

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

Politics of Charisma



Reproduced by

Sani Hussain Panhwar

Member Sindh Council, PPP

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

Politics of Charisma

**A Collection of Articles of Shaheed Z. A.
Bhutto**

Reproduced by:

**Sani Hussain Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP**

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto
Politics of Charisma

Edited by

Syed Abdul Quddus

Reproduced by:

Sani Hussain Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP

CONTENTS

MESSAGE

1. Message from the Prime Minister of Pakistan
Benazir Bhutto 7
2. Symbol of nation's pride and honour
Benazir Bhutto 9

ARTICLES

1. Introduction
Syed Abdul Quddus 12
2. Charisma in Leadership
Syed Abdul Quddus 14
3. Politics of Charisma
Professor Sajjad Naseer 19
4. The Dependent Variable
Professor Sajjad Naseer 23
5. The Bhutto Phenomenon
Syed Afzal Haider 27
6. Attributes of a Revolutionary Leader
Doctor M. R. Khan 31
7. Dead Bhutto Governs the Living, Valery
Giscard D'Estaing (Former President of France) .. 33
8. Living with the Bhutto Cult
Likhari 37
9. Consensus and Ideology in Bhutto's Politics
Doctor S.M. Haider 40

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 10. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto-Quaid-e-Awam Ahmad F. Jivanjee | 44 |
| 11. | Bhutto and the Punjab by excerpts from a letter written by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto | 47 |
| 12. | Bhutto Remembered Mir Jamil-ur-Rahman | 49 |
| 13. | Remembering Bhutto Wajid Shamsul Hassan | 52 |
| 14. | In Remembrance Ikramus Saqlain Haider | 56 |
| 15. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: A Tribute Salman Taseer | 59 |
| 16. | To the Gallows Salman Taseer | 61 |
| 17. | Murdering the Mesiah Basharat Hussain Qizilbash | 65 |
| 18. | Soviet Union Warned Bhutto of U.S. plot against Him Khalid Hasan | 69 |
| 19. | How the World judged the judgment Parvez Ali | 75 |
| 20. | Bhutto - in the Struggle of Life and Death Syed Amir Hyder Kazmi | 80 |
| 21. | At what time was Bhutto really hanged? Rashid Saeed | 83 |
| 22. | They could not kill Bhutto Raja Shahid Zafar | 86 |
| 23. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto as seen by General Gul Hassan, Dr. Afzal Iqbal | 89 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 24. | Two Landmarks Farhatullah Babar | 92 |
| 25. | Pure Populist Politician Aitzaz Ahsan | 96 |
| 26. | Bhutto, Some Recollections M. Azim Khan | 97 |
| 27. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Kashmir Professor Khan Zaman Mirza | 100 |
| 28. | Bhutto and the Making of 1973 Constitution Syed Afzal Haider | 109 |
| 29. | Bhutto Charter for Benazir I. A. Rehman | 117 |
| 30. | My Dearest Daughter Zulfikar Ali Bhutto | 126 |
| 31. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: The Victim of Western Imperialism Dr. Saadat Saeed | 183 |
| 32. | Zab: The Architect of Islamic Socialism Amjad Hussain | 185 |
| 33. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed-A Great Intellectual Mirza Humayun Zaman | 189 |
| 34. | Bhutto: Leader of the Downtrodden Muazzam Khalil | 192 |
| 35. | Legend of Popularity Arslan Rariq Bhatti | 195 |
| 36. | Bhutto: The Man and the Enigma Muslitaq Ahmad | 198 |
| 37. | Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: Not an Ordinary Man Altaf Qureshi | 202 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 38. | Bhutto's Charisma Lives on Wajid Shamsul Hasan | 207 |
| 39. | Did he Consolidate or Break Pakistan? Farhatullah Babar | 210 |
| 40. | Bhutto's Legacy The Editorial "The Nation" Daily, April 4, 1994 | 213 |
| 41. | Nails in the Coffin of Democracy Hashim Raza | 216 |
| 42. | The Youthful Ideals of Z.A. Bhutto Zeno | 221 |
| 43. | Pindi Jail was not too old to be demolished Sadiq Jaffery | 226 |

**MESSAGE FROM THE
PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN
BENAZIR BHUTTO**

Today we celebrate the 61st birthday of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pakistan's first directly elected Prime Minister and Founder-Chairman of Pakistan People's Party. His life was a clarion call to the dispossessed and the down-trodden to rid them of despair by seizing control of their own destiny.

He was a visionary and a statesman who saved Pakistan from disintegration after the military regime of Gen. Yahya Khan had left the country in the ashes of defeat. A nation demoralized by the disgraceful surrender at Dacca was revitalized and reborn as he took the nation to the heights of glory.

He gave the country the only unanimous Constitution, the democratic, representative and Islamic Constitution of 1973, which became the rallying cry of the entire opposition during its battle against the usurpation of power by the military regime in 1977. Under his auspices, the second Islamic Summit Conference was held at Lahore where more Muslim Monarchs Presidents and Prime Ministers gathered than at any time in Muslim history. The measure of Muslim unity in his time was symbolized by the Muslim Heads of State and Government bowing in submission before Almighty Allah at Lahore's Badshahi Mosque. It was here that he coined the term "Soldier of Islam" and considered every Muslim cause his own. During the Ramazan War, soldiers of Pakistan assisted Arab countries in their hour of need.

He was a builder, and the concrete and stone monuments he built stand in silent memory to the era of progress and prosperity. He built not only monuments but modern Taj Mahals of development-- the Karakorum Highway, the Steel Mills, the Heavy Mechanical Complex at Taxila, the Mirage Rebuild factory.

His voice was the voice of the poor and he broke the hack of an inequitable and exploitative system to give peasants land, and labour their right. He believed in the idealism of the youth and built colleges for them across every district. He built hospitals and technical complexes; he built the first fertilizer factory of South Asia in Pakistan. He carried the world development -- *tarraqi* which his enemies mocked at the time but were obliged to ape with the passage of time.

He was a man of courage and integrity who believed that the honour of the people was his own honour. He was fearless in his defiance` of the military dictatorship refusing to compromise with them. He defied death and became a martyr. His suffering became the suffering of the nation, his victory in death, the victory of the nation; his martyrdom the inspiration of the democratic struggle as thousands of youth stepped forward with the battle cry "*Jeay Bhutto*". Throughout the world, his name reverberated in the homes of exiles, in the demonstrations for freedom, in the movements to overthrow dictatorship. He haunted the enemies of the people in the portals of power. State power` state patronage, state machinery could not quell the tide waters of his idea and concept for freedom, dignity and an end to poverty. The triumph of the Party on November 16, 1988, was his triumph, and the triumph of all those, who believed in a modern scientific society where men and women moved to build a great nation.

Such men as he live forever.

He lives in each one of us, us who believe in peace, progress and prosperity.
"*Zinda Hai Bhutto, Zinda Hai*".

SYMBOL OF NATION'S PRIDE AND HONOUR - BENAZIR

How do we pay homage to a martyr who was larger than life? Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed marched like a colossus across the world stage, articulating the aspirations of the down-trodden and dispossessed of the Third World. He challenged them to “arise” and seize their destiny, to break the shackles of exploitation and oppression, to hold high their heads in honour and dignity. With his defiant death, his great courage and heroic martyrdom he transcended the barriers of time and place and became embedded in the heart of history. A symbol of the nation’s pride and honour, a most charismatic leader of our times, pre-eminent among political leaders, he left an overwhelming effect on our generations and indeed his influence, his vision continues to serve as a beacon light ten years after he left this world.

Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the poetry and music of the people’s struggle. The quest for change and a new order based on justice and egalitarianism, an order free of exploitation, can be traced in his epic struggle. He spoke to the people in their language. He owed them his success. He was their undisputed leader. He freed the masses from the tyrants and brought a smile on the faces of those who had only known tears since the dawn of the Indus civilization. The most hostile propaganda spread over a decade, the opera of hate, could not erase his everlasting memory.

As we sit today to reflect on the canvas of his life which was spent in a perpetual state of struggle and in the service of the people, we can examine the contours of the magnificent political awakening that he infused in the country.

The span of his life was cut brutally short, yet his name became synonymous with many achievements -- with the Security Council, with Kashmir, with Tashkent, with China, with the prisoners of war, with the Simla Agreement, with the Constitution, with the Reprocessing Plant, with the Reforms with *Roti, Kapra Aur Makan* with Mochi Gate, with the Awami Era, with the slogan of “*Jiye Bhutto*”. His passionate attachment to the dream of Islamic renaissance and to revive the pristine concept of Islamic brotherhood manifested itself in the historic Islamic Summit at Lahore. His genius at diplomatic maneuvering was dazzling. If he were to be judged only by that he might perhaps be considered the most brilliant statesman of his time.

He was a reformist and gave a new direction to labour, health, education, engineering, peasants and uplift of women during his term. He saved Pakistan from despair and laid the basis of a modern industrial state. He sought to make Pakistan self-sufficient and self-reliant. The research centers in agriculture to defence stand as silent monuments to his greatness. In five years he restored the dignity of a defeated nation. He authored a unanimous Islamic, democratic, representative constitution. He built the Heavy Mechanical Complex, Kamra Rebuild Factory, Machine Tools Factory and the Karakoram Highway. From the Khunjrab Pass to the Bin Qasim Port, he cast his shadow. Each stone bears his imprint. His message in martyrdom to future generations was "Arise, Arise, my friends. Rise above personal Interest. There is no greater life than the life in the service and dedication to Humanity, to Flag and Country."

PART TWO

ARTICLES

INTRODUCTION

Bhutto in death is bigger than life. Much has been written about Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and much more will be written in tomorrow's world. It is not merely a futuristic vision but a fact of life, rather a fact of history. No doubt, Bhutto is equaled by very few people in the history of the world and most certainly by none in the contemporary Pakistan. When he walked in grace to the gallows, Bhutto was already immortal. But more importantly he grows in stature with every day that passes since his assassination on 4th April, 1979. His strength lies in his politics of charisma. What he owes to the present day world is the charisma in leadership. Therefore, he would go in the history of politics as the charismatic leader.

With this back drop, the present study is a compilation having three dimensions. Part one contains messages on his death anniversaries by his dearest daughter Benazir Bhutto, Prime Minister of Pakistan; and, of course, messages from Begum Nusrat Bhutto. Part two consists of articles from scholars and intellectuals, professors and politicians. This part really offers a kaleidoscopic view of the multi dimensional personality of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. It is an eloquent testimony to the fact as to how the nation has been living all these years with the Bhutto cult, and will continue to do so as Bhutto lives with us again. Part three of the book is Bhutto himself, posing the question: If I am assassinated. And this is not only the Epilogue of the book but the Epitaph of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. There could not possibly be a better finale of this elegy in prose than the most eloquent words of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto himself: "If I am assassinated." "An element of the gruesome has entered the politics of Pakistan with the hanging of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Bhutto dead is far from damned. For, tried by a fettered of justice, his crimes -- whatever they were - - are obscured by martyrdom. Written in his death cell, this passionate statement is Bhutto's last testament for history - surviving every attempt at its suppression by Pakistan's military dictator." That was how International Herald Tribune, Paris, summed up Bhutto's martyrdom.

I shall conclude this Introduction to the book: "Zulfikar Ali Bhutto -- Politics of Charisma" with the words; "Workers of the world unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a world to win!" To quote Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, I shall not end on this revolutionary note: I shall conclude with the quotation with which Jawaharlal Nehru ended *The Discovery of India*," the last book he wrote in jail before taking command of a free and democratic India. It is a quotation from Ostrovosky's "How the Steel was Tempered" It says:

Man's clearest possession is his life, and since it is given to him to live but once, he must so live as not to be scared with the shame of a cowardly and trivial past, so live as not to be tortured for years without purpose, that dying he can say, 'All my life and my strength were given to the first course in the world -- the liberation of mankind.'

While remembering Bhutto, let me borrow the words of Valery Giscard D'Estaing, Former President of France: "Dead Bhutto governs the living." Bhutto is dead, long live Bhutto!

CHARISMA IN LEADERSHIP

In the grey fabric of Pakistan's public life, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has been the only thread of scarlet. One can see in him the philosophic unity of a chaotic and manifold world. But all he had conquered were the minds and hearts of Pakistan's impoverished people.

It is not easy to tell the story of a man who has not only been passionately adored but also bitterly attacked and opposed. So many years have passed today since his execution, and he still remains the undisputed focus of our politics. What may be called the Bhutto phenomenon is verily the story of today's Pakistan. He lives, with a sense of urgency that flows from headlines every morning, in the minds of both his admirers and his detractors.

The story can be told in the context of those who still cherish the dream that is his legacy, and of those who have sought to denigrate it. In either case, he has become synonymous with Pakistan's destiny. His name defines the polarization that will decide whether Pakistan can survive as a progressive democracy, a federation founded on equalitarian system.

At a time when the country is groping for a political sense of direction in a deepening darkness, the story should better be told in terms of the party that he formed several years ago, the ideas that he planted in the minds of the people and the indelible awareness he aroused across the scorching plains of this sorrowing land.

Admittedly, it would be difficult to be objective about this assessment. Mr. Bhutto was a charismatic leader and his kind of leadership has an uncanny way of intruding into the personal lives of all those who are touched by it. Mr. Bhutto has touched us all. We cannot be indifferent to him. We must relate to him in an emotional manner. We must try and look at the history of recent years in as dispassionate an analysis as possible. After all, we have to come to terms with this phase in our country's history. We have to look back not just in anger or grief but in an honest attempt to search for answers to our present dilemma.

We should begin with simple questions. How did Mr. Bhutto become a charismatic leader? What did he possess which was denied to scores of other leaders vying for popular attention and unflinching loyalty? Did he have some magic? And why was that magic not transient? Why have all those concerted

attempts by the Martial Law regime failed to erase his influence? Why have his followers suffered imprisonment, torture and even sentences of death to carry on the torch that radiates his message? Why does he remain, after death, the most important political force in the country?

We can begin to ponder these questions by looking at the party that he founded. The “Pakistan People’s Party”, of course was not the launching pad for Mr. Bhutto’s political career. At a remarkably young age, he had made his mark on the national stage, and had given a new direction to Pakistan’s foreign policy as its brilliant Foreign Minister in the early sixties. But he really charted out an independent course for himself when he walked out of Ayub Khan’s faltering cabinet and responded to the challenge of the time to launch a movement for democracy.

The Pakistan People’s Party was born in adversity. It was founded under a tent pitched on the lawns of a private residence in Lahore’s Gulberg because nobody was prepared to lend or hire a hall to the rebellious group led by Mr. Bhutto. From its inception, thus, the party had to battle against formidable odds. Crisis has been its constant companion. This has really been the story of the survival of the fittest in the face of gruesome challenges.

A reference to the newspaper of the mornings after November 29 and 30, December 1, 1967 when the party convention was held will offer little evidence of this momentous development in the history of Pakistan because the reports were suppressed. But the spark was visible to those who knew that it had originated in Mr. Bhutto’s desire to change the Pakistan society to restructure social relationships and to develop a consciousness and morality consistent with the policy of the state.

By all means, it was a new kind of party. We all know what has happened to the various reincarnations of Muslim League. We all know about the lonely bands of religious obscurantists marauding the political landscape. But here was a party that boldly articulated the aspirations of the disenfranchised people of Pakistan by declaring that all power belongs to ‘the people. Its slogans were not meant to camouflage the real issues. It was a social democratic party and its social programme placed it to the left of the centre. It was committed to democracy. This claim was vindicated by the support it readily received from the masses who had never before in this country been mobilized into any meaningful political action.

Immediately after its formation, the party was thrown into a bitter struggle against Ayub Khan’s dictatorial regime. This movement bred what later was attributed as Mr. Bhutto’s charisma. Most of the anti Ayub demonstrations

became almost exclusively a PPP affair. It was at this stage that the coalition of support for the party began to be formed. Students were the vanguard of the movement. Soon workers and other sections of society also stepped forward.

But Ayub Khan, defying the constitution that he had himself decreed out by handing power over to the army junta. Finally, the stage was set for Pakistan's first general elections and after two years of its formation the PPP was thrown into a campaign which lasted a whole year. It was this campaign of 1970 which witnessed a quiet revolution in Pakistan's politics. Thanks to the covenant established by Mr. Bhutto with the people in what was then West Pakistan. We will never be the same again.

How did it happen? Mr. Bhutto went straight to the masses with a message that changed the concept of social relationship in a predominantly feudal society for all times to come. Just as he had raised the banner of civil liberties during the movement against Ayub Khan, he now projected the new vision of an equalitarian society. His rapport with the masses baffled observers. This was sheer magic. For the first time in history, he took politics to the villages and to isolated hamlets and to the multitude. He spoke in a new idiom. He sowed the seeds of ideas that will never die.

And as he made new friends by millions, erasing in one stroke their inferiority complex nurtured through centuries he scared the defenders of the establishment into a conspiratorial unity against the PPP. Initially, they deluded themselves by not taking this new phenomenon seriously. It was argued that the massive turnout at Mr. Bhutto's public meetings was different from support at polling booths. They called it a circus. They did not want to believe that the feudal lords could be defeated in their hereditary citadels of power. They thought that the '*biradari*' system was impregnable.

As the awakening of the masses seemed more and more formidable, they mobilized their forces to attack Mr. Bhutto and PPP. Religious obscurantists were sent into battle. Mr. Bhutto was branded a '*Kafir*'. Big business rallied against him. Conspiracies were hatched in the corridors of power. Attempts were made to intimidate his supporters. There were even murderous assaults. At the same time, the true nature of Mr. Bhutto's appeal and its depth was not fully realized by his detractors until the ballots for the December elections had been counted. Until the very last moment, they were hiding from the breathtaking reality of Pakistan's new politics.

