappeared. With all her impressive strides and undeniable accomplishments, an inherent danger to the existing unity of India remains a reality. An internal decomposition is at work. It might succeed, it might not. The outcome depends on a number of factors, not the least important being the future of Pakistan. It depends on the people and the leaders of India. It depends on developments in the region and on the role of the Super-powers. The fissiparous tendency exists. In some parts these tendencies have sharpened. Whether the unity of India prevails or whether sub-nationalism ultimately has the upper hand is still an open question. A multitude of elements are involved. The mosaic of India is steeped in mystery. Her many gods might remain together under the roof of one temple or under the Indian sky if the temple is too small, or they might clash and plunge India into a fratricidal bloodbath which Jawaharlal Nehru always feared. He feared it was a pattern of Indian history.

Modern means are available to the leadership of India to change that pattern. But a pattern so deep-rooted as to have become a tapestry in the time of Ashok has the resilience to defy modern means. Will Pakistan be a catalyst in this melting pot of races and religious?

This is not a letter on Pakistan. If it were, I could have written a small book entitled “Glimpses of Pakistan’s history”. Time does not permit it. The nation is gripped in her worst crisis, standing in the middle of the road between survival and disintegration. Since the birth of Pakistan, crisis has followed crisis in rapid escalation. Millions of lives were sacrificed to create this country. Pakistan is said to be the dream of Mohammad Iqbal and the creation of Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the Quaid-e-Azam. Was anything wrong with the dream or with the one who made the dream come true? Opinions have differed and continue to differ. The next few years will most probably decide the issue, perhaps once and for all, and not without bloodshed. This process is not inevitable but the present policies of the ruling junta are driving this country towards a sad inevitability. On the 9th of June 1978 the Vice-Premier of the People’s Republic of China, Teng Hsiao-p’ing stated that humanity stands on the threshold of the Third World War. If that horrifying holocaust comes, the future of Pakistan will be determined by the future of the rest of the world.

At one time the Quaid-e-Azam was known as the Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity. Later, convinced of the narrow-minded outlook of Hindu nationalism based on Hindu domination of politics and economics, the Quaid-e-Azam turned his attention to fulfilling the dream of Iqbal with extra-ordinary determination. The resistance to the creation of Pakistan was like an unconquerable mountain peak. It came from the Indian Congress, from the Nationalist Muslims including Maudoodi and his Jamaat-e-Islami. Gandhi declared that he would never agree to the vivisection of Mother India. In the Muslim majority provinces, the resistance to Pakistan came from Sir Khizr Hayat Tiwana, the Chief Minister of the Punjab and the leader of the vested interests in the province. In Bengal it came through the mercurial politics of Fazl-ul-Haq, the Sher-i-Bengal – the lion of Bengal. (The trouble is that our politics produces many lions but when it comes to the test, they turn out to be cats). In Sindh the opposition was headed by Allah Bakhsh but he was assassinated in 1943 and G.M.Syed picked up his mantle. In the Frontier Province the rejection

was spearheaded by Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the Frontier Gandhi. So much so, that a referendum had to be held in that province to determine its future links. Most of the influential sardars of Baluchistan were not in favour of Pakistan. The Shahi Jirga held to decide the issue needed a great deal of homework. In the state of Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was against the two-nation theory.

How then did Pakistan come into being? The people wanted Pakistan. The Muslim masses rallied behind the Quaid-e-Azam, discarded their traditional leaders, and achieved Pakistan with their blood-soaked hands. The hostile policies of the Indian Congress and the negative attitude of the British only spurred them further. It was a triumph of the will and the spirit of the Muslim masses led by an indomitable leader.

The Pakistan Resolution which was passed by the Muslim League under the Presidentship of the Quaid-e-Azam in Lahore on 23rd of March, 1940, in the city of Lahore had two salient features:

- A) It called for a Muslim Homeland comprised of the Muslim majority states of the north-west and north-east parts of the Sub-continent.
- B) It promised provincial autonomy to the provinces or states of Pakistan.

During the upsurge little notice was given to constitutional issues or to the exact boundaries of Pakistan. Every dreamer had his own splendid interpretation of the dream. But after the establishment of Pakistan, when the sun had set on the movement and “when the war drums beat no longer”, the issue of autonomy raised its head. It continued to be the central issue of all the subsequent years.

In the history of the Sub-continent, from the earliest of times, autonomy has been the cause of the more serious conflicts. Actually, the fervour for Pakistan gained momentum when it became clear that the issue of autonomy had become insoluble within the framework of a united India. From a practical standpoint, the Muslims of India found out that the autonomy granted by the Government of India Act, 1935,

under which elections were held in 1937, was not sufficient to safeguard their rights.

From the very first autonomy has been the primary issue in the entangled web of the politics of Pakistan. The first attempt at constitution making embodied in what was called the Basic Principles Committee's Report foundered on this rock. I do not intend to catalogue the political errors made since the inception of Pakistan to highlight the magnitude of the existing crisis. Inherently, the crisis is grave. I am dealing with autonomy since it is the pivotal issue. Later on, the crisis was compounded by the parity formula engineered by the anti-people coterie to deny East Pakistan its legitimate rights. Just when an agreement on autonomy was within sight, the Governor General of Pakistan, Mr. Ghulam Mohammad, illegally dissolved the sovereign Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. He imagined that the vested interests of the coterie had been threatened by the constitution agreement. In 1955 One-Unit was imposed in West Pakistan to wipe out whatever modest autonomy existed in the provinces of West Pakistan. On the twin pillars of One-Unit and Parity, the Constitution of 1956 was erected by the second Constituent Assembly, not a truly representative body like the first Constituent Assembly.

The application of One-Unit and Parity in essence meant two states, but with the domination of one over the other. The instrument of domination over both West and East Pakistan was the same reactionary coterie. In 1958 five months before general elections were due, the 1956 Constitution was annulled by the first martial law rule of General Ayub Khan. Under martial law autonomy was put in the dog house. It was put there for three years or more. In 1962 Ayub Khan gave his Constitution based on the system of Basic Democracies, on an indirect electoral college and on what was in effect administrative rather than political autonomy for the provinces of West and East Pakistan. There being no substitute for political autonomy, the problem of autonomy became more aggravated. The same reactionary coterie continued to rule the roost. In 1969 Ayub Khan was overthrown by a massive upsurge of the people. Instead of transferring the power to the speaker of the National Assembly as required by his own Constitution of 1962, Ayub Khan asked his military protégé, Yahya Khan to declare martial law again and usurp

that supreme power of the State. Recognizing the mood of the people, General Yahya Khan Promised to hold elections on the basis of adult franchise and “one man one vote”. He also restored provincial autonomy by breaking One-Unit. By virtue of his Legal Framework Order, Yahya Khan sought to manipulate events in such a diabolical fashion as to create the impression that he had conceded to popular demands. In reality he sought to retain his power and the power of the coterie. The situation had, however, gone beyond his machinations.

After years of suppression, once the flood gates were opened, there was nobody capable of closing them without a catastrophe. Mujib-ur-Rehman felt that “enough was enough”. He campaigned on the manifesto of his famous Six-points which meant autonomy of confederal character. On this battle cry he swept the polls in East Pakistan. Our party obtained an overwhelming majority in Sindh and Punjab to become the majority party in West Pakistan. We made it plain to Mujib-ur-Rehman that we would not only be happy but honoured to sit in the Opposition but in a federal structure. If it were to be a confederation, both wings of the confederation would have to participate in Government. It was a very simple and unassailable proposition. If Mujib-ur-Rehman compromised his Six-points to the extent of having a federal structure, he was welcome to form the Federal Government. If he did not budge an inch and was determined to create a confederation, he could not govern the confederation to the exclusion of the majority party from the other wing. Mujib-ur-Rehman would not budge an inch of Six-points. He adopted a “take it or leave it” attitude. There was a genuine deadlock. General Yahya Khan thought that the deadlock came to him as the opportunity of a life time for self-perpetuation. He sought to break the deadlock by military action. His military action unaccompanied by any sensible political cover, created a pretext for India to march into East Pakistan in November 1971. By 16th December 1971, Dacca fell to the Indian Army, along with ninety thousand prisoners of war from West Pakistan.

I was at the United Nations at the time making a desperate attempt to save the impossible situation. When General Yahya Khan surveyed the wreckage and was convinced that all was lost, that the likelihood was that nothing could be regained, that the probability was

that what little was left stood endangered, he sent a special aeroplane for me to return to Pakistan. With blood-shot eyes and with brandy beside him. Yahya Khan told me at 10:30 a.m. on the morning of 20th December, 1971, that he had failed miserably and that I should assume charge of an assundered Pakistan as I alone was capable of saving what was left of the country. In those ominous circumstances I was sworn in as the President of Pakistan at about 12:15 that afternoon.

I got moving energetically on all fronts. Among the first tasks I turned to was Constitution-making with a democratic consensus on the vexation question of autonomy. I revamped the economy. I introduced fundamental social and economic reforms. I settled the Bangladesh problem by recognition. I concluded the Simla Agreement with India without any secret clause or understanding and got over five thousand square miles territory in Sindh and the Punjab back to Pakistan. I got the release of ninety thousand prisoners of war in honour and without the threatened war trials. I held the Islamic Summit Conference in Lahore. I got America to lift the arms embargo. I modernized the armed forces. I put the country back on the track. The recovery was spectacular. My greatest satisfaction lay in giving the country an all-party constitution by democratic means. The Constitution of 1973 was the first unanimously-approved constitution by a democratic assembly to bless Pakistan with a fundamental framework based on Islam, democracy and autonomy. It was the voice of the people of the four provinces of Pakistan articulated in a constitutional document by their chosen leaders. Autonomy, which had defied solution for over a generation and which had been the bane of the politics of the Sub-continent from time immemorial, was at long last settled to the satisfaction of the people and their chosen representatives. I experienced the kind of joy, the thrill of happiness which brings tears to the eyes.

With high expectation and new-born confidence we started to function under the umbrella and discipline of the Constitution of 1973. Provincial autonomy had been democratically defined. It began to function in all the four provinces. This was a spectacular accomplishment. Our party, having an absolute majority in the provinces of Sindh and the Punjab, formed the provincial governments in these two provinces. In the N.W.F.P. and the

Baluchistan neither NAP nor its junior partner, the Jamiat-ul-Islam of Mufti Mahmood, had an absolute majority. If I am not mistaken, NAP achieved a one vote slender majority in Baluchistan as a result of the indirect election of the women to the Baluchistan legislature. It was too tenuous a majority to form a stable government all on its own. Besides, this was the first time in the history of Baluchistan that a provincial legislature had come into being.

For this reason among others, a great deal of jockeying was taking place. There were quite a few influential independents in both the assemblies but there were more of them in the N.W.F.P. I have little time for independents. I consider them to be incorrigible opportunists, a legacy of foreign rule. However, the independents of both those assemblies were wooing the Federal Government. Many tempting proposals were sent to joining or collaborating with the PPP. This kind of initiative was coming more persistently from the independents of N.W.F.P. In the beginning, and for quite some time, I spurned the overtures with contempt. I explained to the Central Committee of the party that independents were slippery individuals. They worshipped the rising sun.

I told the Central Committee that NAP and JUI had eventually co-operated to frame a unanimous Constitution or, if not co-operated, acquiesced at least. Besides, I told the members of the Central Committee that I had too many stupendous internal and external problems on my plate to divert and dissipate my energies in maintaining unstable Governments in N.W.F.P. AND Baluchistan on the mercurial support of independents. I told the Central Committee that for these reasons among others, I intended to assist NAP and JUI to form governments in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. I explained to the Central Committee that it would lessen my headache and, for once, involve NAP and JUI in the sphere of responsible, as opposed to agitational politics. I took the unique and unprecedented step of appointing NAP Governors in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan to stabilize the shaky NAP-JUI coalition in the two provinces and to checkmate the parliamentary intrigues of the independents.

There were other reasons also for making such a bold gesture of goodwill to NAP. Many politicians in my party and in other parties, especially the Muslim League of Qayyum Khan, were alarmed by my

gesture. They thought that the end was nigh. Not only the politicians but many other powerful and influential sections of our society were perturbed. NAP had a long and unerasable record of opposition to Pakistan. Their leaders had spent many years in jail at the hands of successive governments after the creation of Pakistan. General Yahya Khan, who had started his martial law with a flirtation with NAP, banned the party a few months before his downfall. Here I was, immediately on taking over the office of President of Pakistan, unconditionally lifting the ban on NAP. Now I was taking the extraordinary step of appointing NAP Governors in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan and helping them to form coalition governments in the two provinces in partnership with JUI. There are a number of white papers, documents and the Judgment of the Supreme Court of Pakistan on NAP that chronicle the events of that period. Suffice it to say that I made earnest and wholesome endeavours to extend the hand of co-operation to NAP in the larger interest of Pakistan after the dismemberment of the country. It was a matter of policy and not of expediency. I had my reasons. None of the reasons were personal or selfish. None of the reasons were based on partisan interests. My reasons were rooted in the supreme interest of Pakistan and the region. It was high thinking and not low living. I wanted to give another chance to Pakistan. I wanted to begin with a clean slate.

It is absurd to maintain, indeed it is preposterous to argue, that I engineered the downfall of the NAP-JUI governments in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan to install PPP Governments in those two provinces. If this had been my aim, I would not have gone out of my way to assist NAP-JUI to form governments in the two provinces. I would not have incurred criticism from a cross-section of the population for appointing NAP governments in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. I would not have given a rebuff to the independents of the two assemblies who were anxious to gain federal patronage. I had a PPP Government in the centre. There were PPP Governments in Sindh and the Punjab. I was more interested in attaining lasting stability, in the orderly development of democracy under the new Constitution, than in toppling two provincial governments in order to replace them by unreliable independents and some PPP members. It was not worth it. The higher objectives were more important. Success on that pedestal meant all round success. I was not so foolish as to jeopardize the great mission and throw everything to the winds for the

dubious and unattractive objective of having PPP governments in Baluchistan and N.W.F.P.

My efforts to avoid a confrontation were comprehensive. I was like a matador to a charging bull. Many interested elements wanted me to plunge the sword into the animal but I side-stepped at each stampede. So much so, that one of my friends, who did not have any ulterior motive in the confrontation, asked me if I had lost the fire of a fight, the thrill of a challenge. I explained to my friend the wide implications of the confrontation but assured him that if it became inevitable, for the sake of national unity, I would not only hold my ground but emerge with gain to national unity. I had made my calculations and I had concluded that every human effort was needed to maintain the modus vivendi. JUI was not a big factor. The leader of the Party, Mufti Mahmood, was a mediocre who could become a Chief Minister only in our backward society. NAP was a different kettle of fish but its popular base was limited to certain militant pockets of support. NAP did not have any worthwhile support in the southern districts of N.W.F.P. Its strongholds were in certain parts of Peshawar district including Mardan and Swabi. It had made some inroads in Malakand. In Baluchistan, due to the tribal composition of the province, NAP was powerful in those parts where the tribal chiefs belonged to NAP. This was mainly in Marri-Bugti area and in Mengal territory in Jhelewan. In some parts of Serevan also, NAP had a good following. Its influence was negligible in Lasbela, Sibi, Kachi and in the Pakhtoon regions. In Quetta itself, NAP was not without influence but the influence was diluted by the sizeable population of settlers, the Hazaras and other heterogenous section of the population. In the mathematics of parliamentary democracy, NAP did not matter for much.

The problem, however, was of a wider dimension. NAP possessed dedicated and intelligent leadership, especially among the Baloch. In my honest and unbiased opinion, the President of NAP, a Pakhtoon stalwart, is an over-rated politician. He is undoubtedly intelligent but he can become morbidly subjective. Either due to his subjectivity or because of his temperament, he has the propensity to suddenly fly off at a tangent and commit damaging blunders, make fatal miscalculations. He can also be petty. Aside from Akber Bugti, the other Baloch leaders are less dazzling but more hard-boiled. More

than the popular base, or the calibre of its leadership, the importance of NAP lay in its credo. It was the credo that would have a magnetic appeal to sub-nationalist sentiments, especially among the youth. It was the credo with which I had eventually to come into confrontation. I knew it would be a long and unpleasant struggle. I also knew that the struggle would have serious repercussions on national unity and on the place of democracy in our polity. For these reasons I was trying to seduce NAP into a "historic compromise". I was trying to do what Aldo Moro was seeking to do in Italy. I wanted to bring them into the net of Pakistan's unity.

But just as I had made my calculations, the NAP leaders had made their calculations. They were not prepared to become the Enrico Belinguers of Pakistan. After the fall of Dacca and with the advent of power of Sardar Mohammad Daud in Afghanistan, it appears that the NAP leaders had come to the conclusion that their hour had arrived. Events moved fast. I was compelled by their defiance to dismiss the provincial government of Baluchistan. Under the provisions of the Constitution I imposed presidential rule in the Province, and appointed Akber Bugti as Governor of Baluchistan. Akber Bugti was not a member of my party; he did not join my party. At present he is in a party which is neither fish nor fowl. Although my action was confined to Baluchistan, Mufti Mahmood, the Chief Minister of N.W.F.P., resigned in sympathy but more out of fear of being dismissed. After that came the dark and menacing clouds. The insurgency in Baluchistan was a hard nut to crack. It took three tedious years before it was broken. It became inescapable to involve the military to cope with the insurgency. The military role kept expending. The tentacles spread to civilian functions.

However, had I not infused a massive political and socio-economic remedy into the crisis side by side with the military part, the operation would not have succeeded. My fundamental reforms in the agrarian sector, the abolition of sardari, the building of roads, the electrification of villages, the sinking of tubewells, the sound of tractors and a multitude of other benefits, captured the imagination of the poverty-stricken people of Baluchistan. I am not exaggerating or indulging in self-praise if I claim that I took sleepy Baluchistan by the hand and made it walk into the twentieth century as this century exists in the rest of Pakistan.

On two occasions, I had calculated that the time had come to withdraw the army. On both occasions, the present Chief of Army Staff pleaded with me to allow him a “final” extension to tie up loose ends. Instead of winding up, he was asking for more authority in the name of winding up. No such problem existed when General Tikka Khan was the Chief of Army Staff. Unlike the present Chief of Army Staff, he did not make political or administrative recommendations. General Tikka Khan confined his responsibilities to the military role and did not poke his nose into non-military matters. But this man was obsessed with entrapping individuals in the Hyderabad trial. He kept asking for permission to follow the insurgents into Afghanistan in “hot pursuit”. He was highly critical of the civil servants, especially of the last Chief Secretary of Baluchistan. As I had definitely decided to pull back the army a month after the elections of March, 1977 the situation made me endure his antics.

In the N.W.F.P. there was violence and trouble but nowhere on the scale of Baluchistan. Bomb blasts and sabotage were the methods adopted in that province. Schools and banks were the main targets. Unfortunately, young Sherpao was tragically assassinated at Peshawar University in one of the bomb blasts. However within a reasonable time, the situation in N.W.F.P. was brought under control.

President Mohammad Daud of Afghanistan was watching the developments like a hawk. He knew that I had effectively controlled the situation in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. As soon as he was convinced that I had mastered the crisis, the realist that he was, he invited me to Kabul to settle the political differences between Pakistan and Afghanistan. He had exhausted the other alternatives. He knew that I had not only overcome the internal crisis but that I had also neutralized foreign interference, both potential and actual. The die was cast. I responded to his invitation for talks with sincere spontaneity. When I set foot on the soil of Afghanistan in the first week of June, 1976 I was welcomed by an amiable and smiling President of Afghanistan. This was the same man who three years earlier had thundered threats at Pakistan in the first speech he made after the coup d’etat that brought him to power. The talks in Kabul were conducted in a cordial atmosphere. President Daud wanted me to release the NAP leaders to generate goodwill. He assured me that

once goodwill had its salutary impact. Afghanistan would recognize the disputed Durand Line. For reasons which are not necessary to mention in this letter, I told the President of Afghanistan that the two gestures would have to come simultaneously in the form of a package agreement. I told him that the balance of equity lay in a give and take settlement reached at the same time. I promised to release the NAP leaders and to drop the charges against them and, as a quid pro quo, he should simultaneously recognize the Durand Line. We agreed to continue our negotiations in Pakistan in August, 1976. A joint communiqué was issued before I left Kabul. The communiqué stated that the two countries would resolve their political differences on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence.

When President Daud came to Pakistan in August, 1976, it was finally agreed that there would be a package settlement to be implemented simultaneously. The Pakistan Government would release the NAP leaders and drop the treason charges against them and, the Government of Afghanistan would, in reciprocity, give recognition to the existing frontier (the Durand Line). The Foreign Office officials of Afghanistan and Pakistan headed by their respective Ministers worked out the package formula in writing in Lahore in August, 1976. It was agreed by both sides that I would visit Kabul in October or November, 1976 to conclude the formal agreement with the Afghan President according to the terms of the draft agreement. The trouble in Dir, engineered or not, prevented me from visiting Kabul in November, 1976. It was then agreed at Nawabshah on the 6th of January, 1977 between me and the Afghan Ambassador to Pakistan. Mr. Noor Ahmed Etimadi, that my visit to Kabul would take place at the end of March, 1977, a week or two after the general elections in Pakistan.