For countless people, December 7, 1970, was a red-letter day. It is incredible that the simple act of casting one's ballot in the national elections has been such a rare event in a country created on democratic principles. We have fought more wars

than we have had proper general elections and what we have lost on the battlefield is insignificant compared to what we must suffer for lack of a regular recourse to popular will. In any case, it was the first time in Pakistan's history that ordinary people, the real masters of this country had an opportunity to offer their verdict on how Pakistan should be governed. The results, in the then West Pakistan, were a resounding victory for the PPP. Out of 144 National Assembly seats, it won 88.

An understanding of what these results signified is crucial. Here was an authentic, irrefutable projection of Pakistan's political reality -- a truth which has persistently been denied by those who live in the high mansions of privilege. Mr. Bhutto had been redeemed in the only court where judgments of history are recorded. A new era had begun.

We know how in the subcontinent, certain passions are raised to a whirlwind, a high fever, for only temporary periods. But the immortal longings that Mr. Bhutto had stirred in the hearts of the dispossessed were not transient. The real nature of this revolution is still to be fully appreciated. It is confirmed by the popular support that Mr. Bhutto and the PPP have continued to enjoy through all the bleeding encounters. All the might of the autocratic regime and their scheming collaborators has not been able to suppress that awakening first revealed by those elections in December, 1970.

The trust that the people of Pakistan had reposed in the PPP has not been revoked even for a single moment. And that is the basis of the continuing confrontation between the illegal rulers and the people of Pakistan. It is true that the 1970 elections came too soon after the formation of the PPP. Immediately after its formation, the party was embroiled in the movement against Ayub Khan. The year-long campaign was very hectic. Mr. Bhutto had to compress the work of decades into months. To be able to do this was a phenomenal achievement, a herculean task in the annals of any country's political history. His campaign of 1970 was outstanding in many respects. As if through magic, he electrified the entire population became the only point of reference and has continued to be so even today.

But election victory was not something to rest upon even if it marked the beginning of yet another dangerous, testing time for Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's Awami League, riding on the genuine grievances of the then East Pakistan, the six-points which betrayed a thrust for secession and the devastating cyclone of November 1970, swept the polls in the Eastern Wing. But Awami League did not have a single member of its party elected in the Western part of the country -- just as the PPP did not have any electoral presence in the other Wing. It was a

very hazardous situation and the Martial Law regime of Yahya Khan was found simply incapable of resolving the crisis.

The position adopted by it has been delineated in Mr. Bhutto's eloquent narrative, "The Great Tragedy." The party demanded a Grand Coalition of the two major parties to save the Federation and made every effort to meet the essential demands of the Awami League. But the 'great tragedy' was forced upon the nation by the Martial Law regime's fatal attempt to resolve the political situation through military means.

For the PPP, period from March 1971 to December 1971 was the most frustrating in its career. Mr. Bhutto continued to press for a political solution and transfer of power to elected representatives. What culminated in the fall of Dhaka -is a testimony to what Mr. Bhutto had said in "The Great Tragedy," in August, 1971, that "all ways but one led to destruction."

POLITICS OF CHARISMA

Charismatic personalities have come to dominate political proceedings in many third world politics. In this context the other potent fact of political life is the prolonged rule by uniform men, who in some cases conveniently wear the garb of civilian rulers in a bid to seek legitimacy! Each type of government constitutes a distinct category and the fall out effects of its respective rule has made peculiar manifestations on the political system.

Pakistan presents a case, where charismatic ruler and personality ruler chased each other in an uneasy interaction and looked their respective political and extra-political forces in a conflict situation that has come to be known as the polarized nature of Pakistani polity. This, more or less caused a stalemate in the politics of Pakistan and the trend persists since 1977, making it difficult for the political system to function on democratic lines. The malfunctioning of the system has generated a host of problems; the most explosive one is that of ethnicity.

Generally, the political climate in the third world has been hospitable in welcoming charismatic rulers. The cultural pattern or variable (traditional society's orientations towards leaders) may act as a facilitator for the appearance of charismatic leaders but they don't satisfy the "necessary conditions" for their emergence. Such leaders arise in societies where 'strongman' alternatives don't exist as a dominant cultural trait. Thus if culture fails to offer a convincing explanation for the appearance of charismatic authority, where do we turn for a satisfactory exposition? Political observers argue that necessary conditions occur at a particular juncture in the history of modernizing society.

In fact, celebrated sociologist, Max Weber offers a precise and lucid exposition to understand the emergence of charismatic leader. His rise, he argues, is contingent on the fact when (a) there is a decrease in the legitimacy of old traditional authority; (no longer do men wish to obey out of habit) (b) when coercive deterrence of a "despotic" power is weak or declining relatively; and (c) when "rational-legal" institutions are also weak and underdeveloped.

In the historical context, the traditional institutions of authority are gradually dying and modern ones are struggling to find a shape; and forces desiring coercive apparatus are relatively weak *vis-a-vis* newly socially mobilized,

frustrated and angry groups. It is in this gap, into this climate of uncertainty that the charismatic leader walks in with rhetoric, ideology and a code book to capture the hearts and minds of the people. Men like Mao in China and Castro in Cuba even raised military forces to crush old order. Thus it is the charismatic leader's artful rhetoric and skilful political command that cause social revolution to occur.

Before we proceed to relate this phenomenon to the available evidence, it will be desirable to explain the word Charisma briefly. The term refers to an extraordinary quality of a person, regardless of whether this quality is actual, alleged or presumed. Men submit to him because of his capacity for magical acts. There is a mystique around him for great acts. Charismatic authority commands allegiance only because people believe that it will lead them into the 'promised land'. As the charismatic leader operates in conditions of tension, uncertainty and unpredictability and presides over a destruction of the past, his capacity to develop the new promised order suffers. He does not have the resources matching his grand plans, nor succeeds in restructuring the system to achieve the stated goals. His policies fail to deliver the goods causing disenchantment among his followers. This is described as waning of the charisma. Leader like Mao, had to salvage his declining charisma by plunging in the 'Cultural Revolution' a device which proved only temporary and after his departure from the scene, a new set of policies pushed China on a different path to development. Charisma faces yet another problem when its posture begins to present a routine look; the rhetoric is used frequently without much action thereby eroding the faith in the leader. The charismatic leader is also trapped by his own symbols and starts treating symbols as ends instead of means.

He views himself as indispensable for the country and treats even constructive criticism as treason. There is also an unhappy ending to such a rule as charismatic rule causes a serious crisis of succession. Such a rule is generally followed by an 'illegitimate' authority type -- a military dictatorship.

Leaders who spearheaded nationalist movements succeeded in mobilizing the masses and made them believe in their capacity to expel the colonialist masters and bring home to them the cherished fruits of freedom and material well being. As struggle continued, various acts of sacrifice by the leaders helped them acquire legitimate credentials of charismatic leadership. While these leaders carried on the struggle, they also defined the contours of a philosophy which would guide them to rule their respective societies. Rhetoric, catchwords, and even a code book was used by such leaders to enlist support/following of the people which become almost unanimous. On assuming charge of their independent countries, the charismatic leaders like Nehru, Saekarno, Mao and Nakhroma etc., faced little or no organised opposition to their rule. Euphoria of

independence in fact facilitated the task of ruling their respective societies comfortably in initial years. At the macro level, these leaders moved on to establish modern institutions in an attempt to achieve their ambitiously stated goals. Where these leaders succeeded in organizing political authority like in India, political stability ensued and political machine was operated with reference to norms and rules. The legal-rational institutions became subordinate to the political power and traditional patterns of authority started interacting with modern institutions thereby creating problems of sorts. Charismatic leadership did succeed in providing at least interim stability in most cases but in the case of India and China, political power was institutionalized.

Pakistan missed the opportunity of its share of charismatic leader. The Father of the Nation passed away in 1948 and the absence of this kind of leadership created problems in terms of political stability. Ten years of uneasy political management resulted in the first Martial Law in Pakistan. The authoritarian rule in the 1960s was responsible for the conditions which led to the secession of East Pakistan.

The break-up of the country left the people in West Pakistan in a state of shock. In this climate of uncertainty, confusion and disillusionment, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto walked in as a charismatic leader and people generally accepted him in those trying circumstances to lead the country from despair to hope. The decayed past offered opportunities to build a new and bright future. The paralysis of authority in view of the military debacle further facilitated the task of emergence of the charismatic leader. The rhetoric of *Roti, Kapra and makan* (food cloth, shelter) and Islamic Socialism as a political creed was used to put the country on the path of development.

The circumstances obtaining in Pakistan at this juncture approximated to the conditions at the time of independence of colonized territories. One qualitative difference, however, separated Pakistan from those countries and that was the charismatic leader's birth which came about after more than 20 years of the independence of the country. This had important implications in our context.

It will be appropriate at this point to puncture the Weberian formulation about the charismatic leader and rationalize the prevailing realities in Pakistan. The vacuum of power caused by termination of colonial rule was filled by charismatic leaders in most countries and the legal-rational institutions were made to play a subordinate role. Pakistan having missed the charismatic rule in the beginning and being governed by military ruler during the 1960s, the civil-military institutions became dominant in power politics of the country. Instead of playing a subordinate role to the political bosses, the military aided by the

civil, occupied the driving seat. The civil and military complex, developed vested interests and entrenched themselves in position of power.

The climate obtaining in Pakistan in 1971 indeed facilitated the emergence of Bhutto as a charismatic leader. The civil-military suffered eclipse and the image of the military was tarnished. Bhutto was able to wield immense power and introduced a host of reforms in an attempt to restructure the Pakistan system. The mobilized masses, who were fed on his rhetoric, continued to lend support to his various policy measures. But the entrenched power centers were threatened by these changes and they began to organize opposition against him.

The military intervention brought an end to his rule rather prematurely. His unnatural disappearance from the political scene kept him alive during the 1980s and the Bhutto myth manifests itself in the form of the *Daughter of the East*. As this charisma did not wane in the normal way, the magic of his personality kept his following intact.

The visit of charismatic leader in Pakistan collided with the rational-legal institutions, who in fact, became actual power players in the body-politics of Pakistan. This confrontation has resulted in what is described as the polarized nature of the Pakistani polity.

The role of charismatic leader has become limited in view of the problems thrown up by the modernization process. We have reached a point in history where new arrangements will have to be worked out to make the political system viable and functional.

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The social scientists are generally prone to describing political leadership as a dependent variable'. This implies that the possible leadership forms and styles of any given time and place are believed to be dependent on socio-economic, and cultural milieu. In part this formulation enjoys validity and political leaders can be viewed as the product of the conditions surrounding them. However, this ignores another reality of the political processes, when political leadership becomes an 'independent variable'. Such leadership serves as catalyst in the society and brings about major transformation in socioeconomic and political fields. Leaders, like, Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung played a decisive role in giving definite direction and shape to their respective societies. Mikhail Gorbachev, who is described as enigmatic by some and visionary by others, has struck a shattering blow to the world order erected in the wake of World War II and has presented to the world leaders the formidable challenge of the century to restructure the international system. Scholars who adhere to the concept of leadership as an 'independent variable' assert that the role of the leader seems decisive in changing the course of history.

Between these two postulates, we will make an attempt to categorize the Pakistani political leadership. Maybe, the Pakistani leadership outfit defies accommodation in the state positions or clearly falls in one category. The following discussion will examine political leadership in this context focusing on the top leadership.

To understand the nature of political leadership in modernizing politics, the classification of Max Weber, the celebrated German sociologist is most helpful. Weber formulated that some men willingly obeyed political authority out of habit, others out of devotion to a particular person, and still others because political authority facilitated a pursuit of their private or public interests. These three authority patterns are distributed in a given society in different ways but Weber recognised that one or another of them might be dominant in concrete situations.

Weber's treatment of leadership thus identifies three legitimate ideal authority types: men who obey out of habit legitimize traditional authority; those who obey out of devotion and faith in spectacular "pay off" legitimize charismatic authority; and those who obey out of interest legitimize rational legal authority.

In the modernizing politics the first of these three is exercised primarily by traditional religious leaders, caudillos, tribal chiefs, monarchs, feudals, and similar entities, the second, at one time or another by such outstanding personages as Mao Tse-tung, Soekarno, Kwame Nkrumah, Fidel Castro and Bhutto; and the third is exercised by modern bureaucratic forms of authority which generally exist in the developed countries of the world.

With due deference to Weber's formulation of ideal authority types, some modifications seem to be necessary in case of Pakistan. Feudals, for instance, owed their existence to the colonial masters, and as such were dependent on the 'state structure' for their continued presence and functioning in the system. Whereas feudals represented traditional authority in their 'local context', their ability to assert in relation to 'state functionaries' was extremely limited. This class was manipulated by the colonial rulers and the pattern 'generally' has remained unchanged in the post-colonial period.

Similarly the religious leaders and *pirs* enjoy tremendous following among the people and they exert influence of varying degrees. Whereas such leadership has aided the political leaders to use their rhetoric for mobilizing the people, no religious leader has occupied a top power position in Pakistan.

The tribal chiefs are either co-opted or punished for resisting the encroachment/penetration by the 'state authority.' (Traditional authority is not an autonomous power centre).

Since Pakistan lost its two towering personalities in its initial years, rule by a charismatic leader made no impression on the Pakistani political landscape. Later, Bhutto's claim to this status is seriously disputed in view of the polarized nature of the society, but his name remains a potent and dominant force in Pakistan's politics. (Short spell of his rule had far reaching consequences for the Pakistani system).

So far as the role of rational-legal authority is concerned, the presence of bureaucracy needs to be understood in our context quite differently from the Weberian conceptualization. The colonial rulers established the civil-military institutions primarily to perpetuate their rule. Interestingly enough, the civil bureaucracy delivered the goods efficiently, and during their 150 years long stay here, the colonialists never faced a situation where they had to impose martial law over the entire country. The assumptions on which this bureaucratic edifice rested never underwent any change to come to terms with the needs and aspirations of an 'independent country.' In fact, the bureaucracy expanded its role due to different compulsions and Martial law became a regular feature in Pakistan. The civil military bureaucracy actually assumed power time and again

and went far beyond the parameters of legal-rational authority. (Role of the bureaucracy as the real wielder of power is to be understood in the special Pakistani context).

We need to distance ourselves from the ideal authority types of Weber and must wallow in the Pakistani political theatre to identify the top political leaders; in fact the rulers.

Pakistan inherited the vice-regal system, and the same started functioning after amending the Government of India Act 1935. In the initial years, three governments in West Pakistan were formed by British ICS officers. The chief secretary in East Pakistan monitored the activities of the elected chief minister to the governor general. In fact the norms of the British colonial system persisted. After the passing away of two top political leaders, the bureaucracy was able to manipulate the power politics as it was the only organised institution. From 1951 to 1956, we had Ghulam Muhammad (bureaucrat) who dissolved the Constituent Assembly, Ch. Mohammad Ali (bureaucrat) who was able to present the 1956 constitution, Sikandar Mirza (bureaucrat) who invited Ayub to impose Martial Law and Ayub Khan (military bureaucrat) who assumed power in October 1958.

It is obvious that the 50s were dominated by key bureaucrats and they were largely responsible for making decisions which had far-reaching consequences. These bureaucrats enjoyed power but their claim to political leadership was questionable. Ch. Muhammad Ali was never the leader of any group/groups nor the establishment of Nizam-i-Islam Party gave him the leadership credentials. As these bureaucrats never represented any political forces, they were rendered irrelevant to the Pakistani scheme of politics.

The decade of 60s was dominated by the military bureaucrats who made momentous decisions in the political history of Pakistan. Both Ayub and Yahya wielded enormous power but they cannot be described as political leaders.

Bhutto as a political leader came as the only exception to the rule. However, his rise to eminence was through the Ayubian system. Through nurtured by the system, he was able to establish his political credentials independently. Precisely for this reason he and his myth through his daughter represent the powerful political force in the Country today.

Zit's rule was again that of a military bureaucrat who tampered the political arrangements of the 1973 Constitution. Junejo, with a relatively unknown politician became the prime minister only to be sacked by Zia.

The post 1988 elections also brought Ghulam Ishaq Khan (bureaucrat) to the office of the president. Aided and backed by the 8th amendment, he dissolved the assemblies and dismissed the prime minister.

In the Pakistani context, the leadership in terms of occupying the top power position has come mostly from the civil-military complex. Political leadership, with the exception of Bhutto, remained a 'dependent variable' and was brought to the front seat due to expediencies of sorts. The establishment emerges as the 'independent variable' throwing up leaderships, which lacked political following. The result has been political instability and a continuing crisis of legitimacy.

THE BHUTTO PHENOMENON

It was a crucial period of our history. A military dictator was making his last efforts to install controlled democracy and thereby defeat the dream of the Father of the Nation. A choking atmosphere was pervading through the length and breadth of the country. Mohtarma Fatima Jinnah offered to contest the presidential election against the sitting President, a General, a usurper whose aversion for political process was not a secret. She challenged the first ruling dictator and toured the whole of country and demonstrated that dictators can be challenged with the power of people. After a long interval she had established the efficacy of political process and mass contact as effective tools to combat bonapartism. Through spontaneous and phenomenal public response in the meetings conducted during the election campaign she exposed the inherent weakness of the system that Ayub Khan represented. The impact of public awareness was so terrific that Ayub Khan had to deploy army on the roads on the polling day and his administration indulged in massive rigging.