Even during the height of the insurgency in Baluchistan. I was revolving in my mind the ultimate political settlement. I was in touch with one of the Baloch leaders in Hyderabad jail through responsible intermediaries. Through them there was a sufficient exchange of views between me and that Baloch leader. When the draft agreement was concluded in Lahore in August, 1976, I started to give the most urgent importance to these contacts. The discussions with the Baloch leader were in sufficient details. The contact with the President of

NAP had barely begun when the upheaval of spring, 1977 turned my undivided attention to the agitation.

There had to be a face saver. Blood had not been spilled in vain. It was clear that it would be unrealistic to return to the status quo ante, as if nothing had happened in the three years. Such an expectation would mean that the Baloch had made sacrifices without a cause. What was the cause? A greater and independent Baluchistan and a Pakhtoonistan? If that was the cause it was unacceptable to my Government and to the people of Pakistan. We had reluctantly entered into the confrontation to prevent the further dismemberment of Pakistan and we had succeeded. Just as that kind of a demand was totally unacceptable to me and the people of Pakistan, it was equally impracticable to expect that the other side would return to the status quo. The requirements of nationalism and sub-nationalism had to be harmonized and reconciled within national unity but with honour and equity to the sub-national aspirations spearheaded by Baluchistan in a foiled insurgency. In plain words, this meant increasing the quantum of autonomy. It was my task to determine the increased degree of autonomy through a consensus like the one attained in 1973. This was the burden of the song in my negotiations with the Baloch leader through the intermediaries. Actually, on this delicate subject, only one intermediary was taken into confidence. I believe there is room for arming the Senate with more powers. There is also room for transferring a subject or two from the Federal list to the provincial list. We can keep our minds open on whether to retain or abolish the concurrent list. A new settlement on autonomy has to be worked out through democratic negotiations conducted by the genuine leaders of the country.

After the elections of March, 1977 I was determined to resolve this issue at the negotiating table. On my side, that is on the national level, the insurgency in Baluchistan had collapsed, the violent and sporadic troubles in the N.W.F.P. had come to an end. The restoration of normality in terms of law and order had been achieved. Due to my foreign policy, dangerous foreign intervention of the kind seen recently in Africa had not taken place. These positive achievements had paved the way for the Afghanistan-Pakistan draft agreement at Lahore in August, 1976. The decks had been cleared to start afresh for a lasting political equilibrium acceptable to the

recalcitrant provinces within the framework of a united federation of Pakistan. I had still to probe the minds of the Baloch and Pakhtoon leaders. I had to find out their conception of an honourable settlement. However, the nightmare was over. Factually speaking, we were in an advantageous if not commanding position and I say this in all humility. While the insurgency was at its peak, I was all the time apprehensive of Pakistan getting into a nutcracker between India and Afghanistan. The fact that this did not happen was my most significant achievement. The insurgency was contained and localized. Unlike that in East Pakistan, it was not internationalized. Having closed the foreign doors, having cleared the ground, the time had come to put down the guns and begin the dialogue. The dialogue could not begin after the elections of March, 1977 due to the spring agitation. As soon as I had managed to find the answer to the agitation, the country was struck by martial law on the 5th of July, 1977.

After the coup of July, 1977, General Zia-ul-Haq visited Kabul and met President Daud. Soon after his return from Kabul he released the NAP leaders from Hyderabad jail. Time will tell in the near future if this was done unconditionally or on the assurances of a quid pro quo. In March, 1978 President Daud visited Pakistan. Pleasant speeches were made. However, in one of his speeches, President Daud made it a point to mention that the political problem had still to be resolved. There was no joint-communique when President Daud visited Pakistan. If, after thirty years of tension and deadlock, sometimes rising very sharply, I could extract a joint-communique from the Afghan Government in June, 1976 in Kabul to settle the political differences on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence, it is an enigma to me why General Zia-ul-Haq did not get an endorsement of that commitment either in Kabul or in Islamabad through subsequent joint-communique. If a more significant secret written agreement had been reached between them, there was all the more reason to reiterate the Kabul communique of June, 1976, for the benefit of the people of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Perhaps there is a fresh secret agreement on the quid pro quo which was reduced to writing when General Zia-ul-Haq went to Kabul or when Daud came to Pakistan in March, 1978. Maybe it was such a big achievement that joint-communications were dispensed with. A

month or so after President Daud's visit to Pakistan, a revolutionary change took place in Afghanistan on 27th April, 1978. The new leaders of Afghanistan have declared that the Pakhtoon and Baloch problem exists and that they want a settlement of this political problem with Pakistan by peaceful means. This position has been reiterated on a number of occasions in the last two months. I do not want to sound critical, but the response to the change in Afghanistan was handled disastrously. It appeared as if the regime here got unhinged by it, as if a bolt from the blue had struck it. To add insult to injury, the regime's PNA collaborators made extremely damaging and ill-conceived statements on the revolution in Afghanistan. With the strictest controls over the press, the Afghans could not interpret these provocative statements as having had nothing to do with the regime. The recognition came late. There were unnecessary announcements that conferences were being held with PNA leaders to discuss the change in Afghanistan.

In the meantime, the Indians, who had immediately recognized the new Government of Afghanistan, started playing the role of a "Big Brother". The Indian Foreign Minister made a series of statements to the effect that India had assured Pakistan that there was no cause to feel nervous or anxious about the change in Afghanistan. The object of these statements was to win the appreciation of the new Afghan leaders and to confirm that Pakistan was worried or upset by the change. The Indian Foreign Minister had no locus standi to take a patronising attitude which, instead of improving matters, made them worse. He killed two birds with one stone. Pakistan is not so much in the dark about Afghanistan to rely on India's assurance or appreciation. In Washington, the Afghan Foreign Minister made it a point to mention that the recognition to his government came late from Pakistan. The special session of the United Nations on disarmament was not the forum to ventilate political disputes between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The special session was confined to disarmament.

This notwithstanding, there was an exchange of statements between the representative of Afghanistan and the representative of Pakistan on the political difference between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The representative of Pakistan fell back on the joint-communique I obtained from the Afghan Government in June, 1976

to form the basis of a dialogue between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Although President Daud and General Zia-ul-Haq had met subsequently in Kabul and in Islamabad, the representative of Pakistan to the special session in New York had to fall back on my communique of June, 1976. He could not produce any document or quote any agreement or communique after that one to indicate further progress. For reasons best known to him, the Pakistan representative suppressed the draft agreement of Lahore, 1976 which had settled the political difference. It is possible that the August, 1976 Agreement has been vitiated by some diplomatic guile of President Daud during his meetings with General Zia-ul-Haq in Kabul or in Pakistan. What a misfortune for Pakistan. If this problem which had been resolved after years of painstaking endeavours has been thrown wide open once again. The pendulum has swung from the side of Pakistan to the side of Afghanistan. Every basic problem in Pakistan has been re-opened, including this one.

Pakistan has lost her sense of direction and her moorings. The country is under the reign of night. In contrast, Afghanistan has come under a politically oriented leadership. The new government had made policy statements acknowledging the supremacy of the people and the equality of cultures. The new Afghan leaders are genuine Pakhtoons but without ethnic prejudices. The new Government has declared its foreign policy on the basis of non-alignment. However, it has a relationship of confidence with a neighbouring Super-power. If this neighbouring Super-power could provide military equipment of over a billion dollars to Somalia and write it off as being inconsequential, it can do bolder things in this region. There is no doubt that this Super-power would not hesitate to provide billions of dollars worth of military assistance to Afghanistan, including the latest Missile-220. These latest weapons will not be put in the bazaars of Kabul. The Foreign Minister of Afghanistan stated in New York that Afghanistan has a political difference only with Pakistan. He made it clear that Afghanistan does not have any difference or dispute with Iran. This regime has messed up just about everything. Its handling of the change in Afghanistan has been provocative and appalling. Stupidity is the style of the regime; foolishness its second nature. To the loss of Pakistan we have seen to logic of its methods. Its logic is the epitome of illogic.

Due to the historical, geographical and ethnic reasons the problem of N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan has fallen under a foreign shadow. The three wars fought by the British with Afghanistan have a bearing. The discussions conducted between Britain and Afghanistan before the independence of India and Pakistan have not been without relevance. A part of Baluchistan is in Pakistan and another part in Iran. A small part of Baluchistan is also in Afghanistan and even in the Soviet Union. Until I changed the policy towards the tribal territories, those sensitive regions were treated like a “no man’s land” by the previous government of Pakistan. The foreign factor, whatever its worth, gave the problem an added complexity. For this reason even the essentially internal demands for autonomy attracted wider publicity and attention. In addition, the strategic importance of Baluchistan, especially after the oil crisis of 1973, was a significant factor in the overall situation.

For those who thought that One-Unit was God’s blessing to Pakistan, for those who consider autonomy as being repugnant to the concept of what they call “Muslim nationhood”, Baluchistan and the Frontier were not the only spoilt children of Muslim nationhood. Sindh’s demand for autonomy was equally vociferous. As a matter of fact, the sub-nationalist sentiment in Sindh was more intense. From the political and intellectual point of view, Sindh was ahead of Baluchistan and N.W.F.P. in the manifestation of these sentiments. Here also historical and economic considerations came into play in addition to the political influences. The problem of Sindh, although in some respects more intense than that of N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan, did not receive the same extent of publicity because ethnic and other related considerations did not overflow into neighbouring countries as in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. Moreover, the intensity of the sub-nationalist sentiment in Sindh was confined to the Sindhi population and not shared by the non-Sindhi Population of the province. The non-Sindhi population was mostly concentrated in the importance cities of Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkar. Even in the smaller cities and towns, the non-Sindhies generally outnumbered the Sindhis. They wielded a great deal of economic power, were better organized and had a good foothold in the civil services and in the armed forces. For these reasons amongst others, it was thought that Sindh’s sub-nationalist outbursts could be controlled and managed without difficulty.

Lacking foreign ties and being encircled internally, so to speak, the Sindh movement was not taken seriously. It was a mistake to underrate it. The fact that the element of external blackmail was lacking, did not mean that the sensitive problem could be ignored or weighed in terms of the number of battalions or brigades needed to stamp out the sub-nationalist spirit. For a long time after the conquest in 1843, Sindh was attached to Bombay Presidency. Only in 1936 was it separated from Bombay Presidency. There remains a sizeable and vocal Hindu population in many parts of Sindh. In Tharparkar district, bordering the province of Rajasthan in India, the Hindus are in a majority in some of the sub-divisions. The Thakors or the Ranas of Tharparkar are very influential in their region. They have martial ties and other blood relation ties with the ruling princes of Rajasthan. There are Hurs and Mahars on both sides of the border. You might be interested to learn that in the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965, the last place captured by the Pakistan Army in Rajasthan was "Bhuttowali".