A political unrest had thus begun in the wake of Ayub's conspiracy to thwart parliamentary democracy. The Indo-Pak war of 1965, apart from shattering many a myth, had exposed the deteriorating political link between East and West Pakistan. A sharp reaction to the Tashkent Agreement had been registered at the power centre in West Pakistan. It gained further momentum due to the serious ailment of General Ayub Khan which ultimately culminated in his abdication and imposition of another Martial Law by General Yahya Khan.

During this period of political agitation the opposition democratic forces, through an alliance known as DAC, played a significant role. Ayub had to convene an RTC, another challenge to the power-group, which could not be ignored by military dictators.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had by this time emerged as a phenomenon on the political horizon. His speeches in United Nations where he had challenged India to fight for a thousand years; his reaction to Tashkent Agreement; the spirited public speeches had won him admiration and with his exit from Ayub's cabinet he had become a hero. Mr. Bhutto also formed a political party and braved the persistent and ugly excesses of state machinery directed against him. His trial by a Division Bench of High Court in the Camp Jail premises, instead of public trial, was an open admission of the popularity of Mr. Bhutto.

In due course of time General Yahya on 28 July, 1969, announced formation of an Election Commission with Justice Sattar of East Pakistan as the Chairman, to hold general elections on the basis of adult suffrage. MLR-60, dated 21-12-1969 had removed the ban on political parties participating in the forthcoming elections. He had also dissolved One Unit and restored four provinces in West Pakistan. Thereafter started the longest election campaign of our history commencing from January through December 1970.

It is an established fact that public meetings advance political process and help in identifying basic issues. It is a recognised form of public involvement on political issues apart from projecting the view point of a party. The people readily participate in public meetings irrespective of their political or religious affiliations.

There were almost 19 political parties in the field in 1969 apart from some independent candidates totaling 800, contesting, for 138 seats of the National Assembly earmarked for the four provinces of West Pakistan. Bhutto's PPP fielded the maximum number of candidates, 119 for the NA seats, 77 in Punjab, 25 in Sindh, 16 in NWFP and 1 in Baluchistan.

In view of the peculiar circumstances and the sociopolitical aspirations of the people of four provinces of West Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto declared a three-point manifesto: Islam is our faith; democracy is our policy; Socialism is our economy. The television facilities afforded to the political leaders in October-November, 1970, to present the party point of view no doubt established Mr. Bhutto as an outstanding leader in West Pakistan. He had in the meantime addressed public meetings wherein he succeeded in convincing the people that for the first time in the history of Pakistan he is pledged to bring about radical changes -through the vehicle of Islamic Socialism. Mr. Bhutto became its symbol of emancipation for the underprivileged class. Punjab rose above provincial considerations and as a consequence of the 1970 elections, Mr. Bhutto emerged as the majority leader in West Pakistan, securing 81 seats out of 138 National Assembly seats. The rest of the seven political parties succeeded in securing only 42 seats and 15 independent candidates were elected.

Without narrating the circumstances at this stage of our narrative that caused Civil disturbances in East Pakistan and the total victory of Awami League in the 1970 elections, the Cyclone tragedy, the emergence of Mukti Bahini and Indian aggression as its sequel to the involvement of some foreign powers which culminated in the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971, we reach the stage when (i) Pakistan stood dismembered, (ii) the army had surrendered to the joint command of Indian Army and Mukti Bahini, (iii) the disciplined forces were

demoralized, (iv) ninety thousand Pakistanis were held as prisoners by the victorious enemy forces, (v) border territories of West Pakistan were under Indian occupation, (vi) the political life had been completely paralyzed and (vii) the people of the left over Pakistan were in a state of shock and deep despondency.

At this juncture Mr. Bhutto, leader of the majority -- elected party in West Pakistan appeared as the first civilian CMLA and President of Pakistan. A mutilated and a humbled Pakistan, a country where ruling elite, blinded by an insatiable ambition to govern had imposed servitude on its own people. A disillusioned group of persons, shattered and possessed by a sense of ill deserved defeat, there was hardly any political institution which could represent the aspirations of the people. There was no sense of direction and a mist of gloom had descended upon the socio-political horizon. Territory there was but it was not peopled by a nation. The country had no constitution. The disciplined forces were in disarray. Innumerable families were facing uncertainties about the future of ninety thousand prisoners of war.

In spite of the political, social, economic and moral crisis the people felt that notwithstanding the magnitude of the problem, Mr. Bhutto had the rare opportunity and capability to rebuild the nation and extricate it from the abyss. It goes to the credit of the people that they reposed confidence in him, wished him success and came forward to help him do the task complete.

Mr. Bhutto made efforts to restore confidence amongst the masses, gave an interim constitution in four months time. After Liaquat Ali Khan he was the first elected leader who held talks with the Indian counterpart and secured Simla Accord. A consensus document in the form of 1973 Constitution was a great achievement in view of the fact that sharp ideological differences existed between to various groups present in the Assembly. The Constitution provided a Senate and a Council of Common Interest at the Federal level to set at rest the interprovincial apprehensions.

In spite of opposition to Mr. Bhutto's policies during his tenure as Prime Minister and notwithstanding the long and dark period of Martial Law, the fact remains that almost all the political parties and democratic forces have upheld the 1973 Constitution. This fact alone is a living tribute to the sagacity and political acumen of Mr. Bhutto.

Land Reforms are another aspect that deserves mention.

The most important contribution, in my view, was that the common man got acquainted with and became conscious of his rights and liberties. This

consciousness was apparent because the tenants and the laborers would sit and talk with courage about the possible change. Common man realized that banks, insurance companies, and a few basic industries have been nationalized.

Mr. Bhutto built the image of Pakistan in the comity of nations in general and the Third World in particular; that Mr. Bhutto attempted to bring the Muslim countries on one platform; that Mr. Bhutto was the person who stabilized Pak-China friendship.

Having successfully held a summit of the Muslim countries Mr. Bhutto was preparing to unify the Third World states by holding a Third World Conference. He had shown that through bilateral agreements between the neighbouring states, bitterness could be reduced. He was also conscious that before we enter the next century the country should be self-sufficient in energy and he started pursuing sufficiency in nuclear power diligently. In this way he wanted to place a strong umbrella upon the Muslim World. The Muslim World could play an important role in the affairs of the world.

In Pakistan the tussle between the two forces has not come to an end. There, however, is a feeling that a few things necessary for the development of political process were achieved in the form of 1973 Constitution and political parties and we have got another God-sent opportunity to go ahead. The people have on their part rejected the non-party philosophy. The onus has now shifted to the elected representatives. The majority (single largest) party has come into power because the electorate wanted to establish that the march on the path of politicization and emancipation should continue.

It should be realized that so far only party-based assemblies have been elected and the Parliament has yet to secure political sovereignty. The year 1988 has gone by. It was a year of its own type, a year of fears, uncertainties, hopes, calamities and a year of party-based elections. It was, all said and done, the year of Benazir Bhutto, the youngest Prime Minister in Muslim domain and now it is for the team at the Centre to establish that people were right when they preferred Bhutto's party.

ATTRIBUTES OF A REVOLUTIONARY LEADER

The attributes of a revolutionary leader are a charismatic personality with biting wit, commitment to the cause, straight forward and intellectual mind. The charismatic leaders have come and gone in history. It is only one in million who attains immortality after death, late Z.A. Bhutto was one of them. As long as he lived he created history, step by step. Even after death he made history--he became immortal. While we mourn his tenth death anniversary, it needs to be reiterated that the revival of democracy after 11½ year's darkness, the atmosphere of freedom and openness owes its resurgence alone to him. His abiding commitment to the poor, his pride in the Pakistani nation and the passion to make Pakistan a modern democratic Islamic State were truly heart-warming and remarkable.

Late Prime Minister Bhutto had rendered countless services to the nation. He was not only loved by millions of his countrymen but also highly respected by the international Community for his stand on the third world issues and for the cause of Islam. Those who have had the opportunity of being associated with the great leader can vouch for the change for the better in the country he wanted to bring about. In his second term of office he wanted to strengthen the democratic institutions the country and steer social changes through democratic politics. But after 1977 elections he was overwhelmed by the opposition forces in concert with Gen. Zia. Now that we have embarked on a new era of nation building we have to first strengthen democracy in the country. Late Chairman Bhutto's positive elements will have to be used in steering social changes through democratic methods. This indeed will be a true tribute to late Quaid-e-Awam's untold sacrifices and all those who are committed to this cause in Pakistan will honour him for that alone and remember him till eternity.

The development and progress of Pakistan rested on a strong federation and democracy. It is most reassuring that Ms. Bhutto is doing all within her power to strengthen the federation and consolidate the newly achieved democracy.

It augurs well for the country that Ms. Benazir Bhutto symbolized a strong and stable united Pakistan and was committed to the socio-economic welfare of the people at large. Ms. Benazir Bhutto, who enjoyed overwhelming mandate of her fellow Pakistanis was striving hard to carry forward the mission of her late father

by putting the nation back on rails of honour and dignity and prosperity. In a period of 100 days of her administration- the image of Pakistan has received tremendous boost in the world.

While welcoming the new era of democracy, it must be kept in mind that anti-democratic forces were still posing threats to the new-born order. Ms. Bhutto would continue to need the intelligentsia's unstinted cooperation and support in strengthening democracy and achieving her goals.

However, in the interest of democracy and for the future of PPP it must be stated that same ills are present as before when Gen. Zia was in full control of the Government. The only difference is the change in the people now exerting control. Ms. Bhutto must consequently change the system instead of expecting the PPP bureaucratic psychology to be different from that prevalent in the past.

The people look forward to the PPP Government for a fair and speedy justice, efficient and clean administration, peace, safety and honour and means of livelihood. The low income group above all would like some hope to improve their quality of life. The law and order has to be restored fully as quickly as possible and ethnic rifts in society healed so as to secure national solidarity and integrity and to put the country on road to prosperity for all segments of the society.

We have entered a new phase in Pakistani Society and if the process is allowed to move through its natural course, then we will reach our destination and the mission of late leader would have been fulfilled. A single moment of sorrow should not be allowed to outweigh the thousands of moments of happiness that Shaheed Bhutto gave his friends and to the millions of his compatriots. There are thousands of pleasant things to remember about him. It was President Charles de Gaulle who once said: "Nothing great will ever be achieved without great men and men are great only if they are determined to be so". Quaid-e-Awam Bhutto in his martyrdom has shown his will and determination not to bow before tyranny and to compromise on principles. He is no more with us but his spirit is there to guide us. His vision is there to steer us clear away from all the turmoil that we face today. Dedication, selfless services and change of life style alone can lead us along the path of achieving his objective, i.e. making Pakistan a modern democratic Islamic State.

DEAD BHUTTO GOVERNS THE LIVING

We give below the full text of the inaugural address by Mr. Valery Giscard d'Estaing, former President of the French Republic which was read by Ambassador Henri Servant, at the international seminar on the legacy of Mr. Z.A. Bhutto at Karachi on Sunday.

"I am very moved to receive your invitation to open this seminar in memory of Mr. Zulfikar Bhutto.

I wished to be with you, among you, at this moment of intense emotion when his glorious family and the reborn Pakistan have come together, at this special moment when the greatness of a man who made the supreme sacrifice is tracing out the destiny of his country, when the recent painful past is opening up on a present and future of democracy and peace.

I would like you to know that on this moving day, only the constraints of my parliamentary duties could keep me from attending. Yet, we are together by the presence and fidelity of our memories in the same fervor and the same spirit.

The French Ambassador, Henri Servant, is here to witness this and to tell you this in my name. I would like to thank him for conveying this message.

May I take you back to July 30th 1978, a little more than ten years ago?

At the Elysee Palace, I was brought a letter which Ali Bhutto had managed to send me from his prison in Rawalpindi. It began with these words: "If it were not so difficult to put my hand outside the heavily fortified bars of this death cell, I would have contacted you earlier to convey my warmest greetings and felicitations."

Written by a man on the threshold of death, this vibrant letter was also written by a fighter: it stated, in a grand and lucid summary, the reasons for his life's combat. In a long plea for democracy, it denounced the "mediocrity" of military dictators, "who seize power in the name of order but create disorder". It restated the sense of a fierce, uncompromising fight for freedom, in the name of the people.

In that tragic moment, it required a remarkably strong spirit to write such a letter, instead of succumbing to defeat and fear.

In fact Ali Bhutto wished his blood to be, in his own words, "manure to the young men and women of this subcontinent," his courage in the face of death was not indifference to life, but the affirmation of faith in the future. By his exemplary death, he wished and in this he succeeded, to establish values and ideas whose implementation he considered essential for the prosperity of Pakistan and the progress of all developing countries.

After he had been overthrown by a military coup in July 1977, his friends suggested that he should seek safety in a foreign country. In the face of the infamous accusations directed at him, he preferred to defend his honour at a trial even though the result had been decided, in advance. Condemned to death, he could have asked for grace from General Zia, then the martial law administrator. He refused, even ordering his family not to use this appeal procedure under any circumstances.

Despite his wishes I as you know, sought to obtain grace for him. It was refused.

Ali Bhutto was demanding justice, not pity.

He did not receive this justice, as Dr. Niazi wrote to me at the time: "Mr. Bhutto's trial was no ordinary trial, Mr. Bhutto was no ordinary convict and Mr. Bhutto's conviction was no ordinary conviction based purely on the findings of the case." In sober, spare terms, everything was said.

The death of Ali Bhutto, "No ordinary convict", marked it tragedy in which he at red and violence had the last word.

However, his political life is rich in lessons for modern Pakistan confronted with problems which have their roots in the long history of your People.

Ali Bhutto succeeded in restoring the regional position of his country, ravaged by a painful military conflict. He had the political courage; to accept the emergence of a new diplomatic situation, which he did by recognizing Bangladesh. He did so again by restoring diplomatic relations with India in the same year.

Only statesmen are capable of such gestures, exceptional deeds which break with the ancient order to trace out new paths where a nation can find the will to progress.

Like Napoleon and Charles de Gaulle, those great leaders whom he admired, Ali Bhutto took a global vision of international balance of power, a vision which he combined with great pragmatism and skill in negotiating with states. He understood that the world of the two superpowers which resulted from the last World War was giving way to a new configuration, that of a more complex world where developing countries would have an increasing part to play.

A diplomatic virtuoso, Ali Bhutto managed to establish friendly relations with China, without adversely affecting his relations with the Soviet Union. He also managed to maintain close cooperation with the United States and to turn towards the nations of Western Europe, not hesitating to make symbolic gestures, like leaving the Commonwealth and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization, where he again demonstrated the analogy with General de Gaulle.

This desire for a balance between the main powers, this search for trusting relations with close neighbours, this capacity to forecast, to take account of and then to influence the changes of history are all signs of the intelligence of the modern world and the rare political perspicacity with which Ali Bhutto was blessed.

In the field of domestic politics, the same perspicacity animated him.

Concerned about “creating a new country in a new world”, he succeeded in founding a nation and proving that it was capable of living.

In order to consolidate its base, he was aware that he had to reconcile religious, political and economic realities. Subsequent events in this part of the world have shown how right this vision was.

In the “Country of the Pure” profoundly attached to Islam, Ali Bhutto wished to institute a democratic regime, based on a constitution whose implementation was unfortunately impeded.

Nonetheless, his major reforms remain in our memories: the virtual abolition of military justice, the release of political prisoners, the introduction of a minimum wage, medical insurance, a workers retirement pension system, recognition of the right to strike.

Recent developments in Pakistan have shown the topicality of his concerns. His death, stamped with dignity and an exceptional courage, was a promise for the future. His ideal, taken up by his people, has survived him.

This is the proof that Ali Bhutto defined his policies not on the basis of transient opinions, but on values which have ensured their durability.

To the question put up by Paul two thousand years ago: "Odeath, where is thy sting?" there are many answers. I will choose one which applies to Ali Bhutto's death and which I borrow from our philosopher Auguste Comte. It is this: "The dead continue to govern the living."

Yes, they still govern them. Because he died through his fidelity to his ideas, because he was executed at the end of fight which he thought useful for his country. Ali Bhutto managed to succeed himself in the person of his daughter, through one of those mysterious turn-rounds of history.

Benazir Bhutto, now brought to power by her tenacity and fidelity, offers the answer to the initial question: the victory of the father's death is the victory of his daughter, who managed to come after him in order to continue his work.

I should like Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to complete this message.

Allow me to read you the last paragraph of his letter: "If I live we shall undoubtedly share the honour of the forward and enlightened thrust of humanity for a more equitable dispensation. If I die, I bid, you *au revior*, with the prayer that better men may come to accomplish the unfinished task of combating the appalling poverty and misery of my people.

"Being a convicted murderer', I cannot muster the courage to call you a friend, but please do convey my warmest regards to your elegant and enchanting wife and my affection to your son."

Thank you Ali Bhutto, for who you were and for what you did. For the being and for the example.

It is my turn, now, to bid you *au revoir*.

Even though it is more difficult today to reach your hand than through the bars of your cell, I hope with all my heart and I know that OMFUG N will see you IHFWC, signed: Valery Giscard d'Estaing.

LIVING WITH THE BHUTTO CULT

Bhuttoism has confounded every party along the political spectrum. The question arises: what is Bhuttoism? To answer that, we have to begin from the beginning. Way back in the sixties, before the rise of the Bhutto cult, stink of stagnation hung over Pakistan's political scene. A decadent coalition of military generals, civil servants, feudal lords and orthodox clergy ruled the country. Policies were framed and governments chosen by the dominant group in their elegant parlours. Since the masses were merely spectators to the parlour politics, they grew indifferent, cynical, and suffered from varying degrees of despair. Z.A. Bhutto set out to bring the large majority into fold which had been pushed into the margin since 1947. He bypassed the traditional power base to speak directly to the masses, igniting with his rousing words the democratic spirit which lay dormant in the heart of millions. Through him, the complexion of national politics changed forever from a parlour game to a vast battlefield where the haves and the have-nots vowed to fight it out till the end.