Whatever the tenuous or not so tenuous links between Sindh and Rajasthan briefly mentioned here, the aims and ambitions of India are even more important. India has not mentally accepted the vivisection of Mother India. She has seen that she was able to get away with her aggression in East Pakistan the moment autonomy became the battle cry of the Bengalis. The non-Bengali population of East Pakistan was of no consequence when it came to the crunch. The Sindhi Hindus who have migrated to India exercise a great deal of influence among the Indian elite. When the Janata Party won the elections in March, 1977, the nomination of the Prime Minister of India was left in the hands of two veteran Indian leaders. One was Jai Prakash Narayan and the other was Acharya Kirpalani, a Sindhi Hindu. At the time of Partition, when the Sindhi Hindus were leaving Sindh for India, Acharya Kirpalani came to Sindh to assist them in the exodus. The Quaid-e-Azam sent him a message to discourage rather than encourage the Hindus of Sindh to leave Pakistan. Acharya Kirpalani's caustic reply was "Shaan sa waiynda auon Maan sa enda". Mr. Advani, another Sindhi Hindu, is the Minister for Information in the Janata Government in Delhi. Similarly there are a number of influential Sindhi Hindus in the Indian National Congress. During the Indo-Pakistan war of 1971, the Indian Army concentrated on the Sindh sector with a definite politico-military objective. Considering the

long-term and uncompromising objectives of India, it was not at all surprising that the Indian Government was the second or third government to give recognition to the new Government in Afghanistan. In giving this bird's eye view of the position, I have not touched upon the importance of the port of Karachi, nor on the large Baloch population of Sindh which does not come under the category of non-Sindhi, nor on the Pakhtoon population of the interior of Sindh, which also does not come in the category of non-Sindhi, nor on the recent concentration of Pakhtoon labour in Karachi.

When I became the President of Pakistan, the Sindhu Desh movement was at its height. Slowly but substantially, in the five and a half years of my control over Pakistan, I neutralized this sentiment and brought the thought of the youth more within the mainstream of Pakistani nationalism. In the elections of 1970, my party, which carried the national message, defeated the god of the Sindhu Desh movement by more than thirty thousand votes in his own constituency. It was a tremendous achievement to stamp out the fire of the Sindhu Desh movement. I repeat, it was a very powerful movement. I have been told, and I am not surprised, that its revival is taking place at great speed. It appears that in the last twelve months, the movement has regained most of the ground it had lost.

The martial law regime, relying on brute force and playing up to India, thinks that all these problems are under control. The unexpected change in Afghanistan initially rattled the regime; but now, since the heavens did not come down on the 28th of April, 1978, the regime has accepted the more optimistic interpretations of its minions and regained a semblance of its lost balance. The junta should not have got rattled in the first place, but nor should it conclude that it can go back to thrashing the people of this country. The heavens do not come down. I am not alarmed by the change in Afghanistan. It did not come to me as a surprise. Although, in my opinion, the revolution in that country is the single biggest development that has taken place in our region since the dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, I believe the future of Pakistan is in the balance independent of this development. Even President Daud would have joined in the melee.

The support of Iran to Pakistan is most valuable. But Iran can be neutralized if there is an expression of widespread resentment in Pakistan by the people themselves. The minorities have been badly discriminated against by the arbitrary imposition of separate electorate. This decision represents the thinking of the regime whether elections are held or not. The working classes have been alienated by the reactionary and obscurantist policies of the junta. There is absolutely no dialogue or rapport with the people. Political activities have been banned. Journalists have been maltreated. Politicians have been indiscriminately put into jails. Political workers have been flogged. The spirit of the students has been crushed as it is considered to be a prelude to anarchy. Women have been bound and packed in chaddars. The bureaucrats and the police are functioning without supervisory control. Corruption has gone up by leaps and bounds. Even the PNA friends of the regime have been deceived and hoodwinked by the junta. They were used and exploited to perpetuate the regime and to ease the regime's efforts to get rid of me. The economy is in a mess. All institutions have been abolished. Parliament is as dead as a door-nail. The Constitution of 1973 has been buried six feet underground. The regime has failed everywhere. Even its sherwani campaign has flopped. In such a situation, with the regime hated and isolated, how would Iran rescue the regime in the event of external intervention? In such a situation, either Iran would be forced to remain out or she would be forced to enter to protect Iran's interests and integrity.

It is a foolish, indeed a maniac's misnomer to think, that merely because General Zia-ul-Haq has called India "a dear and great neighbour" that the present leadership of India would stand by and watch others carve out Pakistan. Whatever General Zia-ul-Haq may do not placate India, even by talking about non-existent secret clauses on Kashmir, India will take her full pound of Pakistan's flesh. On 12th of June, 1978 the Prime Minister of India stated in the United States that India is willing to drop her territorial claim against China on the border dispute in the interests of friendly relations with China. Only two months earlier, the Indian Prime Minister told Pakistani journalists that India would insist on regaining from China what he called India's Territory in Ladak. That uncompromising attitude was shown before the revolution in Afghanistan. Two months later the opposite attitude has been taken with the object of neutralizing China

in the event of a multitudinous assault on Pakistan for what a Pakhtoon leader in 1972 called “a three way split of Pakistan”. The liquidation of Pakistan is the sacred and unwavering mission of India. It would be the height of folly to think that by pandering to India on Kashmir or the Sallal Dam or trade, India will close her covetous eyes on what remains of Pakistan.

On the contrary, the concessions whet India’s appetite. The sweet surrenders and compromises further convince the leadership of India that Pakistan has lost the will to survive as a self-respecting nation. The doubt is not about India’s intervention. The doubt, if any, is about how the four provinces of Pakistan are to be shared by the intervening powers. Nowadays Morarji Desai and Atal Behari Bajpai are uttering words of milk and honey into the “kan ka kacha” ears of the martial law rulers. It is solely a tactical device. Bajpai has been the leader of the Jan Sangh. No matter what he says these days, neither he nor the Jan Sangh need an introduction. As for Morarji Desai, some of the veteran politicians of the Pakistan Movement are still alive to confirm that barring Sardar Vallabhai Patel, no other Congress leader was as implacable an opponent of Pakistan as the present Prime Minister of India. Nehru and Indira Gandhi were reputed to be more broadminded and more tolerant. They were not considered to be as bigoted as Patel and Desai.

In this connection it is worthwhile to reproduce what President Richard Nixon has observed in his recently published memoirs to show the treachery and hypocrisy of Indian leaders towards Pakistan:

“On the morning of November 4, I met in the Oval office with the Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi. Her visit to Washington came at a critical time. Eight months earlier there had been a rebellion in East Pakistan against the Government of President Yahya Khan. Indian officials reported that nearly ten million refugees fled from East Pakistan into India. We knew that Yahya Khan eventually would have to yield to East Pakistan’s demand for independence and we urged him to take a more moderate and conciliatory line. We could not have known the extent to which India would seize this opportunity not just to destroy Pakistan’s control of East Pakistan but to weaken West Pakistan as well.”

“Mrs. Gandhi complimented me highly on the way I was winding down the war in Vietnam and on the boldness of the China initiative. We talked about the uneasy situation in Pakistan, and I stressed how important it was that India not take any actions that would exacerbate it.”

“She earnestly assured me that India was not motivated in any way by anti-Pakistan attitudes. ‘India has never wished the destruction of Pakistan or its permanent crippling,’ she said. ‘Above all, India seeks the restoration of stability. We want to eliminate chaos at all costs.’”

“I later learn that, even as we spoke, Mrs. Gandhi knew that her generals and advisers were planning to intervene in East Pakistan and were considering contingency plans for attacking West Pakistan as well.”

“In our conversation that morning I was disturbed by the fact that although Mrs. Gandhi professed her devotion to peace, she would not make any concrete offers for de-escalating the tension. Yahya Khan had agreed to move his troops away from the border if India would do the same, but she would not make a similar commitment.”

“A month later, primed with Soviet weapons, the Indian army attacked East Pakistan. Fighting also erupted along the border with West Pakistan. But it was impossible to tell whether the Indian objective there, was to pin down Pakistani forces or whether the action was the prelude to a full-scale attack. Battle plans of such dimensions are not formulated in less than a month, and I could not help thinking that Mrs. Gandhi had purposely deceived me in our meeting.”

These observations of President Nixon on pages 525 and 526 of his Memoirs. If the liberal-minded Mrs. Indira Gandhi was capable of deceiving such a shrewd and experienced politician as President Nixon on the Indian attitude towards Pakistan, we can only imagine the strings that the bigoted Janata leaders would tie round the inexperienced martial law rulers in the deceptions of their diplomacy towards Pakistan.

The regime does not know what is happening under its nose. The symbolic indication of this was shown by the burning of the Prime Minister's secretariat under the nose of the martial law lords. They think that there is complete normalcy and peace because political activities have been banned. Political activities cannot be banned because "man is a political animal" and the state is a political theatre. Political activities either remain on the surface or they take place underground. At this rate, within a short time, Pakistan will witness Red Brigades of her own type like the Red Brigades of Italy. By banning political activities, the regime is nourishing terrorism. If political activities cannot be banned in a small country like the Dominican Republic, how can political activities be banned in a country like Pakistan? The banning of traditional political activities is a veritable feast for those who grab the power of the state by sub rosa methods. This martial law regime has been a Frankenstein's experiment. Its intrusion on the political scene has destabilized Pakistan and the region. A bitter harvest has still to be reaped.

When the Supreme Court was hearing the constitutional petition of your mother, I told the court that if the constitution is held in abeyance or suspension for an indefinite period, the outcome will be fatal to Pakistan. I urged the Court to fix a date for general elections and to ensure that martial law gives way to constitutional law in the shortest possible time. In those circumstances, I argued that the legal fiction of validating martial law might be accepted as a bad dream, a bitter pill which has been swallowed, a nightmare which had gone. I made it clear that if the interregnum was not short and of minimum duration, the people would consider the Constitution abrogated and annulled. They would not accept the legal fiction of its suspension or its "deviation". In that event it could be contended that Pakistan had rolled back to 1947 and in existence not by virtue of a constitution passed by the people of Pakistan in 1973 but on account of the Indian independence Act of 1947 passed by the British Parliament. Concomitantly, it could be argued that the quantum of sovereignty voluntarily surrendered by the four provinces to the Federation had reverted back to the provinces due to the annulment of the Constitution of 1973. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court did not heed my warning. Martial law has overstayed; it was never a welcome guest. It would be ludicrous to contend that the Constitution of 1973 still remains valid and intact. For about a year it has not been

functioning at all. Its fundamental clauses on the electoral system have been arbitrarily amended by one man. The same man can make other major or minor amendments by lifting his pen. I believe he is going to indulge in this mutilation in the near future. The moral and the political position is that the Constitution of 1973 has gone with the wind. This is also the legal position. Pakistan is back to the Indian Independence Act of 1947 passed by the Parliament of Britain. The quantum of sovereignty voluntarily surrendered by the provinces to the Federation of Pakistan has reverted to the provinces. My agreement with President Daud on the Durand Line made in August, 1976 has either been subsequently wriggled out of by President Daud with the concurrence of General Zia-ul-Haq or it has been suppressed from the people for some inexplicable reasons. Where then do we stand?

1. The country is without a constitution.
2. Pakistan is a reality due to the Indian Independence Act of 1947 passed by the British.
3. In either event, the provinces have regained the autonomy they surrendered to the Federation of Pakistan under the Constitution of 1973.
4. Afghanistan does not recognize the Durand Line.
5. Afghanistan maintains that the problem of the Baloch and the Pakhtoons has yet to be settled with Pakistan by peaceful means. Furthermore, Afghanistan maintains that this political problem exists only with Pakistan and not with Iran.
6. India wants the settlement of the Kashmir dispute on terms.
7. India has dropped her territorial claims against China and wants friendship with China.
8. The Soviet Union has promised all-out support to the new Government of Afghanistan.

9. The Soviet Union has attacked Pakistan's membership in CENTO.

10. The Shahinshah of Iran has warned that if the troubles in Iran continue the Tudeh Party would be the beneficiary.

11. India is asserting her hegemonic rights through her nuclear policy. She has rejected Pakistan's proposal for an Asian Zone of Peace.

12. The people of Pakistan are dissatisfied, agitated and in utter despair.

No wonder the Guardian wrote of us as "a country without solutions."

How has this vandalistic situation come about in thirty years? It has so emerged because since 1954, vandals have directly dabbled in the politics of Pakistan as representatives of the coterie. General Ayub Khan became a Central Minister in 1954 and the COTERIE authored the One-Unit scheme in Dorchester Hotel in 1952. Poor Dorchester Hotel. I have been staying in that hotel since 1950, ever since I was a student at Oxford. Little did I know at that time that the Dorchester Hotel was going to be responsible for One-Unit. Unadulterated military rule came in 1958 and departed in 1971 with East Pakistan ripped apart. On 5th July, 1977, it returned with full fury to "save" Pakistan just as it had "saved" Pakistan in 1971. Martial law is not altogether unrepresentative. It does not represent the people but it does represent the reactionary coterie. This coterie and its representatives, the succeeding juntas, have brought the country to this sorry pass. Sindh was the first province in the Sub-continent to pass the Pakistan Resolution in its legislature. Today Sindh is frightfully bitter. Baluchistan remained tranquil without provincial status 'leave aside autonomy' for over two decades. In 1958, the martial law of Ayub Khan came into confrontation with the Baloch population not over the Sardari system or land reforms or other reforms but over petty political issues of subjective character. Nauroze Khan Brohi was brought down from the hills with a pledge on the Holy Koran that no action would be taken against him. He was hanged at Hyderabad.

This coterie is the root of all evil. In a speech in the National Assembly in Dacca in 1963 or 1964, I made a frontal attack on the coterie. It was so scathing an exposure that a Pir politician who thought that Shujaabad was his nest until I stormed the Bastille in the elections of 1970, still remembers that speech. The coterie was so shaken by it that the tape was flown from Dacca to Lahore through a special messenger instructed to deliver it personally to Ayub Khan with the request that he hear it immediately.

The coterie despises me. It despises me because I am the first and only leader of Pakistan to have smashed its cast-iron monopoly and gone directly to the people. They wanted me to operate through them like they made all other leaders in the past operate through them. I refused, I called them blood-suckers who, in the name of the Punjab, had exploited the masses of the Punjab. I told them that I would go to the people of the Punjab, to the masses of the Punjab, over their heads and expose their fraud to the people of the Punjab and to the people of the rest of the country. Just as in the name of Islam they have deceived Islam, just as in the name of accountability they have escaped accountability, so also, in the name of the Punjab they have deceived the people of the Punjab. In the name of Muslim nation-hood, which in plain language means One-Unit, they do not want the people of the Punjab to dominate Pakistan. They want their personal domination over Pakistan, including the Punjab. By building one or two factories in the Punjab, the coterie sought not to serve the people of the Punjab but to consolidate their exploitation. The only faithful way of serving the people of the Punjab, like that of the rest of the country, is by liquidating vested interests, by ending exploitation.

In other words by wiping out the coterie. Would the coterie wipe itself out in the interests of the people of Punjab? It certainly would not. The coterie can never serve the people of the Punjab. This is the basic contradiction. This is why the people of the Punjab are with me and not with them. The coterie claims to have drunk the waters of the Ravi. It says I have drunk the waters of the Indus. Both rivers belong to Pakistan. Both contain good water. But water is not blood. The coterie has drunk the blood of the people. Whereas to me the blood of the people is more precious than my own blood. I am not made to accept any form of domination, whether external or internal. I believe in the supremacy of the people, of all the people and by people I

mean the genuine people and not the abominable coterie. In 1970, I went to every village of the Punjab, to every town and every city of the Punjab and burst the balloon of this coterie to become the undisputed leader of the masses of the Punjab just as I am the authentic leader of the rest of the masses of the country. This is why the coterie hates and despises me. I exposed them in their own backyard. I made the people of the Punjab catch them by the neck and kick them into the garbage. This is why they want my neck.

Recently General Zia-ul-Haq gave another reason for his martial law. He told an American correspondent that I had no intention of transferring power even had I lost the elections. He will soon realize that his selfish ploy of 5th July, 1977 has not only destabilized Pakistan and the region, but it has most probably damaged Pakistan permanently. If he does not quickly reverse the direction of his suicidal policies, even a reborn Mohammad Ali Jinnah would not be able to save the situation. Martial law is a cancer for any civilized country. For Pakistan it is a negation of her raison d'etre. Firstly, because Pakistan is the product of the people through a democratic movement. Secondly, no country in the world, is spending as much of its GNP on the armed forces as is Pakistan. This heroic sacrifice by one of the poorest peoples in the world has been made year in and year out. This self-denial has been exercised in favour of the armed forces for them to meet the territorial threats to Pakistan's integrity, not so that the armed forces compromise Pakistan's external position in order to dominate the country. Thirdly, there is no country in the world except Pakistan whose neighbour has pledged to obliterate it from the map of the world. Israel was also in the same position until President Sadat made his journey to Jerusalem. Besides, militarily at present Israel has a superiority. The position in the Sub-continent is the opposite. Here, militarily, the state seeking Pakistan's liquidation, enjoys a predominant superiority. The Pakistan Armed Forces therefore cannot afford a moment's deviation from their real responsibility. For the sake of Pakistan's integrity, they simple cannot afford to get involved or absorbed in the political life of the country. Those soldiers who leave barracks and move into Government mansions lose wars and become prisoners-of-war as happened in 1971. The generals of the Pakistan Army are determined to repeat history.

In a recent book by James Morris entitled “Farewell the Trumpets”, the author has stated:

“The rule of law proved transitory when the imperial tyrants more fierce than any colonial governor swept away the baubles of democracy. Nations gently nurtured into statehood fractured themselves in civil war, or were curdled in corruption.”

This has happened where the so-called professional generals of a so-called professional army modelled on an apology for Sandhurst have usurped political power on the assumption that it is jolly good sport.

A great deal has been said on human rights in the recent past. Whether human rights have become a code of diplomacy on humanitarian consideration in the absolute sense, or whether they are an expedient being used selectively for narrow aims has still to be determined. The attachment to human rights as a moral principle might make a distinct contribution if the goal is pursued impersonally and with angelic objectivity. If the object is one of convenience or meant to needle an adversary, it might recoil as an example of unscrupulous double standards in diplomacy. Since a military junta is the most savage negation of human rights, it is an irony to appeal to a military junta to respect a particular aspect of human rights. In such a situation, the only way to honour human rights is to refuse to recognize the illegal junta. Tin-pot dictators have ravaged Asia, Latin America and Africa. In the aftermath, they have done more to promote communism than the works of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Mao. They are the worst tyrants of the post-colonial period. They have destroyed time-honoured institutions and treated their people like animals.

They have caused internal divisions and external confusion. The dictator is the one animal who needs to be caged. He betrays his profession and his constitution. He betrays the people and destroys human values. He destroys culture. He binds the youth. He makes the structure collapse. He rules by fluke and freak. He is the scourge and the ogre. He is a leper. Anyone who touches him also becomes a leper. He is the upstart who is devoid of ideals and ideology. Not a single one of them has made a moment’s contribution to history.

These tin-pot dictators are not the freedom fighters or the ideologically committed warriors. They are the cocktail conspirators, the shoe-shine boys of foreign ambassadors. The anti-people professional who is seeking every little opportunity to dump his profession and take over his master's profession. He is the one who is mortified of the people. He is the one who rests on the crutches of a bureaucrat. He is the one who thinks that the reduction of inflation by one or two per cent means the liberation of Kashmir. Does he stop to ask the bureaucrat if with the reduction in the rate of inflation, employment has also increased? In advanced countries it is more essential to reduce inflation even at the cost of greater unemployment as the large section of the population is affected by inflation. Besides, in advanced countries, the hardships of unemployment are cushioned by social security schemes. In developing countries it is more important to provide employment even at the cost of inflation because a large section of the population is affected more by unemployment than by inflation. Besides, in developing countries, there are no worthwhile social security schemes for the unemployed. The choice between inflation and unemployment is not a simple one. Neither of them are without grave repercussions. But an ideal solution is not available. The conditions of advanced countries and those of developing countries are quite different. Both inflation and unemployment are bad and bothersome. But if a choice has to be made between the two evils, advanced countries would prefer higher unemployment to more inflation. Developing countries would be better advised to chose inflation to unemployment. Many a developing country, Brazil for instance, developed by making this deliberate but painful choice. Keynesian theories might no longer be applicable to countries which have crossed the limits of growth but not to those countries which are in their economic infancy. These are not the questions that would occur to a tin-pot dictator. To such an individual what is good for the rich nations is good for the poor nations. He accepts the formula of the rich man because he is the tool of the rich man. Real and substantial relief should be given to the people by drastically cutting non-developmental expenditure. This is all the more necessary where disputes with foreign states have been compromised or where it is unconceivable to solve them by military means. Such reductions would drastically cut the rate of inflation and also provide productive employment. Will such fundamental and economically sound decisions be taken especially when budgets are

announced in the cosy rooms of a television studio and not in Parliament? The junta will not take such decisions because the generals are like children in a kindergarten. They must have toys to play with. The weapons of war are their toys. They cannot go to war. They will not go to war. They have to have the weapons nevertheless. It is a matter of their pride and prestige on the parade ground. Such sycophants need the help of sycophants to keep away from gruesome reality, to avoid getting exposed and hearing the unpleasant truth. No wonder they fear the real march – the march of ideas, the march of men and women without jackboots, barefooted men and women. They try to put everything into a dungeon, even the cry of an infant child hungry for her mother's milk as occurred in Kotlakhpat Jail. When these individuals destroy their own country's interests and future, it is a wicked myth for the Western Powers to think that then can protect Western interests.