The Bhutto-appeal lies in the fact that it is a home-grown phenomenon, rooted in our culture, history and social conditions. The cult character of a movement in which there is a fusion of person and idea, uncritical obedience to the leader, stress on institution and emotion rather than rational analysis, links it to our mystical tradition. Resistance and martyrdom so central to the Bhutto creed attract many men and women with fire in their belly, wishing to reshape the world. It's earthy, hard-nosed economics of 'now' and 'here' distinguishes it from socialists who speak of a bright tomorrow while the rightists sing the glories of kingdom come. Food, shelter and clothing as a slogan have elemental simplicity as well as elemental force which can rouse the dispossessed to revolutionary pitch.

Nationalization, such a bad word today, was greeted with wild enthusiasm in city streets and country barnyards, when the PPP introduced it first. Our culture and theology regard wealth as social, ownership, collective and individual only a trustee. Inalienable property rights of the individual have a harsh and grating ring for us. Abolition of privilege to bring about fraternal equality is a very potent weapon in the political arsenal of the People's Party, but it has come down to us from the dissident movement of Muslim medieval empires.

These facts show that there was nothing alien in Bhuttoism. It is simply an idea whose time had come. Bhutto did not invent it he only saw it, seized it and gave it flesh and blood.

Of late there have been demands for the removal of the Bhuttos from the PPP because they act in bad faith after coming into power. Many activists tend to forget that the People's Party in power and out of power requires two different responses. When Benazir and her party are in opposition, they are arrayed against a formidable coalition of reactionaries -- feudal barons, fascists in mufti and khaki, big business mafias, and religious orthodoxy of medieval cast. To oppose Benazir in this confrontation is to give comfort to the enemies of progress. Forces of progress are compelled by the logic of political alignment to propel Benazir and her party into power. In spite of all its defects, People's Party has a better track-record on human rights, freedom of thought, minorities and persecuted groups. It also has greater sensitivity to public pressure. Therefore, the demand at this point to form a Bhutto-less mass-based party is premature. The Bhutto may be autocratic, capricious, and compromise-prone, but they are the only ones capable of matching the fire-power of the established order with the agitational potential of their vote-bank. The left may not love and cherish them, but it has to learn to live with them.

Once the Benazir-led party is in power, a radically different equation comes into play. The grass-root activists and left-leaning leaders can form a strong pressure group within the party to give it a leftward push. Benazir rule shall not be judged by diplomatic coups, the grant of abstract liberties, or fiery speeches. What will make or mar her is the way she handles the nitty gritty matters affecting everyday life of the common man-inflation, unemployment, and provision of welfare benefits. A future PPP government is going to inherit rising external debts, escalating defence costs and a shrinking aid package. Given Benazir's no-confrontation approach and economic conservatism, she does not seem to have either the will or the ability to divert resources from military to civilian projects, to redistribute wealth on more equitable lines, or to give the existing dispensation of power a democratic bias. All the signs suggest she would fail to deliver. In that case, social unrest is hound to grow to a point where she will have to use repressive measures to quell the disturbances. The voters will begin to see the essential duplicity of the Bhutto creed. Growing disenchantment will lead to an unrigged electoral defeat, eroding Benazir's position within the party and the country. Then and only then the Bhutto magic will fade and die a natural death.

But that scenario depends on a number of assumptions. Firstly, the opposition sits back and gives Benazir a long rope. An all-seeing president or an all

powerful general does not step in. Intervention will only serve to revive her martyr-image and with it the emotions of pity, giving her a fresh lease of life.

Elimination of the Bhutto factor by natural selection provides unique opportunities to both the right and the left. The left can exploit the situation to bring internal democracy to the party. Once that is in place, time and numbers will help them take over the full control of the party. The right will react differently. A PPP in radical cast should be perceived as a grave threat to the existing order by conservative classes. They are likely to go for a dictatorial form of government as the only way out. Worsening economic at home and isolation abroad will drive them to a degree of repression seen only in remote Latin American countries. And that will be a bonanza for those, within and out of the country, who want to break Pakistan up.

CONSENSUS AND IDEOLOGY IN BHUTTO'S POLITICS

We are recalling today, with a feeling of great sorrow and grief, the events of Pakistan's political history which ultimately resulted in the untimely and unforeseen death of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. It was a great loss to the nation and to the world society as a whole.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto emerged as a great leader and savior of Pakistan society at a time when the polity was groaning under the pangs of dictatorship. He rescued the nation from the authoritarian rule and placed Pakistan on a sound footing of democracy. The policies that he initiated in the field of foreign affairs are being appreciated and valued highly by the comity of nations. They do not have any substitute and cannot be substituted either. The entire world felt the pinch of this loss and all persons who favored democratic ideals were shocked with grief and lamented when they came to know of it. In fact his political caliber was such that it would not be possible to replace him at least in the near future. He stands separated from us because of circumstances beyond our control. His contributions and the role that he played in the restoration of democracy in Pakistan remind us of the well known couplet authored by the poet philosopher, Allama Mohammad Iqbal.

ہزاروں سال نرگس اپنی بے نورمی پر روتی ہے
بڑی مشکل سے ہوتا ہے چمن میں دیدہ ورسیدا

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto entertained the belief that consensus is essential to the continuation and perpetuation of democracy. He tried his level best to develop agreement on "fundamentals". He projected the view that political stability depends upon widespread belief in the superiority of democratic norms and procedures as well as on its acceptance. He emphasized that any assessment of the vitality of a democratic system should rest on an examination of the outlook of the people, the sense of purpose, and the beliefs of the masses. He, therefore, held consensus to be necessary to a free society.

Having firm faith in consensus, Mr. Bhutto went deep enough into the psyche of the people to satisfy their basic needs. He told us that a society could exist when

the minds of citizens were rallied and held together by certain predominant ideas; when a great number of men considered a great number of things from the same aspect, and when the same occurrences suggest the same thought and impression to their minds. He spoke of the customs and traditions in Pakistan as the peculiar cause which rendered the people in Pakistan able to support a democratic government. Consensus, in his view, became merely a synonym for legitimacy. He spoke of consensus as a sense of solidarity or social cohesion arising from the ethos and heritage of Pakistan society which united men into the polity of Pakistan. His view of “fundamentals” was incorporated in the draft of the 1973 Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The constituent ideas of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in regard to Pakistan’s democratic ideology are held principally by the more articulate segments of population in Pakistan, including the political influentials; and that the people in Pakistan exhibit an identical and far-reaching consensus on democratic and constitutional values than one could imagine. That consensus is evidenced on political and economic questions, on procedural rights and on the concept of freedom.

Mr. Bhutto diffused and disseminated elements of liberal democratic thought in Pakistan. This thought possessed a liberally defined theory, a body of inter-related assumptions, axioms, and principles, and a set of ideals that continue to serve as guides for action even after his untimely death in Pakistan. His tenets, postulates, sentiments and values continue to inspire the great revolution in social, economic and legal segments in offing in Pakistan. They have been repeatedly and explicitly set forth in several notions of the higher judiciary reflected in such terms as constitutional government, rule of law, and equality before law. They have been restated with remarkable uniformity in the messages of many politicians, in political speeches, in the pronouncements of constitutional commentators and in the writings of political theorists, historians, and publicists in Pakistan. They are so familiar that we are likely to see them in Pakistan not only as a coherent uniformity of ideas and principles embodying a self definition of political tendency but also as a miscellany of noble sentiments being expressed on ceremonial occasions.

Although scholars and members of intelligentsia in Pakistan might argue over fine points of interpretation, they would unanimously recognize as elements of Shaheed Bhutto’s philosophy such concepts as consent, accountability, constitutional government, representation, minority rights, the principle of political opposition, freedom of thought, speech, press, and assembly, equality of opportunity, the religious toleration, equality before law, the rights of judicial independence, and the right of self-determination of people over a broad range of personal affairs. These elements of democracy projected by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto are held in esteem today and will continue to inspire the posterity in the years to

come. Shaheed Bhutto's philosophy constitutes an integrated body of ideas which has become a part of the political ideology in Pakistan.

The political views of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto were relatively ordered and coherent. The personality of Mr. Bhutto appeared as a repository of public conscience and as the carrier of public creed. His intellectual consistency inspired not only the political system in Pakistan but the systems as they obtain in many parts of the globe. This development was the outcome of his attitudes since they were related to principles. His actions were connected to beliefs. His longings for freedom, tolerance, justice and other democratic values sprang spontaneously from the inner depths of his mind and soul.

Democratic viability is preserved in Pakistan by the fact that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto continued to support the Objectives Resolution enshrined in the Constitution of Pakistan. His role in the nation's political process was very significant. He contributed immensely to the vitality of the political system. With democracy consolidated and reinvigorated by the efforts of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the nation no longer runs the risk of rejection of democratic ideals in favour of some hostile ideology.

As a result of Mr. Bhutto's continuing influence in Pakistan's political system, people have developed comprehension of the very institutions which they believe themselves to be defending. The popular support of Mr. Bhutto's political ideology, even after his demise, represents the success of democratic values. We find in Pakistan many thinkers and philosophers who genuinely share the attitudes and values associated with the name of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

In Pakistan, and doubtless elsewhere, numerous influences had worked to prevent democratic norms from assuming an important role in the nation's political life. This tendency is however, averted by the everlasting influence of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who advanced the cause of such political institutions as federalism, checks and balances, separation of powers, bicameralism, the parliamentary committee system, the independence of judiciary and a system of party based elections. The Pakistan political system continues to contribute to the same end, under the legacy of ideas made available to us by Mr. Bhutto. This legacy is spread over the vast and variegated territory of Pakistan. The complexities of a pluralistic social and political order tend to diminish under the impact of his political contributions. Thus the possibilities have emerged for the divergent views to crystallize into impressive doctrines.

The democracy loving people of Pakistan may wisely follow the Bhutto's model in preference to the Zia-ul-Haq's model of dictatorship. The people are being called upon to develop a secure framework within which that model might be

made continuously, effective. The power of people within a structure of shared political values would, by this logic, be the optimal condition for the maintenance of a democratic society in Pakistan. The need to assign a controlling influence to the frame of ideas projected by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in the operation of democracy is very great. Partly this arises from the impact of crisis and unrest found elsewhere that sometimes penetrates Pakistan and, therefore, adherence to Mr. Bhutto's ideology can avert this danger and can bring people closer to the reality of democratic life. Bhutto's model presupposes an alert citizenry, aware of its rights and duties, cognizant of the basic rules, exercising consent, enjoying perfect information and choosing competent and highly qualified persons to occupy significant positions that shape the national character. This model places great weight on ideas, values and rational choice as the cementing forces of a democratic society. Possessing the intellectual equipment to assess complex political developments accurately, the sophisticated Mr. Bhutto gave support to causes that are seen to promote national interest.

In the context of freedom, democracy, and the Constitution, Mr. Bhutto worked unstintingly to uphold the constitutional liberties. He did not have any difficulty discriminating political integrity from demagoguery, maturity and balanced judgments from fanaticism, and honest causes from counterfeits. There is sufficient reason to believe that ideological sophistication and the general acceptance of liberal democratic values are interesting under the influence left behind by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

The democratic ideology advanced by Mr. Bhutto, linked as it is with the people of Pakistan, offers promise of growth as the people grow in stature and acquire higher standards of living. Many developments of the past decade in social life in Pakistan point to the increasing influence of Mr. Bhutto's ideas which have given rise to rapid social mobility, proliferation of mass media, a decline in the size and number of isolated rural groups, a reduction in the proportion of people with sub-marginal living standards, the incorporation of the minority groups into the culture and their increasing entrance into the professions, and so on. And, of course, these developments taking place under the impact of norms upheld by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto will, on the one side, have the effect of reducing the tensions and conflicts on which the military governments feed, they are likely, on the other side to beget a more articulate population and a more numerous class of political influentials, committed to liberal democracy and aware of the rights and obligations which attend to that commitment.

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO -- QUAID-E-AWAM

Some men are like rain, God's gift to mankind. The shower comes on a dry, parched and arid, land and it begins to bloom and blossom with gold and glory. Great minds, with their messages, resuscitate the dead humanity; the teeming millions; and human corpses begin to bestir themselves with hope, action and life. Such was Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the Quaid-e-Awam.

Statesmen have come and statesmen have gone, but very few of them have left permanent indelible footprints on the sands of time. One such person was Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, whose 61st birth anniversary is being celebrated today.

Shaheed Bhutto gave to the poor masses of Pakistan, groaning since Tong under slavery and servitude, a sense of identity and direction. He salvaged the shelterless, the shirtless and the serving people of our country, from falling down the deep precipice of degradation and despondency. He awoke the multitude from slumberous stupor and these destitutes of destiny at last saw the life-giving dawn's rays of hope in an otherwise dark cloud of calamity.

After the 1971 war, Pakistan was shattered. Her people's mutilated morale was at its lowest ebb. Shaheed Bhutto gallantly picked up the pieces of a broken country and rebuilt it once again with fervor and fortitude. He gave solace and succor to a defeated and demoralized nation. What we lost on the battlefield of East Pakistan, Shaheed Bhutto won for us across the conference table at Simla. He played his cards so brilliantly that he outwitted the late Mrs. Indira Gandhi in each and every hand; so much so that when Mrs. Gandhi returned to New Delhi, she was vehemently criticized by the Indian Press for returning empty handed and giving everything away to Shaheed Bhutto. He brought home our 90,000 prisoners languishing in Indian Jails and regained vast territory of ours occupied by India.

Perhaps one of his colossal contributions was the holding of the greatest and the grandest Summit of the Islamic countries at Lahore where he conveyed in no uncertain terms to the enemies of Islam that the Muslims have been humiliated by them enough; they have been suppressed by them enough; they have been

squeezed by them enough and now enough is enough. Shaheed Bhutto's clarion call at this Summit galvanized the Muslims of the world into a force to be reckoned with.

Shaheed Bhutto was the architect of the 1973 Constitution hailed by one and all as the best Constitution the country ever had. Alas! His luminous legacy was immensely tampered with and the 1973 Constitution in its present form, with the inclusion of the Eighth Amendment, is a battered document, which has lost its original lustre.

During Shaheed Bhutto's regime, Pakistan's foreign policy was the best which greatly enhanced Pakistan's prestige and image in the comity of nations. It was really a non-aligned policy which earned Pakistan the friendship of all the countries of the world, particularly the Third World.

Although horn with not a 'silver' but a 'gold spoon' in his mouth, the glitter of bold did not dazzle him but, on the contrary, acted as it potent force to prevent the creation of "two Pakistans" which we, unfortunately, have created. Where are we today? A birthday is usually an occasion for rejoicing; but can we, with it clear conscience, really rejoice and celebrate Shaheed Bhutto's birth anniversary? Contrary to his teachings and philosophy, we have to swallow the bitter pill and admit that we are actually living in "two Pakistans". The Pakistan of the ELITE and the Pakistan of the NON-ELITE; the Pakistan of the rich and the Pakistan of the poor. In the former, we have the best of everything, while in the latter, the worst of 'everything'. We have abject poverty and extreme affluence side by side; the posh palaces and the sluggish slums side by side; which is it highly explosive situation. In the Pakistan of the rich, we have the best English medium schools; while in the Pakistan of the poor, the unfortunate children have to study in shoddy structures. In the Pakistan of the rich, the elite travel in air-conditioned, chauffeur driven cars, while in the Pakistan of these miserable destitutes of devastation perpetually doomed for the dust, they are jam packed like cattle in rickety, noisy and polluted buses. In the Pakistan of the rich, sumptuous, delicious dishes are enjoyed, while in the Pakistan of the poor, thousands go to bed without even a piece of *roti*. In the Pakistan of the rich, the CHOSEN ONES are immaculately dressed while in the Pakistan of the poor, the shirtless 'slaves' of our sad society move about in shivering servitude. The extremely wide gap existing in our country between the haves and the have-nots has to be narrowed down somehow. In her first address to the nation, Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto also rightly emphasised this point.

The milady of our society is not ETHNIC but intrinsically SOCIO-ECONOMIC. Let us hope that Shaheed Bhutto's dauntless and determined daughter, Mohtarma Benazir, will succeed in her mission; nay, her Shaheed father's

mission, with the support of the masses and all right-thinking people. Democracy has at last dawned after years of suppression and suffocation; it has to come; for in the Almighty's merciful Court of Justice, there may be temporary trauma but never an everlasting entombment.

Only when a Pakistan devoid of hunger, devoid of humiliation, devoid of injustice, devoid of inequity, devoid of poverty, devoid of pestilence--an egalitarian Pakistan is finally created, as Inshallah it will, will Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's mission be finally fulfilled.

Shaheed Bhutto's greatest contribution was that he gave to the poor people of Pakistan reverence and respect, dignity and decorum, where only oppression and subjugation, tyranny and torment prevailed. The teeming millions of our country owe their deliverance from despondency and deprivation to Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. That is why he is firmly and lovingly enshrined and entrenched, and still ten years after his martyrdom rules the hearts of millions of our pestered people from his last resting place in Naudero.

BHUTTO AND PUNJAB

The following are the excerpts from a letter written by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to his daughter, Miss Benazir Bhutto (now the Prime Minister) from the death cell:

“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.

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 Muslim nationhood, 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 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.

BHUTTO REMEMBERED

Most people die before they are dead, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto lived until he died. He was alive every moment of his life. Whether in chains or a free man, in power or in opposition, in the comfort of home or on the gallows, he remained vibrant to his last breath. He was so full of life that even death could not annihilate him. He willed his life to continue even after he had gone.