Two countries in Asia excell in this type of dictatorship. One is Thailand and the other is Pakistan. Thailand has the consolation of a fall-back position in a hereditary monarchy. A vacuum can be avoided in that country even if the constitution is abrogated due to the presence of a monarchy. Pakistan's fall-back position is an act of the British Parliament. If Pakistan falls back on the Indian Independence Act of 1947, the British Parliament is competent to legally amend the Indian Independence Act of 1947 or pass a superseding Act, making Pakistan a British colony again or dividing the provinces of Pakistan to other successor states. In reality Pakistan does not have a fall-back position once its democratic constitution is abrogated or annulled. This crisis of jurisprudence I had in mind when I warned the nation of the ominous consequences arising out of the validation of martial law as a meta-constitutional action.

The minds of the professional military dictators run on the same lines. The modus operandi is that they have reluctantly and temporarily left the barracks they adore, to save the country from civil war and the spectre of communism, to clean up the mess created by dirty politicians, restore law and order, liquidate corruption and establish stability. If you study the main speeches of Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan and Zia-ul-Haq, you will detect the common thread without the slightest difficulty. Actually, the same cord runs through the uniform of all such "simple soldiers" of negative aspirations in

other parts of Asia, in Africa and Latin America. They do not usurp power to pursue an ideology but to amend an agreement on a nuclear reprocessing plant, to protect the foreign interest in copper mines, to ensure that the country does not get out of NATO or CENTO, to abandon the territorial claims of the nation to accommodate the global interests of the super-powers. Instead of the right of self-determination, they start talking about GNP. Instead of supporting liberation movements, they get entangled in the rate of inflation little realizing that their establishment is the giant promoter of inflation. They are the creators of contradictions. If and when they depart from the scene, they leave behind more corruption, more instability, a sharper polarization, a weaker economy, greater fissiparousness and the maximum confusion created by constitutional voids.

Now you can appreciate why the Red Brigades of Italy are provoking the military to take over the Italian State in their strategic quest to destroy the state. This is self-apparent in the Italian example because Italy is the mother of Western civilization and not a banana republic. In a highly advanced country like Italy such fundamental issues are immediately understood in contra-distinction to developing countries, where subtle political implications are not easily seen by the naked eye of a populace made naked by poverty. A connected element in the adventurism of the generals of the junta is to ridicule, belittle and disgrace “the corrupt and dirty politicians”. Without a qualm, the junta places the responsibility of all national ills squarely on the shoulders of the political leadership. Distorted and false versions are given with exaggeration of past events; fabricated documents are prepared to malign the past leadership. The achievements of the political leaders are usurped with the usurpation of power. The more popular the political leader, the greater his achievements for the nation, the more vociferous the propaganda and persecution against him.

The simple soldier has a tendency to believe that the problems of the state are essentially very simple and that the scheming politicians have deliberately complicated them to satisfy their preserve political ambitions. Believing this to be the position, the simple soldier displays indecent haste in resolving complicated external issues. He wants to show that with goodwill and a pat on the back of the other chap, the

problem can be reduced to a bare minimum and settled in a jiffy. He wants to demonstrate that the problem has been unnecessarily complicated by the politician, and that the simple soldier can succeed where the professional politician has failed. With this urge and motivation Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan and now Zia-ul-Haq tackled the Jammu and Kashmir dispute with the open hearts of simple soldiers. The irony is that each one of them has successively complicated the dispute further. Not one of them achieved the twin purpose of discrediting the politician and attaining immortals fame by equitably resolving the dispute with a simple soldier's mind. The net result is that the people have had to suffer more as a consequence of their follies.

When the Indian Foreign Minister came to Islamabad in January, 1978, it was reported that General Zia-ul-Haq expressed the profound view that there would have to be "give and take on Kashmir". If the recognized international principle of self-determination is abandoned very few nations would support the smaller state against the much larger state when the dispute degenerates from a moral principle into a carcass to be cut in a butcher's shop. In such an eventually, it would be all give and no take because, to the lion will go the lion's share. In 1959 Ayub Khan made a pilgrimage to Palam Airport on his own initiative and without invitation to offer joint-defence to India against the northern threat. India responded to this gesture of the spiritual if not actual liquidation of Pakistan by giving Ayub Khan the bamboo in 1965. In the first Islamic Summit Conference held in Rabat in 1970, with Yahya Khan's permission and agreement, a Sikh entered the Conference of the Islamic leaders to represent India. Gandhi had always held that India could legitimately represent the Muslims and therefore Pakistan was not needed by Muslim India, but by no stretch of imagination and under no circumstances, could Hindu India represent the cause of the Muslims. Yahya Khan, following his predecessor, gave the second blow to the spiritual rationale of Pakistan at Rabat. When he was informed of the sharp and spontaneous reaction to India participation at the Islamic Summit Conference, in fear, Yahya Khan went back on his agreement. The damage had been done. The subsequent chauvinistic statements could not undo it, especially in the light of the long statement by Shahi defending India's participation in the Conference. Despite the strenuous efforts made by Yahya Khan to emulate Ayub Khan and

make fundamental concessions to India, Yahya Khan also got the bamboo from India in 1971. I fail to understand what prompts Zia-ul-Haq to follow the footsteps of his unillustrious predecessors, by pursuing the same supine policy. He is sadly mistaken if he thinks that he will get lollipop from Jullundur in place of the bamboo. Desai has already placed the order for the bamboo. It is being made in Ahmedabad. The previous two were made in Allahabad. “Jo hotta hai woh manzure Khuda hotta hai.”

If freedom, democracy, constitutional government, and the rights of man have abiding value for the “free world” the answer lies in the complete ostracization of tin-pot dictators. If General Franco of Spain, the victor of the Spanish civil war, could be ostracized for over twenty years, these palm-tree dictators who are no Francos or rulers of Spain can be ignored, condemned and chastised. Only then would democracy, constitutional government and the rights of man have the strength to withstand totalitarianism. It is either communism or freedom. It is either civilian rule or junta rule. A half way house does exist but with foundations in sinking sands. A military junta is the herald communism. The failure to realize this axiomatic fact is the cause of the confusion in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Military rule turns the people totally and irrevocably against the bemedalled generals and their patrons. Where else can the people turn? If freedom, democracy and the rights of man are to be put on the counter to see whether copper and coffee is to cost ten cents more or ten cents less and bargained away with so little consideration, then freedom is a very cheap commodity and the rights of man are not worth a nickel.

When the cold war was at its peak and the Western powers were in fierce confrontation with communist powers, it was perfectly understandable that the West was not only anti-Soviet Union and anti-communist China but was also anti-non-communist states friendly or sympathetic to communist states. Those states were the “fellow travellers.” But after détente, after President Nixon’s visit to China and after the Helsinki Accord, with the West seeking SALT II with the Soviet Union and selling armaments to China, the position should have changed for the better, more conspicuously for others. After détente and the Shanghai communique every state becomes a fellow traveller in a different context. The West wants normal and

friendly relations with the communist states. This is true not only of the Soviet Union and China but also Yugoslavia, Romania, Poland and other East European communist states. At the same time, the West is unhappy with or allergic to those non-communist states which are regarded by the West to be pro-Soviet Union and China. This means that communist Brezhnev, the President of Soviet Union, or communist Hue Kuo-feng, chairman, of the Communist Party of China are to be preferred to non-communist Muslim nationalist, Gaddafi of Muslim Libya and non-communist Muslim nationalist Boumedine of Muslim Algeria. Similar comparisons can be made with Tito and Ceausescu. Having made the point I will go no further. The conclusion is that in Western estimation it is preferable to be a communist leader of a communist state, than to be a non-communist leader of a non-communist state having friendly relations with communist states. The anomaly does not cease here. It is even more dangerous to be pro-West. One disagreement in defence of a national cause, and out goes that civilian leader by a coup d'état. He gets replaced by a tin-pot military dictator who would not dare to disagree about anything, including the vital national interests of his country. The anomaly goes still further. The anti-people and anti-national policies of such a guaranteed stooge do more to promote communism in his country than a disagreement here or there by a civilian national leader.

There is a method in this madness. A communist leader of a communist state is preferred to a non-communist leader of non-communist state, who in turn, is preferred to a pro-Western but self-turn respecting civilian leader. This category of hardship is in turn endangered by military juntas promoted by the West. The policies of the military juntas form the way for a communist revolution. Through this cycle the Western states, get to deal with the leadership and the type of state most preferable to the West. This rigmarole explains the underlying logic of détente and the Shanghai communique. This is the spirit of Helsinki and the meaning behind Brzezinski's compliments to communist China and her leader during his recent visit to Peking.

Since he was a pragmatic person and the event pinched him. Ayub Khan described this rigmarole, as I call it, in plain language to President Richard Nixon in a conversation held in Pakistan. This is

how President Nixon recalls the conversation in his Memoirs on page 256:

“In Pakistan I saw my old friend, President Ayub Khan. He spoke sadly about what he believed had been American collusion in the murder of President Ngo Dinh Diem in Vietnam on November 1, 1963, three weeks before Kennedy’s assassination. ‘I cannot say perhaps you should never have supported Diem in the first place. But you did support him for a long time, and everyone in Asia knew it. Whether they approved or disapproved, they knew it. And then, suddenly, you didn’t support him anymore – and Diem was dead’. He shook his head and continued, Diem murder meant three things to many Asian leaders that it is dangerous to be a friend of the United States: that it pays to be a neutral: and that sometimes it helps to be an enemy!”

It is typical of Ayub Khan to have personalized a general principle I have tried to set out in interpreting the warped Western strategy. When the so-called “Iron Curtain” existed it was logical for the west to be hostile to the communist states behind the Iron Curtain and to those who strengthened or seemed to be strengthening that curtain from outside. But when détente lifted the Iron Curtain and Western leaders began toasting Soviet leaders with Vodka and caviar in the Kremlin, and subsequently, Chinese leaders with Mao Tse-Tung in the Great Hall of the people, their antipathy towards the non-communist friends of the communist powers appears to be incongruous. What appears to be more incongruous is the ill-tempered display towards neutral or pro-West national political leaders who dare to disagree in good faith to protect their national interest. I would venture to go a step further and make so bold as to say, that it appears as if the United States relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan have more latent tensions than the tensions between the United States and, let us say, communist Poland or communist Romania. The global equation is indeed lopsided.

This jeremiad could be put in the mould of a dialectical interpretation of history. Karl Marx said in 1848 that “Capitalism sows the seeds of its own destruction”. This is a more succinct way of describing the phenomenon. Marx was referring to the destruction of

capitalism through wars among the capitalist states for the raw materials of the world. Since capitalism has apparently overcome that method of destroying itself, it has found recourse to another method through its diplomacy.

Examples are legion. Nasser and Soekarno for instance, were not communist leaders. Neither were they lackeys or stooges of Western powers. Strangely enough, President Eisenhower was able to grasp the fundamental nuance of Nasser's position better than other Presidents of the United States. You might say that I am contradicting myself by acknowledging the political wisdom or intuition of a military leader like Eisenhower. Not at all. There are military leaders and political leaders. I have drawn the distinction earlier. General Charles de Gaulle was also a military leader par excellence and an outstanding political leader. Such leaders are leaders, period. They went through the hell of the Second World War and were deeply involved in diplomacy and politics. Both General de Gaulle and General Eisenhower were elected by their people through the ballot to become the Presidents of two well-established democratic nations. They did not seize power through the back door or by cheap coups. It is an insult to compare such celebrated military-cum-political leaders with tin-pot, non-revolutionary, non-ideological, GNP-oriented usurpers.

Two more examples are striking and pertinent. Pakistan was punished in 1965. An arms embargo was imposed although Pakistan was in SEATO and CENTO and an accomplice in many partisan manoeuvres. Pakistan, a faithful ally and, according to Nehru, the most aligned ally, was punished for the China policy. Five years later, an American President was using Pakistan to throw a bridge between Washington and Peking for him to walk across it to Peking. It was not without purpose that Premier Chou-En-Lai told him not to forget the bridge he had crossed. The other example is that of Brazil. President Goulart was a big ranch owner, a very wealthy man. He had a beautiful wife who dressed like a queen. Goulart might have been anything, he might have been many things, but he was not a communist, any more than Ayub Khan was communist. The unforgivable sin committed by President Goulart was to recognize the People's Republic of China in 1963 or 1964. A Chinese trade mission visited Brazil, and a few months later, there was a coup d'etat in

Brazil which ousted President Goulart. The same reasons were given – those of inflation and economic mismanagement. Brazil has been under military dictatorship for almost fifteen years. A long enough period to de-humanize human beings. Thus, Brazil's military junta has brought terrorism under control. How would Brzezinski compare his recent speeches in praise of China in Peking in May, 1978 with the speeches that President Goulart made on China in Brazilia in 1963 or 1964? If the answer is that it is all a question of timing, in that case, friends and allies should not be penalized for having a better sense of timing.

The Western civilization is Christian civilization. The great and magnificent civilization has its roots in the teaching of Jesus Christ. According to the Christians, Jesus Christ was not only a Prophet but “the son of God”. We Muslims recognize him as a Prophet and also believe in his immaculate conception, but Islam is a strictly monotheistic religion. It does not accept the concept of “the Father, and Son and the Holy Ghost”.

For Christians, the teaching and directives of Christ are more Sacred than those of a Messenger of God. According to the Christians, those teaching and directives are of God Himself. Most of the problems of the Third World would be solved if the Christian West implemented in letter and spirit only one directive of Jesus Christ. The directive to “Render unto Caesar that which belongs to Caesar and to God that which belongs to God”. The Third World only want what belongs to it and nothing more. For over two hundred years, the Christian civilization of the West has been mercilessly violating this directive of Jesus Christ. The West has been taking everything belonging to Ceasar and everything belonging to God. The West is not dividing the share equitably. It is not rendering to us what belongs to us. This division relates to the economic, social, racial and political rights of the Third World. It means majority rule in Africa without any further delay. It means the end of segregation and discrimination. It means the end of inequality of opportunity. It means respect for human dignity. In short, it means a just and honourable life. There is no need to fret. The arrangements can be worked out without harm or injury to anybody. We want our daily bread. We do not insist that it be spread with butter or cream. We have not attained that level of material prosperity to gloat in greed and to take pride in selfishness.

We do not want anything more than the neighbour living next door. Otherwise it would not be possible for us to be good neighbours. We want the friendship of the East and the West, of both the worlds. That is why we are the Third World, the World that can be the bridge between the other two worlds.

We know how to keep our distance. We will not embarrass the West. Our bridge will not be the kiss that General Mobutu Sese Seko gave to President Valery Giscard D'Estaing when he landed in combat fatigues in Paris for the Versailles Conference on Africa. Nor will our bridge be the embrace that General Zia-ul-Haq threw round the startled Prime Minister of Britain when he was leaving Lahore for Aswan in January, 1978. Fraternization and familiarity flows from the attainment of relative material equality and not from the "master-servant" relationship which glaring economic disparities impose. In 1954 at the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, John Foster Dullus refused to shake hands with Prime Minister Chou-En-Lai. During the funeral of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in Delhi near the banks of Jumuna, handsome Lord Louis Mountbatten sat in a resplendent Admiral's uniform three chairs away from me. I avoided shaking hands with the British lord and the last viceroy of undivided India chief because of what I thought to be the harm he had done to Pakistan but partly in retaliation for the insult Dulles inflicted in Geneva on a great leader of Asia. Out of respect and admiration our bridge will be our hand of friendship. If the West reciprocates, it will be a firm and warm clasp.

We understand the West very well. Its weaknesses and its virtues are known to us. The West, having dominated the Third World for centuries, fails to understand or respond to our restive mood, our sensitivity. When the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union takes off his shoes at the United Nations and shows them to the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Secretary General responds with a smile, walks down from the high rostrum and goes to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union to shake hands with him. I was sitting only three rows in front of the Soviet Prime Minister when this happened in the fall of 1960. but when we try to protect the legitimate rights of our country or try to make it a more useful member of the international community, our endeavours are misunderstood. Coups are engineered and after the success of such coups, remarks are

made to the effect that “he was getting too big for his boots”. My country, my boots are not waved in anyone’s face, and yet the intoxication of power prompts such lamentable remarks.

Please do not think I have been unduly harsh in my judgement on account of what the junta has done to me. I have sufficient knowledge of history to know how the tide turns, how emperors of yesterday become the mendicants of today. You know of my admiration for Napoleon Bonaparte. You know of my romantic attachment to the French Revolution and the Napoleonic period. Not only did the revolutionaries execute their king but they got devoured by their own revolution. Robespierre and Denton, to mention only two of the prominent revolutionaries, had to mount the scaffold. There was retribution on top of retribution, revenge on top of revenge. Napoleon, that genius of a man, that complete captain of civilization’s caravan, was put away on Elba and St. Helena. Who exiled Napoleon to Elba and St. Helena? Not the people of France. The French revolution came two centuries ago but it lost its basic purpose by revenge and counter-revenge. As it became subjective and vindictive, the masses of France, those who had the highest expectations from the revolution, lost faith in the revolution and the revolutionaries. France is the mother of revolution. She gave birth to the child of revolution. Since then the proletariat of France has made France pregnant with the child of revolution very often but has carried out abortions on the eye of the birth. We need not go far back into the past. Abortions of revolution took place in France in May 1958, in May 1968 and in March 1978. This is partly explained by the experience France had with her child two hundred years ago. That child destroyed as much as it created. The paradox is that it had to destroy the old order to build a new order. The opponents of the revolution turned this paradox into a prejudice. The revolutionaries failed to sufficiently consolidate into sober institutions the ideals of “liberty, equality and fraternity.” An orgy of blood letting became the index of the revolution. The revolution killed the nobles but the nobility reappeared. The revolution killed the king and the queen, but the kings and the queens came back to the thrones of France.

The Czar and his family were killed in Russia but the Russian Revolution has not been built and strengthened on that act. Either way, it was not relevant to the building of Soviet power any more than

the escape of Chiang Kai-Shek was relevant to the building of the power of the Revolution in China. When Abdul Gamal Nasser overthrew the corrupt and hated regime of Farook, many of his comrades wanted Farook's execution. Nasser refused. He allowed Farook to leave Egypt. Nasser rose in the estimation of the civilized world. He followed the sublimer values of humanity. Farook left Egypt with full honours. Nasser saluted his former king as the royal vessel moved away from the shores of Egypt. As a good Muslim, Nasser followed the traditions of Islamic history. His revolution did not suffer for being tempered with mercy.

In Turkey, the junta thought that the simple and easy answer to the problems of Turkey lay in the execution of Adnan Menderes. Ayub Khan sent me to Turkey in September, 1960 to plead with the junta to spare the life of Menderes. I had a long meeting with General Gursel. The Turkish Foreign Minister Selim was present. General Gursel told me that the problems of Turkey would get resolved by the execution. Strangely enough he said that there would be violent reaction in certain pockets of Anatolia but in a few months everyone would have forgotten Menderes. I told the General that the problems of Turkey would not be resolved by the execution but that, the real problems of Turkey would begin with it. I told him that the people of Turkey would not forget the execution in a few months. On the contrary, every Turk would carry the guilt of the execution for generations to come. I told General Gursel that Menderes would be immortalized and the tragedy would leave a deep scar on the face of Turkey and an equally deep schism in the body of her politics. When I left General Gursel's Office, Selim Sarper put his hand on my shoulder and said "God bless you". Earlier, I had a heated discussion with Colonel Alpaslan Turkes who, at that time, was a key figure in the junta. Turkey is still in the trauma of that tragedy. She has not recovered from that psychological shock.

Recently President Daud and members of his family were killed in the transformation in Afghanistan. It happened in the thick of a revolutionary battle. It was in the logic of the moment. It was not a pre-planned, cold-blooded and calculated judicial murder, such as I am to be the victim of. There is a qualitative difference between what transpires in the heat of the moment and a sordid conspiracy lingering on for months and months. One is like an earthquake or a

volcano. The other is like administering slow poison or like putting red ants on a chained body. However, what is the purpose of such primitive vengeance? In this case, it is selfish and retrograde. It is for the benefit of the coterie and not the people or the country. If the people wanted my head I would bow without demur. If I had lost the confidence or the respect of the people, I would not want to live. The tragedy of this drama is that the very opposite is true. Juntas gather advisers of all shades and hues. The mind of a junta is not susceptible to good advice. After the Second World War, it was said that the British would be to the Americans what the Greeks had been to the Romans. This did not happen because the Americans behaved like the Italians. The AICapones, the morons of a junta cannot understand the Greeks.

There is bound to be indignation and personal anger for what these barbarians have done to me. By me, I mean the whole lot of us, our friends and party loyalists. This notwithstanding, I am convinced that they have hurt national interests more. There is personal bitterness no doubt, but the impersonal hurt predominates over my personal feelings. These individuals have taken Pakistan back to 1947. In the process they have robbed the nation of the high ideals and spirit of fraternity the people shared and demonstrated in 1947. It is worse than saying we are back to square one or that we are right back to where we started from. Nations do not fall back to square one. Nations progress or they deteriorate explosively or decompose silently.

You are in the spring time of your years but living in a world of gloomy winter. There is a sense of foreboding everywhere. There is a troubled and turbulent world. There is a burgeoning mood of discontent and despair. In some parts it is worse than in others. In some countries the crisis is retrievable; in others, it has passed the point of no return. Humanity is on the throes of its worst crisis. This is the intensely critical situation which prompted Teng Hsiao-P'ing to ring the alarm bells on 9th of June, 1978 by telling the world to wake up to the realization that the Third World War is about to start.