The people who cared, and for whom he cared, cried and are still mourning his death. They were, and still are, bewildered how it man of such great intellect got ensnared and ended up on the scaffold. His departure flung the country into a predicament from which it extricated itself last month by electing his daughter as Prime Minister.

Bhutto rose to the pinnacle of power through the force of popular will. People, gave him the mandate to rule over them; to lead them to better pastures; to deliver them from the clutches of an ossified and perverse Establishment; to free them from the twin quagmires of ignorance and poverty; and above all to inaugurate an era of democracy. But something went wrong, terribly wrong.

Bhutto had begun his political career in the company of army generals. He was picked up for his first public office by General Iskander Mirza when the latter abrogated the 1956 Constitution and declared Martial Law in October 1958. After the abdication of General Mirza, Bhutto continued as Federal Minister under CMLA Field Marshal Muhammad Ayub Khan. But his political education started in earnest when, in the aftermath of 1965 Indo-Pak War, he parted company with the Field Marshal and founded the Pakistan People's Party. The general elections of 1970 provided him with the most valuable political education a politician could desire. His campaigns took him to the remotest corners of the country. He came face to face with ordinary people. He came to know what ailed the common man and vowed to cure the ailment. He faced his political antagonists with courage and determination. He uprooted the long entrenched and better organized political parties to win by a fair margin in the then West Pakistan.

It was a scintillating experience to watch a popularly elected leader presiding over the affairs of the country. Painstakingly, Bhutto steered the country out of the agony of 1971 military defeat. He regained the lost territory without firing a shot. He brought back the prisoners of war from the Indian camps. He restored

the dignity of the armed forces which it had lost in East Pakistan. He instilled fearlessness in the down-trodden masses. The National Assembly adopted the 1973 Constitution with a unanimous voice. Economic reforms were set in motion. The Bureaucracy was put in its proper place. Apparently he was going to make Pakistan safe for democracy.

Political parties are essential for the sustenance of democracy. They are the sinews of democracy which keep the anti-democratic forces at bay. A realistic democratic set-up cannot be imagined without the existence of political parties. Dictators, for obvious reasons, abhor political parties. The first act they perform ritually after staging the *coup de'tat* is to ban all political activities and proclaim the death of all political parties. The successive military dictators in Pakistan have regarded political parties with repugnance. Sometimes they have ruled out the party system, and thus democracy, as incompatible with the genius of our people. Other times they have decreed it un-Islamic.

Democracy is a system of Government in which the majority rules but not to the absolute exclusion of the minority. Majority rule does not imply that the majority could impose its will in whatever way it likes. The success of the system lies in tolerating opponents and accommodating their points of view. The party in power may, by virtue of its brute majority, amend the constitution and outlaw all the other political parties and rule the country in perpetuation. Although such a law could be adopted through democratic procedures, but that would be the end of democracy in the country.

Bhutto had attained power through democratic means by defeating the other parties in elections. He had fought the elections and emerged a clear winner. There was no political party or leader in Pakistan which could have threatened his authority. But he was always reluctant to tolerate them. He refused to lift the emergency laws and used them to suppress political activities of his opponents. Fundamental rights remained suspended. He failed to evolve a working arrangement with the non-PPP Governments in the NWFP and Baluchistan. He was averse to critics and did not hesitate to put them in jails. He clamped down on the newspapers. One after the other all those institutions which sustain democracy and help in its growth were maimed. He manipulated the nonexistent PPP into majority in the NWFP and Baluchistan legislatures. PPP's short-lived gain was democracy's absolute loss.

The elected leader does not rule through the barrel of the gun. His exalted position is not indebted to the fire power of an army. Nor does he owe his eminence to bureaucracy. He derives his strength from the parliament composed of elected representatives of the people. An elected parliament in a democratic

set-up is the fountainhead of all power. If the parliament is weakened, the power-base falters.

For negligible political gains Bhutto had reduced the parliament to a rubber stamp and in the process himself became vulnerable. With no strong parliament to support him he ended up as the Biblical Samson shorn of his hair. The antidemocratic forces did not lose the opportunity. They pounced on him with long pent-up ferocity and there was no one around strong enough to save either him or democracy.

Bhutto was a perspicacious genius. He could identify a problem quick as lightening but its right solution would escape his agile mind. He was gifted with great mental skills and a photographic memory. He could confront any intellectual challenge and come off with flying colours. Fools were anathema to him but flatterers he loved. This trait in his character made him a bad judge of men. He sacked the Chief Ministers of Punjab one after the other and in the end opted for a nervous wreck who slipped away quietly from the scene when the hells tolled. His FSF Chief, a reject of his own department, was a psychopath who turned against him at the first opportunity. One of his Information Ministers used to terrorize newspaper editors with the descriptive visions of Mach Jail in Baluchistan. His handpicked Information Secretary used to exchange blows publicly with the journalists. It still holds true what a sage said almost three hundred years ago:

“Among all the diseases of the mind there is no one more epidemical and more pernicious than the love of flattery.” One by one he parted company with his old comrades who could tell him his faults to his face. He made his party subservient to bureaucrats whom he himself used to describe as effete and stubborn. Consequently, democracy suffered an irreparable loss.

Bhutto carried a passionate heart in his chest. He was unable to hide his emotions which made his actions predictable. His feelings were always writ large on his face. He could not have, even had he wanted to send an enemy of his Government to the gallows with the cold detached manner of Machiavelli, complacently and impersonally. His style of Government was very personal. He detested procedures and regulations, regarding them as impediments in running an efficient administration. He had promised his people a place in the sun -and- Wanted to get there in a hurry. He had unleashed forces which could have, if he had harnessed them properly, changed.

REMEMBERING BHUTTO

On 4th of April, 1979, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto walked to the gallows head high so that we as a nation, as legatees of the Quaid, as torchbearers of a great Islamic civilization, could learn to live with honour. Today when we remember him, when we assemble to pay him tributes, we should not be just doing it as a ritual. Rhetorics, high-sounding phrases, skyrocketing slogans would not do justice to the man who lived by his deeds.

It is a day of stock-taking. How far we have acquitted ourselves of the responsibility of being the flag-bearers of Shaheed Bhutto's legacy--a legacy that provides a key to civilized life, to a life which ensures justice to all and which seeks end of exploitation of man by man. It was his concern for the poor, their "*roti, kapra our makan,*" it was his love for the youth, toiling peasantry, landless tillers and his ambition to make Pakistan a great country, a great nation and a great people that would leave an indelible imprint on sands of time.

Ziaist's propaganda and attempts at character-assassination against Bhutto for more than eleven years could not dent his image.

Shaheed Bhutto wanted to make Pakistan strong, self-reliant and independent. His short-term measures and long-term policies had only one objective: to better the lot of the common man. To him it was the man in the street, well-fed, well-looked after, prosperous, healthy, sheltered and clothed, as the sole defence of the motherland. Economic prosperity coupled with a political will, he had always thought would engine his nation onto a track to a greater glory.

Gen. Zia tried to erase his name. The more he tried, the greater became its endearment to the poor masses of Pakistan. Bhutto had shown the way. He preferred martyrdom to ignominy of surrender to dictatorship. Through his blood he nurtured a political philosophy, a philosophy that gave strength to the youth of the country, to the *Haris*, to the *Mazarays*, to the laborers, to working men and women, to the teenagers, to face the atrocities of a dictator, his whip and his bayonet, his pillory and his hangman's noose, so that truth could triumph over falsehood, so that decency could win over chicanery, so that the voice of dissent could live for ever.

Shaheed Bhutto has the unique distinction of founding, organizing and leaving as his legacy a political party that has stood test of time, that has seen ups and downs and that has learnt to survive dictatorship one after the other. Our history of the last two decades which has seen many political parties passing into oblivion is a testimony to the fact that it is the Pakistan People's Party which is the only alternative to martial law in the country.

As a true heir to both Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah and - Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has been, in right earnest, trying to establish a democratic culture to replace Ziaist legacy. Her father was handed over a broken Pakistan, an economy in shambles and a shattered nation without hope. She was elected to power when the country had been devoured by soldiers of fortune. With no experience in administration in a country rendered into a cesspool of corruption by Ziaists, she is getting to know things step by step and during the last fifteen months she has travelled far. Like her illustrious father, she is showing courage and is not hesitating to take bold decisions, unpalatable decisions. No promises that she cannot keep, no castles in the air. She is showing the way how realities are faced. No sugar-coated pills. Bitter pills, yes, if they offer a cure to a malaise.

Democracy and a federal Pakistan were Quaid's ideals. So were they of Shaheed Bhutto's. She is doing her best to repair the battered boat. She is balming wounds, making bridges and dismantling the divides. Her task is enormous. Challenges are much too many. Odds are heavy. Even her bitter critics accept that she is the last hope.

While a freedom wave is sweeping away citadels of totalitarianism the world over, nations like Pakistan shall have to untangle themselves from economic conditionalities imposed by organizations such as World Bank and IMF. Without economic self-reliance, political freedom is a myth. Policies adopted by Zia rendered Pakistan into an import trade-oriented society. Liberal imports dictated by IMF/World Bank have encouraged consumerism, ostentatious living and a philosophy of "buy now, pay later". As a result, Benazir Bhutto has inherited a country whose many generations, one after the other, shall have to pay and go on paying back the debts created by Gen. Zia and his doctors. This situation can only be reversed if the nation adopts "simple living and high thinking" approach to its existence.

Shaheed Bhutto was eased out by hired agents of those who were opposed to Pakistan's nuclear programme. Bhutto wanted us to bask in nuclear glow, to run our industries by using nuclear energy, to have our villages lighted by power generated by nuclear plants. He did not live to see all that. He however, paid a price with his life for what we have achieved and what we are going to achieve

once Chinese and French nuclear power plants get going. These acquisitions are but two of the most outstanding achievements of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. Indeed, she has taken forward the energy policy from where her father left and which had remained criminally neglected in Zia's time. Once the generation capacity being sought by the government both in public and private sectors is attained, Pakistan, Insha' Allah, will have enough power to ignite it in a big way into the 21st century.

Shaheed Bhutto championed the cause of freedom for those denied the right of self-determination. The struggle by the people of Kashmir against Indian occupation was close to his heart. As long as he lived, the people of Kashmir had a hope. Once Zia came into power, he would not even talk about it. For eleven long years it was a lost cause. The return of democracy in Pakistan and the advent of another Bhutto in power, and a worldwide wave of freedom demolishing iron curtains, Berlin walls, have all contributed to igniting a new flame of liberty in the held valley. Benazir's response to it has been typical of her father's. And that perhaps is the reason that Indian Premier V.P. Singh dare not go to what his government calls "*atoot ang*" of Bharat.

While that being a major departure from Gen. Zia's foreign policy, Benazir's government has indeed to go a long way in recasting the Afghan policy which it inherited from Zia. It was time it new approach was adopted and a meaningful political solution was sought. The experience of March 1989 and February 1990 when Jalalabad and Kabul did not fall, should serve as the basis for correcting the future line of action.

Bhutto Shaheed had a different perception *vis-a-vis* the defence of Pakistan. While he believed in a strong standing force, he had believed that a people's army was the only effective solution to Pakistan's defence requirements in view of India's capacity to expand its forces and the strategic depth it had. As such he had introduced military training in colleges. We should enlarge the pattern now so that we have a nation capable of wielding its own buns with reduction on a standing force. Money thus saved could be used for socio-economic development of a society, an incentive that is very much needed to generate a strong sense of belonging. It is indeed a right observation that it is not the standing armies that provide the best defence to ideological and geographical frontiers. Had the contrary been the case, the Red armies would have stemmed the tide of democratic freedom sweeping away the iron curtain and the Berlin Wall. It is prospering people, inspired by freedom and human rights that forms the best defence of an ideology and of a country.

Ziaist culture has debased every sector of our society. We have terrorists and dacoits making life miserable. Corruption has gone deep into the marrow. Merit

has become a demerit. Laws have become ineffective. Acute political polarization has rendered the nation's political will very weak. And without a political will a nation cannot face newer challenges, cannot counter terrorism, and cannot eliminate dacoits and anti-social elements. To revive political will we need strong political parties. Only a few of these and not dime a dozen or what is popularly called "*tonga*" parties.

In this obtaining scenario, PPP is required to play a very big role. It has been through the mill. It has a work force of hundreds and thousands of dedicated workers. They should be properly used to generate the much needed political will. Its government must not act just as an employment bureau. It must offer its diehard elements venues other than jobs to stand on their feet so that they could devote their whole time to creating awareness among the masses, mobilizing them from one end to the other, to provide them a sense of direction and a set of priorities.

A well organised PPP, disciplined and properly oriented, would not only be a bastion of democracy but would also be the best tribute to its founder, Shaheed Bhutto.

IN REMEMBRANCE

Today we are mourning the untimely death of late Prime Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who created a deep imprint on the minds of the people of Pakistan with his exceptional political acumen and with his inbounding faith in democracy and the dignity of human beings. He will always be remembered for his great contributions toward the uplift of our society and to the restoration of democracy. His political wisdom remains unexcelled. His sacrifice for the advancement of democracy and the undaunted courage that he exhibited in the political affairs of the nation constituted a bright chapter in the political history of Pakistan.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was of the view that democracy did not only signify the just social condition but also reflected human excellence.

The principle of equality was the starting point of Mr. Bhutto's reflections. It was reflective of his deep concern about the abiding needs of mankind.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto sought to resolve the political conflict of his times in Pakistan. He was desirous of introducing in Pakistan a just social order. He attempted a frontal defence of democracy as the only just social system. He suggested that the energies of those already committed to the principle of equality should be channeled in the constructive tasks necessitated by the new social conditions. He attempted to diminish the terrors of dictatorship. He was of the view that democracy, taken by itself, is a just cause. Popular sovereignty and equality of conditions, in his opinion were principles which were good by themselves and a society founded on these principals was considered superior by him in every respect.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto entertained the belief that it is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the democratic system and to die for it if the rulers do not give it to them. In actual politics, he gave practical touch to his principle.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was favorable to open ended, well designed, and well projected constituents of the democratic revolution. He defended the concept of liberty and did not favour restricted liberty directed at protecting a small group of privileged people who were independent so far as economic circumstances were concerned. He appreciated democracy as a form of progress. Democracy, in his opinion, constituted a political system which can be viewed as a blessing for

most people. Democratic set up according to Mr. Bhutto about the defence of intellectual and cultural standards of modern Pakistan through education, political action, and the application of social justice to the problems of social action.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto attached great importance to the ineluctable triumph of democracy and even made it functional as a first cause from which almost everything else took root. He considered it an established truth, on the proof of which it is no longer necessary to insist, that the progress of democracy neither can nor ought to be stopped. He presented the view that the movement towards democracy dated from the dawn of modern civilization, and has continued to steadily advance from that time. In his opinion, the rise and growth of the democratic movement pointed to the will of Almighty Allah in its irreversible process. The wisdom of Allah Almighty illuminates the direction in which mankind moves. It leaves freedom of action for the fulfillment of these providential ends.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto worked to provide opportunities to people from all segments of society and struggled hard for a just legal system. Mr. Bhutto was of the view that an effort to check democracy would mean a resistance to the will of Allah Almighty.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto also dwelt on the subject of national integration in the context of political development and democracy in Pakistan. He was of the view that national integration required the creation of ideological consensus with a degree of comprehensiveness that has yet to be developed in Pakistan. The success of democratic process in Pakistan depends upon the creation of social strata which are, by virtue of peculiarities of their socialization and education, both willing and capable of presenting an ideological synthesis of democratic values and the values associated with modernity.

Dwelling on the achievements of PPP Government during the first phase of his role as Prime Minister of Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto observed an increasing democratization in Pakistani society. Human freedoms and privileges were stated to have broadened. The workers were enjoying better conditions of labour. The masses were being admitted more effectively to the advantages of modern civilization in Pakistan. Mr. Bhutto argued persuasively that the presence of intellectuals, researchers and academicians of high caliber in government institutions was compatible with the presence of democracy. All order and civilization must exhibit greater regard for and better placement of intelligentsia and philosophers. This proposition of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto seems logically unassailable. The presence of academicians and researchers in the governmental system augurs well for the emergence of system of meaningful planning and

development. He enunciated the general rule that an increase in the strength and power of academicians is directly proportional with the extension of the organizational development in the governmental system.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was desirous of upgrading the political and economic norms in our society. He wished these norms should ultimately result in a relatively high per capita income and should reflect a relatively equalitarian distribution of income. In his capacity as Prime Minister he wanted to make provisions against the hazards of life - *i.e.*, against sickness, unemployment, and dependence in old age. He was struggling hard to manage the economy of Pakistan in such a way as to smooth out the business cycle and avoid depressions. He was desirous that, under his political guidance, people should come to trust each other more, to be more in control of their lives, and to be more hopeful regarding the future. Under his leadership started taking on a new meaning. He recommended that religious prejudices and hostility should decline and the influence of religious and sectarian identification upon partisan political choice should not remain predominant. He had lunched a struggle for equality and for the availability of governmental resources for the attainment of that end.

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO: A TRIBUTE

Mr. Bhutto's opponents have consistently tried to malign him on his role in the separation of Bangladesh with ill-founded half truths to substantiate their point of view. Pronouncements attributed to him like "Yahan Hum Wahan Turn" (the brainchild of the Urdu Daily "Azad") were part of the campaign. In fact Mr. Bhutto like all the players in that drama was caught up in a chain of events which swept them all aside. He was an inveterate opponent of six points as a manifesto of secession and was not prepared to walk into an Assembly where under the Legislative Framework Order the Constitution had to be framed in 120 days or the Assembly stood dissolved. He realized with the tide of nationalism sweeping Bengal, Mujib despite earlier promises could not afford to retreat even a step from six points. It was against this background that in a massive public meeting in Lahore on 28th February 1971 he offered to go to Dacca and attend the session of the Constituent Assembly provided either Mujib agreed to show some flexibility on six points or the deadline was extended from 120 days for the framing of the Constitution and if this was not accepted then he would "break the legs of anyone who betrayed the national interests". He followed up by quoting from Shah Abdul Latif with a message to Mujib "I will go to my beloved and touch her feet and beg her by all means."

As a result of the traumatic events of 1971 followed by the war with India Mr. Bhutto inherited a truncated Pakistan split asunder by the Indian Army. The world watched expecting another Armageddon. Six thousand square miles of Pakistani territory was under Indian occupation and 90,000 prisoners were in Indian Jails. The whole structure seemed on the verge of collapse. With Pakistan's defeat the power balance of the Sub-continent had undergone a major change.

For Mr. Bhutto this was the authentic call of destiny. He shrugged off the prevailing gloom and set to work. All through the night he reconstructed the administration, promulgated a series of reforms, made key appointments and by his energy and will helped it shocked nation to revive. Mr. Bhutto has reserved a special place for himself in Pakistan history for the courageous manner in which he directed events at that moment. In an interview with the Baltimore Sun he said: "If you think Franklin Roosevelt had an amazing first hundred days watch us."

All his life he had a quality that held the eye. His undoubted achievements in the five years he held power--directing and propelling a new foreign policy, stabilizing Pakistan from the ashes of defeat after 1971, giving Pakistan a Constitution, politicizing an entire nation, reconstructing the national economy and redirecting economic priorities, negotiating from a hopeless position the Simla Agreement to bring back 90,000 prisoners of war and recover six thousand square miles of territory under Indian occupation, the Islamic Summit and its everlasting kudos for Pakistan. His iconoclasm, populist style, courage and respect he gave the poor will all combine to enshrine him in the corridors of history.

The overthrow of Mr. Bhutto's government and his subsequent execution must be the ugliest chapter in Pakistan's existence. The farcical trial that convicted him and the eleven years of terror that followed are burnt indelibly upon the psyche of our country. Despite the White Papers and the officially inspired attempts to malign him he remains one of the most dominant forces in the country's politics. He lived as courageously as he died. His long incarceration, dignity under persecution and refusal to plea for mercy have made his martyrdom part of the history of Pakistan.

On the 4th of April 1979 Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was transported by the military authorities to Ghari Khuda Buksh family graveyard for burial. Carried in a helicopter his body made its final journey back to his ancestral village. All shops and businesses in nearby Larkana closed in respect. Maulvi Mahmood Bhutto according to family tradition read the last "*namaz-e-janaza*" and then a procession of sobbing clansmen led by Sardar Pir Bakhsh Bhutto carried his coffin. Intermittently the procession would halt so that fresh mourners could have the honour of putting their shoulders to his coffin. Occasionally they cried "*Sain Bhutto Ayo -- Bhutto has come*". Weeping and reciting from the Quran they lowered his body into his earthly abode. The mortal remains of Sindh's most famous son were interred but a legend watered by the tears of millions was born to live on.

TO THE GALLOWS

Apparently it may look to be a wrong assertion, but in reality it was the political strength of Bhutto that prompted his hanging. The military junta could not control him and was of the view that its vacillating position could only be consolidated when Bhutto is physically removed, and thus the General was of the view that of the two, one has to be eliminated. He was also afraid that if Bhutto is allowed to come to power then he shall try all those Generals who imposed Martial Law under section 6 of the Constitution, which clearly states that whosoever abrogates or attempts to abrogate the Constitution through power or other means then he shall be treated as traitor. The junta naturally could not take chances.

It was the tragic night of 4th April, 1979, when Bhutto was hanged at 2.00; which was quite contrary to the Jail rule under which the hanging is done a little before dawn. However, the Generals found it feasible to hang Bhutto in the dead of the night and bury him at Larkana in the same hours so that the people may not know of this tragic event. Despite this it agitated the followers of Bhutto, but for the betrayal by some members of the People's Party who had been purchased and due to strict measures taken to let things go astray, even then hundreds of people faced the situation courageously by going to jail, hanged, whipped and tortured in many ways. Some loyal workers of Bhutto even immolated themselves. With all these loyalties, some high-ups of the party continued conspiring with the new rulers and did not make any effort to get the Quaid released. And this encouraged the Generals to an extent that pleas by scores of heads of states and political leaders for releasing Bhutto were rejected by General Zia-ul-Haq. However, this act of the General had a very sharp reaction the world over. The Government of Syria cancelled General Zia-ul-Haq's visit. The USA stopped American aid two days after hanging; giving the impression as if it was in anger against this act, although the action was to apply brakes to Bhutto's atomic programme. Col. Ghaddafi arranged prayers in absentia for Bhutto and held a large condolence meeting. In Srinagar the procession brought out condoling the death in anger burnt the offices of Jamaat-i-Islami, Indonesia observed one day state mourning. The President of UAE Sheikh Zaid wept in public on hearing of the tragic news. The people of Russia, China, Britain, France, Eastern Europe and almost every country mourned the hanging in large number and condemned this act of Zia-ul-Haq. Alas! It all happened much too late.

Shaheed Bhutto was unruffled with all these developments. He was in perfect calm a few days before hanging as he had psychologically prepared himself for the on coming act of hanging. Those days he was kept in the special female ward of Rawalpindi Jail, which was seven feet wide and 10 feet long. He was provided a bed, a mat, a table and a small bookshelf. The attached enclosure was treated as kitchen; one prisoner was deputed to arrange food. This attendant was changed every tenth day so as to prevent any sympathetic influence on him of Bhutto's personality. The food used to be brought by his family friend, Dr. Niazi.

The stringent measures at one stage were further strengthened, and after sometime a guard was posted in front of the toilet, to which Bhutto reacted as an insult and in protest started hunger strike to demonstrate his anger. This restriction was removed after a few days, and he was provided a private toilet. He was also allowed to read books; and the important books which Bhutto react were; Khyber by Charles Miller, Memoirs of Richard Nixon, Discovery of India by Nehru, Eva Peron by John Barnes and Siddiq Salik's Witness to Surrender.

The Punjab Government deputed the old and professional executioner Tara Masih for hanging Bhutto. He had been in this line for the last four generations right from the days of Ranjit Singh. His salary at this time was Rs. 300 per month. He was given Rs. 10 extra for hanging Bhutto in accordance with previous practice. Tara Masih was a drunkard, and due to paucity of resources he used. to drink spirit and tincture. Till now he had hanged hundreds of prisoners. He once said that although the most important case in his career was hanging three prisoners in Lahore before the general public, but hanging of Bhutto was much important for me than any other hanging.

During this solitary confinement, Shaheed Bhutto developed infection of gums and inflammation of kidney. His weight slashed sharply and the clothes could no more fit him. All this torture did not break the morale of Bhutto. His sense of humor and wit sustained and the proof of it was witnessed when he in light mood told Dr. Niazi, during inspection of his teeth and was being helped by a prisoner showing light; "In this cell you are also unlucky like me as in your clinic a beautiful girl used to assist you, but here this prisoner is helping you."

During the last days of imprisonment, the Jail officials refrained from giving severe treatment to Bhutto. However, in those days a Colonel of the Punjab Regiment used to visit him in jail along with other Martial Law personnel. Once he taunted him by saying that when after a few days he would be hanged then why he was reading books; Bhutto remained quiet to such contemptuous attitude.

It was 3rd April, 1979, when Begum Nusrat Bhutto and Benazir were provided an opportunity to meet Bhutto for the last time, and Benazir wrote to one of her friends. "I have been told that this is my last meeting with papa. I shall try to put up bravely, and shall not weep."

The two ladies were brought to Pindi Jail in a Chevrolet. They were duly checked, and after passing through a barbed wire fence, they were conducted to Bhutto's cell. Both of them were made to sit five feet away from Bhutto, who was told by an officer about this being the last meeting. Both Nusrat Bhutto and Benazir demonstrated exemplary patience, and this provided the real strength to Bhutto under the shadow of death. No tears came out, no sobbing was heard. Both mother and daughter continued talking about Pakistan and the Party, and Bhutto provided encouragement.

After the meeting, Bhutto handed over his shoes, dressing gown and other personal assets to the ladies. He then started talking about his engagement ring, but Begum Bhutto stopped him talking about it any further; rather she presented him a "*Tasbeeh*". Bhutto did not use it like a *Moulvi*, rather he put it around his neck like a *sufi*.

In the last moment he picked up two cigars and a bottle of Shalimar perfume to provide him succour at the last moment. His last wishes are only known to Begum Bhutto or Benazir. So this way the last meeting ended, and two ladies had to depart with sorrowful faces. It was only on return that few tears came out of Benazir's eyes.

The moments just before hanging have been reported by closer sources. Bhutto drank coffee and lit the cigar. At eight in the night he had a wash, and took light food. He had not been provided any blade or razor ever since the Supreme Court had pronounced the death sentence, as it was feared that these may not be used for self killing. However, he was allowed to shave at the last moment; and he is reported to have remarked to his servant, Rehman the reason for shaving that he did not want to die as a *Moulvi*. After shave he lay down and shut his eyes with confidence.

At 1-30 a.m. jail officers woke him up and told him to get ready for hanging. He was wearing at this time an off-white *kurta shalwar*, and the jail people did not insist on changing clothes. However, he resisted getting his hands tied up at the back, and said: "Don't insult me. I would like to go walking to the gallows" But the jail personnel gave a beating and forced him to lie down on the stretcher. Hardly after going 400 yards, Bhutto jumped off the stretcher. The officials again beat him, but Bhutto refused to be on the stretcher. He walked up to the gallows. The hangman put the black cover on his face and tied his feet. The Magistrate in

attendance identified him for the last time as “Zulfikar Ali Bhutto on whose head had been placed the black cap.” and ordered the lever to be put on. The last words uttered by Bhutto were: “Stop this drama! Finish it” And then the hangman put on the lever. After 35 minutes the dead body of Shaheed Bhutto was brought down from the gallows and placed on the stretcher.

Bhutto dared death with the same courage as he passed his life. Eighteen months of jail did not weaken his determination. Today the physical being of Bhutto is meaningless as he gave life for setting up much stronger traditions, which have left lasting impressions on the minds of the downtrodden and tortured people of his country. It was possible to extinguish the physical body of Bhutto, but to eliminate the spirit left by him is absolutely impossible for ever; and this has left many a crack in the exploitive system of Pakistan. The events of November 1988 do prove to the hilt the existence of this spirit.

MURDERING THE MESSIAH

“The sword of law should never fall but on those whose guilt is so apparent as to be pronounced by their friends as well as foes.” (Jefferson) But in the case of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto exactly the reverse happened.

Not only during his life but even after his death Bhutto has remained an enigma to this nation which believes more in rhetoric and less in deeds. It so often happens in history that those who have the will and vision, courage and character to stand up against oppression and exploitation always meet a tragic and unnatural end. Most probably because it is the evil that reigns supreme in this world. But the struggle between the oppressors and the liberators of mankind will, and shall continue. Leaving it for history to decide their real place in its realm. It is, however, imperative for us to try to evaluate and appreciate the contribution of the ‘great men so that their deeds could serve as a beacon light to posterity.

“Bhutto ka Siyasi Virsa”, which is an edited Urdu translation of papers read at an international seminar, contains an objective study of Bhutto and his trial by eminent jurists, politicians and scholars. What they have said is not a mere tribute to the dead man, as is common at such gatherings, but an honest and sincere effort to analyze his achievements and define his legacy so as to help history in determining due place to this liberator of humanity.

Sardar Swarn Singh, the ex-foreign minister of India wondered that despite being a feudal who received his education in the West, Bhutto was a great supporter of socialist ideas; he not only brought the first wave of democracy in Pakistan but also successfully maintained a working relationship with both Russia and China which in Swarn’s opinion was no small achievement especially considering Pakistan’s membership of the West sponsored anticommunist regional treaties like SEATO and CENTO.

Dr. Mohammad Zikria Ismail, former vice-foreign minister of Syria was highly appreciative of the reforms initiated by Bhutto in the fields of agriculture, finance and industry. The reforms he thought were aimed not only at breaking the ‘parasitic monopolies’ but also at bridging the ever widening gap between the haves and the have-nots and giving social-respectability to the downtrodden of

the Pakistani society. But when it came to giving Bhutto his due, we as a nation became so callous that he was denied even his basic human right --justice.

A. Jodl, a renowned French jurist and secretary-general of International Federation of Human Rights informed that as per articles ten and eleven of the World Human Rights charter, the following three conditions are the basic prerequisites of any fair trial: (a) the case should be tried in an independent and impartial court of justice; (b) trial should be open and public; (c) defence attorneys should be given full freedom to defend. However, after going through the papers of Jodi, Ramsay Clark ex-attorney general USA, Victoria Schofield author of "Trial and Execution of Bhutto", and Yahya Bakhtiar former attorney general of Pakistan it becomes crystal clear that the trial of Bhutto was not conducted fairly as it did not fulfill even the minimum standards of international justice.

The independence of judiciary was compromised from the very beginning of the case when Justice K.M. Samdani of Lahore High Court (LHC) who had granted bail to Bhutto in the initial hearing of the Qasuri murder case was later excluded by the LHC Chief Justice from the special bench constituted to try Bhutto. As per judicial traditions Samdani should have been included in the bench, but was immediately transferred from the LHC to the Law Ministry.

The impartiality of Molvi Mushtaq, C.J. (LHC) and Anwaar-ul-Haq, C.J. Supreme Court of Pakistan was also compromised. They proved it by their biased conduct during the course of hearing as both of them held personal grudges against Bhutto who had not given them promotions during his rule, as his government did not consider them competent enough, but both of them were made the chief justice by Zia-ul-Haq after usurping power.

The unjust behavior of C.J. Mushtaq can be imagined from the fact that while he was encouraging and sympathetic towards the prosecution, his attitude towards the defendant was sarcastic, humiliating and at times disgraceful; once he asked Bhutto to 'Shut up'. At one time he lost his cool in these words, "Take this man out of the court and keep him outside until he comes in his senses."

Jodl was of the opinion that as an 'accused' it was Bhutto's fundamental right to defend himself in the open court so that the world could also hear his version and in this connection criticized LHC for not allowing Bhutto to record his statement publicly. Instead the court arranged that his statement would be read behind closed doors without the presence of any public or press representatives which forced Mr. Bhutto to boycott the proceedings and stop his attorneys from further pursuing the case.

Similarly, according to international standards the defence attorneys should have all the freedom to defend their case but in the case of Bhutto, says Victoria Schofield, not only the movements of his lawyers were actively monitored but they were also kept under round-the-clock watch by the security agencies. Victoria revealed that while she was here during the trial, she herself was trailed by the intelligence operatives who at times openly enquired from her about her schedules and activities. She realized Bhutto's popularity when some of the nameless persons during the course of their enquiries confided to her that deep down inside their hearts they were admirers of Bhutto but were forced to work against the conscience because of the fear of the ruthless military authorities.

The degree of freedom enjoyed by the defendants Bhutto could be understood from the fact that according to J at one stage during the hearing all his lawyers were arrested. Victoria Schofield also informed that it happened on more than one occasion that all the clerical staff assisting Bhutto's attorneys was also imprisoned without any explanation. Further, Jodl has written that once during the course of the trial at LHC, C.J. Molvi Mushtaq lost his balance of mind, threw a file at the face of Mr. Awan (an attorney of Mr. Bhutto) and in a fit of fury warned the poor fellow that if he dared look again at him in that way he would have to face contempt of court.

Observations of Justice (Retd) Dorab Patel and Victoria Schofield about the hanging of Bhutto despite a split judgment are weighty and thought-provoking. Dorab Patel commented that he could not recall even a single case in the judicial history of the sub-continent in which a person accused of conspiring in a murder was sentenced to death because normally death penalty is awarded only to the one who commits the murder and the abettor gets a less severe punishment and certainly not death penalty. Victoria Schofield opined that as a result of such judgment in such cases, the death penalty is reduced to imprisonment and said that had such a situation occurred in the US, there would have certainly been a retrial.

Ramsay Clark, the former US attorney general termed the execution of Bhutto as a 'political murder' because in his opinion if facts were allowed to speak for themselves then this trial would go down in the judicial history as the worst example of making mockery of the institution of justice.

Dorab Patel, while highlighting the role of justice during General Zia's period which was termed by Justice (Retd) Fakhrudin G. Ibrahim in his paper as, "The period of total darkness", said that it was very painful for him to reveal that the draft of article 212 (A) which was introduced as an amendment in the constitution by Zia stating that neither any order of Martial Law could be challenged in any court of law nor the courts were left competent to admit or

entertain any such petition, was unfortunately not drafted by a military General but by two eminent jurists of Pakistan.

Makhdum Ali Khan in his paper simply blew off the judiciary to pieces for its alleged collusion with General Zia. He strongly questioned judiciary's right of giving Zia the authority to effect amendment in the constitution, who in his opinion later badly mauled and disfigured it. He said that though the judiciary had kept the right to review and assess the working of military government but it came to nothing because once the judiciary had itself handed over a loaded pistol to the dictator, it was foolish of it to expect that he would ask for this permission before pulling the trigger. In this connection, Jodl came up with an interesting proposal. He said that the military adventurers and dictators know it pretty well that they could not be made accountable for their such heinous crimes and corruptions, therefore, now it was high time that the world should think of establishing an International Criminal Court to try such soldiers of fortune on the pattern of Nurembug Trials where the Nazi leaders of WWII were tried and given severe punishments for their crimes against humanity.