I have written of the need for an honourable modus vivendi as a last resort to turn back from the brink. To tell you the truth, I am not very hopeful. I see destruction coming with an almost inevitable

persistence. For the sake of my children, for the sake of all my children the world over, I would like to see a modus vivendi. But if I were to think of my grand-children, all my grand-children everywhere, I would say, let the destruction come. Those who miraculously escape from the world-wide decimation will have the glorious opportunity of building the world anew, from scratch. The whole broken world will be at their feet. They will be the pilgrim father of a new world order, they will be the frontiersmen of a manifest destiny without limits. They will pick up the ashes and build newer and better sky lines. Each one of them will be a superior Frank Lloyd Wright and a superior Le Corbusier. Perhaps a dashing genius like Ricardo Bofill might survive the carnage and reach the soaring heights of Michelangelo or Gaudi according to his ambition. If the big explosion is to come let it come, as Confucius would say. The tension of the existing nightmare is without sublimation, without an outlet. The pulleys holding the top heavy world structure are cracking. The structure will come crumbling down. How long will make-shift arrangement hold a decrepit edifice with basic structural defects? Capitalism is at the end of the road. Communism has been bypassed and is suffering from internal conflict. The Third World has become the football of military dictators with big boots. The football is kicked around without the goal in sight. The flash points of the Third World War are: -

1. The Middle East
2. Central Europe
3. South Eastern Mediterranean
4. North East Asia
5. Africa

There are so many flash points, that the Third World War can break out in any insignificant corner. The champions are in the ring. They are shadow boxing at present. Let us see who gives the first punch. Will it be conventional punching all through the fight? It might start as a conventional fight, escalate into tactical nuclear war and finish with strategic nuclear weapons. The scope for tactical nuclear weapons is limited. This might explain the eagerness of the Super-Powers to come to an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons. But humanity will drag them into the holocaust. The Super-Powers cannot watch the destruction of the rest of the world from an elevated balcony. This might also explain partly why the militant youth of

Europe has opted for self-destruction on a smaller scale and in installments. The destruction is coming either in installments or in one swoop. Either through conventional means or through nuclear means, or both.

How do you prepare for it? You prepare for it not by siding with capitalism or communism, not by identifying yourself with one Super-Power or the other, but by having a communion with the people, by identifying yourself with the aspirations and yearnings of the masses. "Man is mightier than the megaton". You have to keep struggling until the bitter end for the dignity, self-respect and equality of the homosapien. Follow the footprints of the bare-footed ones. This lice in the hair of a poor child in your weapon. The dirty smell in the mud hut of a peasant is your poison gas. The strength of the masses can be judged by the depth of the furrow and the billowing smoke of the factory. The script of the ideology will come from the howls of a starving soul.

Please do not think I am evading a theoretical guide-line. Chairman Mao Tse-Tung delineated the concept of seeking truth from facts. I am guiding you to seek truth from the facts of the historical conditions of our society and to identify the problems. The correct solutions will come with the correct identification of the problems. Also draw on the fundamental documents I have written and speeches I have made from time to time, especially since the formation of the Pakistan Peoples Party. So much thought has crystallized that even our critics call it "Bhuttoism". I would not be so presumptuous. I will admit however, that the thoughts are indigenous, though within the perspective of Islamic history and those modern developments that have shaken the world. I am not an individual who is sitting in the back seat of a tonga, with the horse going forward and I looking backward all through the journey. Do not be afraid. A decline in courage is the first symptom in the decline of a civilization. You will be fully armed with both the right sort of weapons and ideology. Above all, God will guide you. He is the Master and the Maker.

Earlier, I have cautioned you against an outright pragmatist approach. Now I am cautioning you against an outright populist approach. Sometimes a populist decision is, in the long run, not beneficial to the masses. Neither pragmatism nor populism are

fundamental political and socio-economic doctrines. Nor do I say that you should play it by ear. I have made this melancholy analysis in anguish. My jail surroundings have not influenced my objectivity. I do not want to see the whole world in a death-cell merely because I am in a death cell. I do not say that the High Court has pronounced a death sentence on the world because a law court has pronounced a perverse death sentence on me. I would be the happiest man if the gloomy winter of mankind were to give way to a shaft of sunlight and to coloured flowers. The world is very beautiful. "A thing of beauty is a joy forever". There is the beauty of the landscape, of the tall mountain, the green plains, the humped deserts. There is the beauty of the flowers and the forests, of the azure oceans and the meandering rivers. There is the splendour of architecture, the magnificence of music, and the sparkle of the dance. Above all, there is the beauty of man and woman, the most perfect creations of God.

I am partial to the pantheism of Shelley. There is beauty everywhere. Even in a total war of annihilation it will not be possible to wipe out all of it. Beauty is too beautiful to perish altogether. In this period of twelve months in solitary confinement I have rarely recalled an unpleasant or ugly glimpse of the past. When I stare at the blank walls for hours on end, many flashes of the past cross my mind. Some glimpses of the past have reappeared which would never have come back to me if I had not been dumped here. I have again and again returned to the earliest days of my boyhood in Garhi Khuda Baksh Bhutto, to my school years in Bombay and my sparkling years at Berkeley and Oxford. The regal splendour of the Taj Mahal at Agra keeps returning, as do my halcyon days in Srinager, Gulmarg and Pahlgam. The vale of Kashmir is astonishingly beautiful. Europe, in her own way, is unsurpassable. Nobody can forget the serenity of a stroll in the Meadows of Christ Church or the spell-binding lure of Carmel by the sea in California.

Life is a love affair. There is a romance with every beauty of nature. I have no hesitation in saying that my most passionate love affair, my most thrilling romance has been with the people. There is an indissoluble marriage between politics and the people. That is why "Man is a political animal" and the state a political theatre. I have been on this stage of the masters for over twenty tumultuous years. I believe I still have a role to play. I believe the people still want me on

this stage, but if I have to bow out, I give you the gift of my feelings. You will fight the fight better than me. Your speeches will be more eloquent than my speeches. Your commitment equally total. There will be more youth and vitality in your struggle. Your deeds will be more daring. I transmit to you the blessing to the most blessed mission. This is the only present I can give you on your birthdays.

It would be bad politics to try and summarize a situation which is dynamic. Have faith in mankind and its mission. God the Creator is the God of all mankind. God is omnipotent yet. The Creator of this World and the World after this one has imposed on Himself the obligation to be kind and forgiving. No tin-pot dictator of a palm-tree society is capable of imposing any such obligations on himself. On the contrary, he vainly boasts that he is answerable and accountable to nobody.

Africa will ride herself of the maniacs. Africa will live to show that "Black is beautiful". Africa is ancient but Asia is ageless. Her nimble and graceful beauty has adorned civilization from the birth of mankind. Latin America has become the castanet of an international culture that links Andalusia to Arabia and the Caribbean. What beauty there is in the tap of her flamenco! Europe is glamorous and adorable, so seductive that she is still beautiful after a number of face lifts. America has been watergated. In that flow of stagnant waters you can behold beauty in its reflection. In etherial terms the whole world is beautiful. In physical terms I have rarely seen more scenic beauty than in California or in Taxes. What pains me is to see how the blind power of that most powerful society is turning that beauty into something as sinister as the portrait of Dorian Grey.

Religion is a link between God and man and man and man. Political ideology is a link between man and man. For this reason the great religions of the world like Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, the last of all religions, have outlived and outlasted political ideologies. If an unlearned adventurer in his quest for political power and perpetuation brings religion down from its celestial plane to a mundane level by converting it into a narrow political ideology, the adventurer endangers the link between God and man and man and man.

There are four personal matters with which I would like to conclude:

1) When I married your mother in September 1951, I took her to Istanbul for our honeymoon. Istanbul is a beautiful city, it is the physical bridge between the East and the West. However, I took her to Istanbul because I wanted to walk hand in hand with her through the corridors of the most gallant and glorious chapters of Islamic history. The history of Islam is inspiring but nowhere is it more inspiring on a continuous course than it is in Turkey.

2) Since my youth I have fought genuinely against British imperialism. I have had a fierce hatred for imperialism, but I do not have any rancour left when I think of those degrading days. It is a closed chapter. You cannot live on the memory of a past struggle when you are engaged totally in the struggle of the present.

3) On 15th June, 1978 General Shaukat came to see me as I was indisposed. He had operated on me in the Civil and Military Hospital, Rawalpindi in 1963 when I was Foreign Minister, We remembered that when I was coming under the influence of chloroform, I kept repeating that I would not allow the Government to hang Akber Bugti. I kept calling for Akber Bugti and Khair Baksh Marri. How strange are the zigzags of historical events? In 1973, as President of Pakistan I came into confrontation with the same Baloch leaders for the sake of Pakistan. If perchance your path crosses their paths, please tell them that I believe that the Baloch is the son of a brave father and a proud mother. Both the bravery and the pride fall exquisitely into place on his handsome face.

4) In the winter of 1957 when you were four years old, we were sitting on the terrace of "Al-Murtaza". It was a fine morning. I had a double-barrel gun in my hand. One barrel was 22 and the other 480. Without thought, I shot a wild parrot.

When the parrot fell to the ground near the terrace you cried your eyes out. You had it buried in your presence. You cried and cried. You refused to have your meals. A dead parrot in the winter of 1957 in Larkana made a little girl weep in sorrow. Twenty-one years later, that little girl has grown into a young lady with nerves of steel to

valourously confront the terror of the longest night of tyranny. Truly, you have proved beyond doubt that the blood of warriors runs in your veins.

What I write is full of infirmities. I have been in solitary confinement for twelve months and in a death cell for three months, deprived of all facilities. I have written much of this by resting the paper on my thigh in unbearable heat. I have no reference material or library, I have rarely seen the blue sky. The quotations are from the few books I was permitted to read and from the journals and newspapers you and your mother bring once a week during your visits to my suffocating cell. I am not making excuses for my deficiencies but it is very difficult to rely on a fading memory in such physical and mental conditions.

I am fifty years old and you are exactly half my age. By the time you reach my age, you must accomplish twice as much as I have achieved for the people. Mir Ghulam Murtaza, my son and heir, is not with me. Nor are Shah Nawaz and Sanam-Seema. This message has to be shared with them as a part of my heritage. Mir Sain is a close friend of the son of Robert Kennedy. That youthful leader of America wrote:

“Every generation has its central concern, whether to end war, erase racial injustice, or improve the condition of the working man. Today’s young people appear to have chosen for their concern the dignity of the individual human being, they demand a limitation upon excessive power. They demand a government that speaks directly and honestly to its citizens. The possibilities are too great, the generation only the prophetic lament of Tennyson:

‘Ah, what shall I be at fifty, should nature keep me alive, if I find the world so bitter, when I am but twenty-five?’”