Air Marshal (Retd) Zulfikar Khan discussed in detail the contribution of Bhutto for the uplift and development of the defeated and demoralized defence services of Pakistan. Quite contrary to the generally held view that he tried to rein in the army and disgrace the Generals, the (Retd) Air Marshal revealed that he not only saved the army officers of the war crimes which they were suspected to have perpetrated on the poor Bengalis during the army operation in East Pakistan but also withheld the publishing of the Hamood-ur-Rehman commission report on the request of the army.

The book is revealing and unique in many respects. Although there have been many good books on Bhutto but this is the first book which contains the unsuppressed and outspoken comments on trial and achievements of Bhutto by different leading world figures, who are themselves considered as an authority in their respective fields. Regarding the legacy of Bhutto, there was a consensus among all these learned men that apart from being a visionary, a revolutionary and a diplomat par excellence he acted as the liberator of the common man in Pakistan since it was he who for the first time inculcated in them the political consciousness so necessary for an individual to realize one's real place in the society. No wonder, it is none but the people of Pakistan who are the inheritors and custodians of his political legacy.

Published in Urdu, at a reasonable price, this book becomes a must reading for us Pakistanis as it helps understand how the foreign world looks at Bhutto and his execution from an unbiased perspective.

SOVIET UNION WARNED BHUTTO OF U.S. PLOT AGAINST HIM

Washington -- The Soviet Union warned former Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto about seven weeks before his overthrow in a military *coup de'etat* in July 1977 that the United States was "afraid of Pakistan's independent foreign policy and its support for the Arabs in their just struggle against Israel," and while the *mullahs* had no genuine support, people were being paid and bribed to agitate" against his government.

The Soviet Ambassador to Pakistan, S.A. Azimov, who said this to Mr. Bhutto, described the American approach towards developing countries as that of a "cow boy", quickly to use "force."

The envoy also advised the Prime Minister that "the time had come for him to take the historic decision to quit CENTO." While he made no promise to do so, arguing that the matter needed "careful and cool consideration," he announced on the next day May 10, 1977 that he had decided not to send his Foreign Minister to the forthcoming CENTO meeting in Tehran. The Prime Minister also told the Ambassador that he would quit CENTO provided he received a "definite" promise that Pakistan's defence needs would be fulfilled by Moscow through "continued and uninterrupted supply of military hardware."

This and a number of other "disclosures" are contained in the long-awaited biography of Mr. Bhutto by Stanley Wolpert, the Quaid-i-Azam's biographer. The book entitled *Zu1ji Bhutto of Pakistan, His Life and Times* and priced at \$35 was published by the Oxford University press this month in America.

Considering that the Bhutto family made all of Bhutto's personal papers available to the author, the amount of new information that the book contains is disappointingly meagre. It also paints Mr. Bhutto in a most unsympathetic manner and often reads like a third rate work of cheap fiction with situations, of which the author could have no personal knowledge, recreated dramatically with dialogue and descriptions as if he was present when these events took place. The hook is replete with such -tawdry writing.

The book will cause a great deal of anguish to the Bhutto family and his followers since it repeats every ugly story about the former Prime Minister's mother and the woman Husna Sheikh. Why Mr. Bhutto's wife and daughter cooperated so fully with the author, opening all the Bhutto family archives to him, is mystifying and a sign of their good faith in the fairness of foreigners. Had they had any inkling of the kind of book Wolpert was going to produce, it is most unlikely they would have had anything to do with the project.

The book is dedicated to three men, among them Ardeshir Cowasjee, once Bhutto's friend but later his bitter enemy who has seldom missed an opportunity in print or conversation to malign the former Prime Minister.

Ambassador Azimov is further reported to have told Bhutto that in his forecast of the 1977 election results, the American Ambassador Byroade had told his government that the PNA would win 60 per cent and the PPP the rest of the vote. He also advised the Prime Minister not to resign his office because it would "not be in the interest of Pakistan" or for "peace, stability and security in South Asia." The Soviet envoy asked Bhutto to remain "very vigilant" about his personal security, adding that Moscow was "watching the situation very closely" and "deeply regretted" the "diabolical game" that the United States was playing against the "Prime Minister's Government."

The author claims that Bhutto had reported his conversation with the Soviet Ambassador to Byroade who had in turn informed the State Department. A few days later, the Americans told Soviet diplomats in Washington that Bhutto had no intention of leaving CENTO and was merely using it to put pressure on the United States. The Soviet Ambassador informed Bhutto of this advice. The author suggests that Bhutto was playing one power against the other.

The book confirms the view that though the negotiations between the government and the PNA were long and difficult, when Gen Zia-ul-Haq overthrew Bhutto, the two sides had reached a complete agreement and an accord for fresh polls and a great deal else would have been signed within two days at the outside.

Wolpert writes that the formula to which Bhutto finally agreed was the establishment of a "super cabinet" comprising PPP and PNA with the Prime Minister having the casting vote. Bhutto also accepted the PNA demand for the dissolution of the National Assembly produced by the 1977 elections. It was the PNA Central Council which raised 11 new points that though minor were irritating. Bhutto could have agreed to them on the spot but to "save face" he told the PNA team that he would first have to consult his own party and cabinet. It was, however, clear to all concerned that full agreement on all fundamental

issues had been reached between the two sides. Therefore, when Gen. Zia moved against Bhutto's government, there was no justification for doing so.

One question that has often puzzled people is why in the middle of the parleys Bhutto went abroad on a whirlwind tour of Muslim countries? According to Wolpert, he did so to personally thank those governments for their support since March. He was especially grateful to King Khaled of Saudi Arabia. It also appears from the Wolpert account that the Saudi Ambassador Riaz Al-Khatih played a positive role in bringing the two sides together and, in fact, at one point brought a personal message from the King to the PNA leaders urging them to settle their differences with Bhutto.

Bhutto was received warmly in all capitals with the exception of Tehran where the Shah was "cool" and somewhat distant. Earlier, he had refused a request from Bhutto to underwrite a \$3000 million loan that was being negotiated abroad. Wolpert's book contains many inaccuracies, both major and minor, shoddily written and even more shoddily researched, the American "historian" alleges that Bhutto's purpose in seeking a two-thirds majority in the 1977 elections was to bring in the Presidential system. He writes: "He had hired an academic expert on constitutional government, Prof. Leslie Wolf-Philips of the London School of Economics and Political Science, who was busy preparing the new Presidential constitution in London that year, working for the Pakistan embassy there, devising his own "secret codes" and deceptive use of "appendices" to draft a document that no one would be able to read or understand until Prime Minister Bhutto was ready to spring it on his unsuspecting nation. Wolf -Philips flew to Pinch that July to brief Bhutto on his top-secret labors."

This correspondent happens to be in a position to know that this is not true. While it is true that Wolf-Philips advice was sought through Rafi Raza on certain aspects of the constitution, the sensational scenario painted by Wolpert is inaccurate and untrue. What the exercise involved was the relationship between the central and the provincial legislatures which Bhutto felt needed grater coordination. It was no more than an academic exercise. The LSE teacher he was not a full professor but a senior lecturer--did go to Pakistan once and made a call on Bhutto which did not last more than 10 minutes. He met Rafi Raza and Abdul Hafiz Pirzada. Wolf-Philips was adviser to Altaf Gauhar's Third World Foundation and editorial advisor to the journal it published, the *Third World Quarterly*. A more intellectually upright man it was hard to find, according to those who knew him.

About Gen Zia-ul-Haq the book contains less than flattering materials. According to Wolpert, he was picked up out of turn because it was felt that he would stay in line being under an obligation to the Prime Minister. Relying on Gen. Gul

Hasan's account--not the most reliable one--the author says that Bhutto often made Zia the "butt of public ridicule." The General also called Zia a "dark horse."

He narrates a story about Zia and Bhutto which sounds apocryphal and quite out of character as it concerns the Prime Minister.

Gen Gul Hasan says that Bhutto would often shout to Zia from the head of the table, "where is my monkey General? Come over here monkey." He goes on to say that Bhutto would pretend to "pull Zia towards himself on an invisible string and key and then introduce him to a distinguished foreign guest, quickly dismissing him, even before Zia finished bowing ever smiling."

It is bad enough that the former Chief of Army Staff would narrate what is a palpably false story and worse that Stanley Wolpert who considers himself a historian and an authority on the subcontinent should reproduce it.

The authenticity of his other anecdotes is thus thrown into serious doubt. According to a former Pakistani diplomat who worked with Bhutto and knew him well, Bhutto was highly circumspect, especially when foreigners were present.

Bhutto's opinion of Yahya Bakhtiar, his lawyer in the murder case, is far from complimentary. Here is an excerpt from a note the Prime Minister sent to Begum Bhutto from jail.

Referring to the tribunal for which she had engaged the former Attorney General, he writes: "It should not be like my trial. I was left to the mercy of a lazy lawyer who did no homework and forgot documents in his car and forgot instructions. It was a fatal blunder, an unforgivable one. Do not repeat it in your case, a lot of dirty things are happening behind the scenes...Yahya Bakhtiar had capitulated, broken down and joined the conspiracy. But why is everyone...doing it ... dig my grave?"

Before Bhutto released Mujibur Rahman, he went to see him a couple of times. A transcript of one of these meetings quoted by Wolpert contains the following exchange. Mr. Bhutto, "listen, Presidentship, Prime Ministership, whatever you take I am prepared to retire to the country. I swear by the Holy Quran that I am prepared to retire." Mujib, "I told you there is no objection. My idea was that we will live together and we will rule this country. This *haramzada* started the fuss telling me this was what you had said.... and ...communicating to you. Then the disaster started in Bengal." "Mr. Bhutto, "but now we have to put the things right." Mujib, "we have to try. But you know the route. I have to go, I have to

cope. You know the occupation army is there ...our army massacred ...as in Indonesia. Another point is there, I tell you frankly....the West Bengalis, I have to take them out from Bengal and crush My difficulties you understand.”

Bhutto is said to have offered to fly to Dacca with Mujib. He also offered him some money which he refused. He then told him (Mujib), “you should be our President.”

There are errors of fact and detail which mar the authenticity of Wolpert’s work. For example, he describes Bhutto as wearing a green achkan with a gold collar when he took oath as President at a public ceremony in Rawalpindi Mr. Bhutto never wore that dress and, in fact, he disliked it.

For instance, he has described Prof. Abdus Salam as the man put in charge by Mr. Bhutto of Pakistan’s plutonium facility. This is, of course, untrue. The Noble Prize winner was Chief Scientific Adviser to the President, an honorary post he had held since Ayub Khan’s days.

Wolpert also states that Bhutto used the “Urdu formulation *idhar hum, udhar turn*” when it was only the headline placed on top of a story run by Azad the racy Urdu daily, reporting his Nishtar park, Karachi, speech. The man who thought up this catchy headline was its inventive News Editor Abbas Athar. The book is replete with many such minor mistakes which show lack of care and errors unworthy of a serious biographical work in whose preparation the author had more first-hand, unpublished material than anyone has ever had access to.

Wolpert quotes from a handwritten note by the young Bhutto on Embassy of Pakistan, Washington stationery wherein the future Prime Minister pays tribute to the Quaid-i-Azam who had just died. “(He) is solely responsible for the creation of a State for those whom he led in the struggle for the emancipation of their lives. His dream of creating a Pakistan has been a great dream the realizing of his dream has been nothing short of a miracle, for it has been an achievement carried out single-handedly. He has led a people who were thoroughly derelict and disunited and depressed. He has been a God-inspired man, a man of purity of heart, of an unbelievable audacity and a unique courage and determination.”

The people who agreed to be interviewed for the book include the two Bhutto ladies, Bhutto’s only surviving sister Begum Manna Islam, Sahibzada Yaqub Khan, Yahya Bakhtiar, Mustafa Khar, Hanif Ramay, the late Jam Sadiq Ali, Gen. Tikka Khan, Roedad Khan, Rafi Raza, Mubashir Hasan, Malik Mairaj Khalid, the late A.R. Cornelius, Justice Anwarul Haq; Chief Justice Naseem Hassan Shah, Mian Mumtaz Daultana, the late Admiral S.M. Ahsan, Gen S.G.M. Peerzada, Khurshid Hasan Meer, Salman Taseer, Omar Kureishi (whose name Wolpert

spells with a Q, another instance showing lack of care), Ardeshir Cowasjee, Masood Mahmood (living in the United States since Bhutto's execution), Dr. and Begum Zafar Niazi, Mr. and Mrs. Kamal Azfar, Rafi Munir, Omar Kalim (which must be the journalist Kalim Omar, another instance of Wolpert's shoddiness) and, of all people, the young actress Zeba Bakhtiar.

HOW THE WORLD JUDGED THE JUDGMENT

From the dark and dirty cell measuring “9 feet by 6 feet in which he was locked up 23 hours everyday for over a year and watched through iron bars round the clock by six pairs of visible and numerous invisible eyes,” Mr. Bhutto wrote, “I did not kill that man. My God is aware of it...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.” He said: “I am entirely at peace with my conscience in this black hole of Kot Lakhpat. I am not afraid of death. You have seen what fires I have passed through.”

Such were the parting words of a man, an institution who was given a “farce trial” by a “fettered court of justice” as *International Herald Tribune* put it. There was a selfish, retrograde purpose in such primitive vengeance which Prof. F.C. Crone of Copenhagen who followed the proceedings of the case in Pakistan described in *Asiaweek* of May 5, 1978, saying “The trial of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto cannot by any standard be characterized as fair.” He said: “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 elections.”

After the death sentence announced by Molvi Mushtaq of the Lahore High Court the *Economist* of London wrote on 25th March, “The quality of 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.” Mr. Eitene Jaudel, the Secretary General of the Intentional Federation of Human Rights, who came to witness the proceedings said, “Mr. Bhutto did not receive fair treatment according to the essential criteria... he was denied justice in the real meaning of the term.” He said that as an international observer at the trial “I was received by the Chief Prosecutor of the government and he (Mr. Rahman) at his house confided to me that we have to prosecute Mr. Bhutto.” “That kind of speech,” said Mr. Jaudal “was not admissible from reputable jurists in front of international observers.”

The Secretary General of the International Federation of Human Rights trembled with rage as he spoke: "Permission to meet Mr. Bhutto in the jail was denied... I was extremely sensitive to the atmosphere of extreme "aggression existing between the Chief Justice (Anwar-ul-Haq) and the defence team" of Mr. Bhutto. "Despite ... the presence of the full bench of nine judges, *Justice Anwar-ul-Haq was to operate with great skill to get from the Supreme Court the confirmation of the death penalty required by the Chief Martial Law Administrator.*" He said the "defence was optimistic at the period of my visit in Rawalpindi that five of the judges were in favour of Mr. Bhutto and so "one of the judges was to retire during the trial and will not be replaced." "That lost one voice for Mr. Bhutto." Another "Judge Waheeduddin will also retire (becoming sick) before the verdict." Mr. Ramsay Clark, the former Attorney General of the United States described it saying, "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." The New York Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights in their Report on 'Violation of Human Rights in Pakistan' (August 1982) summarized it saying, "of nine judges, four upheld the conviction, three opposed it and two were forced to withdraw from the proceedings." Of the four judges of the Supreme Court who found Mr. Bhutto guilty, including the Chief Justice, two were ad hoc appointee while the three who found him innocent were all permanent judges.

About the judgment issued by the Lahore High Court under Justice Molvi Mushtaq, the *Economist* of London (25th March 1978) wrote The Chief Justice who heard the case was known to have a deep personal antipathy towards him (Mr. Bhutto)." Mr. Jaudel from Paris described the objectivity of the Lahore High Court as "seriously questionable." The eminent British Lawyer John Mattheos, who attended the Lahore trial, in his publication said, "particularly, I am concerned at the way a witness's favorable answer would be the subject of immediate interruption from the Bench, who would take over the witness and cause him to whittle down or change his answer. None of this would be recorded by the typist contemporaneously, but ultimately the court would dictate to the typist the original question and the final answer which frequently bore no resemblance to' that which the witness had first said,"

At the Lahore High Court Mr. Bhutto was first prevented from pleading his case by being told that in "due course he would speak for hours and hours" but when his turn finally came, Maulvi Mushtaq decided that the statement would be recorded in camera, with no one present. The Maulvi only permitted those witnesses whom he deemed fit to appear before the Court and "only those portions were recorded which the Chief Justice approved." "Nobody to hear his arguments, his pleadings, his opinions, his reply to the charges," as the Secretary General of the Paris-based International Federation of Human Rights put it,

“That, “he said, “is certainly not a normal way to render justice” and is a violation of Articles 10 & 11 of the International Declaration of Human Rights. Mr. Ramsay Clark, the former Attorney General of USA who witnessed the Lahore trial, said he found the allegations against Mr. Bhutto to be “inherently improbable,” the evidence of the Chief Witness to be “more than suspect” and the Chief Justice’s prejudice against Mr. Bhutto to be “spread throughout his 145 page decision.” As reported in *The New York Times* of February 14, 1979, Mr. Ramsay Clark 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.” Later, he also said, “It was not a trial by any standards of Law.” He described the charges as “farce” and “absurd,” and the conduct of the judicial officer as “improper,” with “a seed of prejudice in his deliberative process” with “extra judicial statements.” He said “the evidence presented against Bhutto even if believed would not support a verdict of guilt.” “During these long years, I have been to so many countries but no one, not any one believes these charges.”

Surprisingly the judgments of the three dissenting judges, all of them permanent judges of the supreme Court, Mr. Justice (R) Dorab Patel, late Mr. Justice Safdar Shah and Mr. Justice (R) Haleem, the recently retired Chief Justice, also corroborate what all these eminent and learned men of law say all over the world. Their judgment, which declared Mr. Bhutto as innocent, is filled with such remarks: “With due respect to the learned judges, I am compelled to observe... (that) the opinion of the trial court is based on misreading of evidence;” “no reliance whatsoever can be placed on his evidence because he has given false evidence on every material particular;” “I have to state with great regret that they are totally irrelevant to the question of Mr. Bhutto’s guilt,” Justice Haleem observed that the “case mainly hinges on the evidence of the approver, Masood Mahmood, the question arises as to whether he should he believed or not? An overall examination of his evidence has led me to conclude that, it is not of the quality on which reliance can he placed.” “If I may say so with respect this was wholly unjustified, for the benefit of doubt in the evidence must in law go to the accused, as that is the elementary principle of criminal jurisprudence;” “I am firmly of the opinion that (the) evidence is unnatural and thereby lacks the guarantee to inspire confidence.” “It does not appeal to wisdom and I would therefore disbelieve him. This should suffice to demolish the case...”

Mr. Safdar Shah who wrote the dissenting judgment acquitting Mr. Bhutto as innocent and with which Justice Haleem concurred, observed that “It is true that the (Lahore) High Court has accepted all the said evidence, but in doing so, with respect, it seems to have disregarded even the basic principle of scrutinizing the same on the touchstone of naturalness and Probability.” “Therefore I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the witness was not telling the truth due to

well calculated motive." "The High Court...seems to have accepted the evidence...without subjecting them to proper scrutiny..." "This axiomatic, wholesome and cardinal principle relating to the safe administration of criminal justice does not seem to have been present, with respect, to the mind of the High Court... which cannot - even be remotely supported."

When original documents were not available photocopies were produced in utter disregard to the court procedures. Mr. Telephone was used as the principal witness; that Mr. so-and-so told me on telephone to do so, right from Mr. Bhutto down to the last police man. When the empty cartridges did not conform to the guns used in the murder Maulvi Mushtaq said the *empties might* have been replaced." Demonstration of firing was not done by the High' Court and when the Supreme Court saw the demonstration, Justice Dorab Patel observed, "It was unfortunate that the High Court did not have an opportunity of watching a demonstration of firing practice as we had which proved that the statement given was "false and is a piece of deliberate perjury." In the opinion of the late Justice Safdar Shah, as observed in the judgment, "fiction can be stronger than truth." He thus concluded that, "looked at from whatever angle the evidence...is not only unnatural improbable but patently absurd and untrue." Even in London an international Convention of Jurists which was organised to discuss the trial came up with the unanimous opinion that that there had been a "gross miscarriage of justice."

Why was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Mr. Justice Yaqoob Ali Khan replaced by Justice Anwar-ul-Haq from Jalandhar, in violation of the Constitution? The Supreme Court of Anwar-ul-Haq had not yet given Gen. Zia the right to amend the Constitution. But he violated it by sending home the Chief Justice himself and installing Mr. Anwar-ul-Haq instead, illegally. Why was the divisional bench of Mr. Justice Samdani and Mr. Justice Mazharul Haq ousted who were trying the murder case and had earlier granted Bhutto's habeas corpus petition? Why was Justice Maulvi Mushtaq brought in as temporary Chief Justice of the High Court to oust the original bench who installed himself on the bench? Why was the case taken straight to the High Court as against the normal procedure of the Sessions Court? Why Chaudhry Fazal Ilahi was suddenly retired as President and Gen. Zia installed himself as President under an ordinance to become the President, as well as the Chief Martial Law Administrator as well as the Chief of Staff? In normal course after the judgment of the Supreme Court the mercy petition would have gone to President Fazal Ilahi and not to the CMLA. Why was Gen. Iqbal removed as the Governor of Punjab and replaced by Gen. Sawar Khan to whom the mercy petition may have gone after the judgment of the Lahore High Court? What assurances were given by Gen. Chishti to the other four co-witnesses who were hanged in the murder case? What was the personal conduct of Moulvi Mushtaq other than his being

intensely annoyed with Mr. Bhutto for being superseded first by Justice Sardar Mohammad Iqbal and then Justice Aslam Riaz? What was his involvement with the girl called Julie, the daughter of General Sherjan, against which Shahzada Jalil Sherjan reported both to Gen. Zia and to the Supreme-Judicial Council while Justice Moulvi Mushtaq sat presiding over the bench? Notwithstanding the plight and the pathetic burial of Moulvi Mushtaq, when at least three people, Shafqat Hussain, Zahoor Ahmed and Shiekh Asghar, died of being bitten by bees, was a judge allegedly guilty of such misconduct under Hudood Ordinance fit for sitting on the bench? Wasn't it constitutionally illegal for Moulvi Mushtaq to be Chief Justice as well as to be Chief Election Commissioner giving press conferences openly accusing Mr. Bhutto as well as meeting Gen. Zia for day to day orders? Was it legal for Justice Anwar-ul-Haq to become acting President thus mixing the judicial function with the executive when he sat presiding over the trial? Why were, as rumors go, some portions of Mr. Bhutto's historic address at the Supreme Court and which were recorded by one Mr. Nagshbandi, erased? On whose orders? Why did Gen. Zia order the demolition of the Rawalpindi jail where Mr. Bhutto was hanged? How true is it that the late Justice Safdar Shah who behind tapes in England which spell the whole truth in this preplanned, cold-blooded calculated judicial murder?

That "Justice was biased and the trial was unlawful" is the unanimous opinion of international jurists. Even the hanging was arranged violating Rule No. 361 of the Jail laws which state the timing of execution, that during March, April, September to October, executions shall take place at exactly 5.30 a.m. Mr. Bhutto was hanged in the middle of the night in disregard to the jail laws.

Mr. Bhutto refused to appeal for mercy. He left behind no will. He belongs, to history and his parting words to his daughter continue to echo. It is time to say good bye for ever. Be courageous my daughter. He left behind Victor Hugo's "last days of a condemned" for those sinister faces that hatched the conspiracy to execute him. From the death cell he asked his hangmen: Does the junta in Pakistan want to kill me for posthumous recognition?

BHUTTO - IN THE STRUGGLE OF LIFE AND DEATH

اور نکلیں گے عشاق کے قافلے قتل گاہوں سے چن کر بجائے علم
 مختصر کر چلے درد کے ناصی جن کی راہ طلب سے ہمارے قدم

Twentieth century occupies a prominent place in history as a large number of great heroes were born during this period. The current century is also important because it has the eminence of a historic era that has been decisive in the continue class struggle in social development. During the past two centuries mankind achieved unprecedented progress through the development of modern capitalistic system. Because of sharp class struggle, as a corollary to rapid development, the degree of exploitation of the working masses was bound to increase further. The sharpening of the political struggle on the basis of class struggle therefore was inevitable. The twentieth century has turned into an era that witnessed the class contradictions and sharp struggle between the antagonistic class interests. The issues such as the right of self-determination of the nations, socialism and democracy have developed into such an important historical issues that have a determining effect on the very existence of humanity with this background, the great historical struggle of the working masses took birth against colonialism, neocolonialism and fascism.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is one of those great heroes who were born during the current century. In his great struggle, he gave his blood and life for the cause of justice and righteousness. His sacrifice today symbolizes the truth and great human values.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto rose as a historical necessity for Pakistani society during this long human struggle, which witnessed rapid social and political changes. It is, therefore, a great challenge to write on an ever-living personality like that of Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. During the last 11-year period, every effort was made to destroy democratic and human values, first direct under the dictatorial rule and then through the remnants of Martial Law. They did not spare any opportunity to misinterpret, misreport and wrongly project the personality of

great Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, and thus attempted to create a controversial personality. Finally they eliminated him physically. In their nefarious attempt to end the popularity of the great leader, these anti-people and anti-democratic elements tried to build up other personalities to replace his charismatic personality. But in this, the historical forces take their own shape; the people emerge as great opponents of anti-people elements who are wiped off the face of earth. Thus begins a, movement a strong movement calling for justice for the great hero of the masses. During this historic period, it becomes difficult for the people to pay tributes to the great hero. Because during this period Yazid attempts to dominate Hussain. They attempt to defy the historical values and conspire to eliminate the great hero spiritually and physically. We must understand this historical fact in the words of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who once said: "I prefer to die at the hands of tyrants and refuse to be eliminated historically."

The way the oppressors and the exploiting forces made Zulfikar Ali Bhutto their target is an undenyng proof that he was a champion of the new era, the modern social system and was a historical necessity. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto entered the Pakistan political stage during a revolutionary phase. He had a deep understanding of the changing values and thus sided with the oppressed majority and led their struggle with courage and heroism. With his struggle and sacrifice, he became a part of national democratic movement and won the hearts of the common people.

It is natural that in an era of extensive and complicated exploitation of the masses by different groups of oppressors and exploiters, the birth of a popular hero is inevitable. And then he becomes as great a legend of popularity and of great heroism.

Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto resigned in December 1967 from the Ayub cabinet. He was confident and had a strong faith when he declared at the Hala inaugural session of Pakistan People's Party:

"I love my country; I love my home and earth. I will be buried in my country. I will sacrifice every thing for the people. When I left the Ayub cabinet, I told him very clearly that no one can separate me from my people. I am for the solution of the people's problem in a peaceful and in a democratic way. But if necessary, I will be the first person to enter the battleground. We do not fear revolution."

The whole world then witnessed in September, 1968 that a great man launched a powerful people's movement against the dictatorial regime of Ayub Khan. The foundations of a new national and democratic political movement were laid. Pakistan's history was undergoing rapid changes and written in the name of this great hero.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had all the great qualities that made him popular with the masses. He came up to their expectation and in him they found a leader who could lead them to their freedom on whom they could fully rely because of his great leadership values. He became a symbol of a message for the oppressed people, a message for their emancipation, a message for a new life, free of exploitation and oppression. A symbol that can only be found in the poetry. On September 17, 1971, in a message to Karachi newspapers he said: "It is not an ultimatum, it is not a threat, I am a humble person, and I cannot extend threats. I state only the realities, the facts; I close my message on Lenin's great words: Life is the most precious possession of a person. Because he gets only one opportunity to live, he should therefore lead a life free of cowardice. You should therefore lead a life that you should never repent that it was a purposeless life. You should live in a way that you can tell the death on its face that your whole life and energy was devoted to a great goal, the emancipation of mankind."

This great goal, service to humanity, was always above everything for Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, at all the stages and under all the circumstances. He did not ignore this great goal even after he enjoyed the unprecedented confidence of the masses and even after ascending to power. He allowed history to determine his fate; he refused to allow the enemies of the people to give any verdict on his personality. From the death cell, he wrote a farewell letter to the French President:

"I say you goodbye with the hope that in future, better people will emerge in the peoples' struggle."

But people never forget those great people who lay down their lives, sacrifice every thing for the people and for the struggle of the people. 'Peoples' consciousness is the consciousness of history. When the enemies of peace and progress fearing the victory of the oppressed people try to eliminate great heroes like Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the strong forces of history come under play and the history-provides eternal protection to the hero, it gives him eternal popularity. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was a great man, a legendary character, a great phenomenon; the sacrifices of such heroes become symbolic in the historic fight by the oppressed and the exploited people. That is why they always live in the memory of people despite strong opposition of those in power. Those elements opposing heroes like Bhutto suffer from various other weaknesses, including their opposition to literature and culture. If the lackeys of a dictator do not have the decency of doing justice with the personality of Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, they cannot prevent history giving its verdict.

AT WHAT TIME WAS BHUTTO REALLY HANGED?

The late Mr. Bhutto was he hanged or was he tortured to death before time and only later, to complete the procedure, had the noose slipped round his lifeless neck? The latter kind of hanging is not according to law and can only be termed as murder. Bhutto's friends and foes alike are not all certain of the manner of his death. Understandably so.

At the time of Mr. Bhutto's hanging I was not at the Rawalpindi Jail. Therefore I cannot say anything as an eyewitness, but referring to documentary proofs and the prescribed rules and regulations I can throw some light on what is still a hit of a mystery.

The Jail Manual, which is applicable to all the jails of the country, states clearly on pages 81 to 88 how to treat and behave with the prisoners. Chapter 14 is wholly for the condemned prisoners and the treatment is prescribed from the arrival of the condemned one at the prison till he is hanged to death. But we will refer only to those paragraphs which have present relevance.

Mr. Bhutto's review appeal was rejected by the Supreme Court on 31st March. According to law, he had to submit his mercy appeal to the provincial governor and the president. But that he did not do so, and also forbade his wife Mrs. Nusrat Bhutto and his daughter Miss Benazir Bhutto from doing it. But afterwards the press reported that the sister of Mr. Bhutto, Mohatarma Munawar-ul-Islam, made the appeal to the President, but the appeal was rejected on April 2.

According to practice in vogue in the Jail Department, the man under sentence of death is hanged on the seventh day of the President's rejection of his appeal. This can be verified from the record of all hangings since the creation of Pakistan. Even if no mercy petition were made. Mr. Bhutto should have been hanged no earlier than 7th April, counting from the date of the Supreme Court verdict. If we take the date of the President's rejection of his sister's appeal into account then the hanging according to established practice could have come no sooner than 9th April. In actual fact the event occurred on 4th April and How?

We accept that there are no specific instructions in the Jail Manual but only an unvarying practice to hang a condemned prisoner only after a week of the final word. Since this was not a law the practice could be waived in the case of Mr. Bhutto.

But the timings of the execution and its procedure do come under the law and that cannot be tampered with.

In the chapter pertaining to the condemned prisoner, Rule No. 361 is as follows:

Time and day of Execution

Rule 361(1)

Execution shall take place at the following hours:

May to August 4.30 A.M.

March, April and September to October 5.30 A.M.

November to February 6.30 A.M.

Then on page 88, Rule No. 363 explains as under:

Body to remain suspended half an hour. Return of Warrant.

Rule-363 (i) The body shall remain suspended for half an hour and shall not be taken down till the Medical Officer declares life extinct.

Leaving all else aside, we will discuss the case only under these two rules. Let us accept that according to rules Mr. Bhutto was noosed at 5.30 a.m. sharp. Also accept that since it was the case of Mr. Bhutto, a special one for several reasons, all the jail personnel remained alert and everything was done like clockwork. Even then the rule requiring the dead body to be kept suspended for half an hour, and then the examination of Medical Officer to declare life extinct, which must at least have taken another 15 minutes, should mean that the corpse was released from the noose no earlier than 6.15 a.m. If the corpse was not bathed and wrapped but straightaway put in the coffin box, sealed and sent off from the jail for the airport, the journey and the emplaning should have taken at least 30 minutes, so that it was 6.45 a.m. at Rawalpindi. It was in the news that the plane had to go to Larkana but due to emergency it landed at the Sukkur Airport and from there the coffin was transferred to a helicopter and carried to Larkana. In all this at least another one and half hours must have elapsed. At Larkana bathing and wrapping up the body and allowing the final viewing of it by the relatives must have taken more than an hour. If all the above had been done with mechanical economy of time the burial should have taken place at 8.15 a.m.

However the news media announced that it had happened at 7.30 a.m. The news of the hanging and burial were first heard from All India Radio in its news bulletin of 9.30 a.m. (9 a.m. Pakistan time) while Radio Pakistan confirmed it in its bulletin at 11.30 a.m.

Keeping all these facts in mind it is hard not to wonder if the event had not after all taken place well ahead of the legally prescribed time. Even computerized efficiency could not have packed everything, from the mounting of the gallows in Rawalpindi to the internment in Larkana, between 5.30 and 7.30 of the same morning.

That then opens the question of the manner of dying too.

THEY COULD NOT KILL BHUTTO

The death cell is a cold and damp room measuring seven by eleven feet. It's 1.30 at night on 4th April, 1979. The prisoner is lying on the floor on a mat of palm leaves. Half asleep waiting for gallows is one of the most brilliant and beloved leaders of Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Jail authorities shake him up and tell him its time to go. Normally the time of execution would be just before dawn. But today, they are in a hurry-they can't wait for the dawn - a symbolic and desperate gesture to block the rising sun.

Bhutto's hands are tied behind his back and he is forcibly put on a stretcher. But they can't keep him immobile for long. He gets up and insists on walking to his gallows. He is aware of the tradition. No one can take this right from him.

He climbs the steps and stands there.... silentalone, there are no witnesses... only masks and uniforms. But history is watching.

Someone rolls a black hood onto his face. His feet are tied. Now they are waiting for the final signal of the assassin.

"Finish it", Bhutto says in disgust... and the lever is pulled.

Bhutto is dead. Long live Bhutto. As indeed he lives on. He lives on in the memory of all freedom loving people. He lives on in the ideals that he propagated. He lives on as the hope of the weak and oppressed. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto may not be with us today in a physical sense but in spirit he never left us. His towering presence and his ideals have stayed with us like a beacon of hope that lit up the darkest hours of the long night of oppression and gave strength and sustenance to the torch hearers of democracy.

Savior like he came when the country was sunk in an abyss of depression. He inherited a demoralized nation, an empty treasury, 90,000 prisoners of war languishing in India camps, a large chunk of Pakistan under Indian occupation. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was not daunted. He set to the task of rebuilding the nation with a zeal and will that is the hallmark of truly great men. In a short period of time he obtained the freedom of our prisoners of war, got back the captured territories and introduced long ranging and revolutionary reforms in the country.

He brought the key industries under public control; put a stop to the exploitation of the workers through a new labour policy, introduced land reforms and a new administration policy. On the international scene he cemented relations with brotherly Islamic countries which culminated in the historic Islamic Summit Conference at Lahore.

There were many who did not like what was happening. While the poor and the exploited felt secure for the first time, the rich and the powerful felt threatened. They did not have the freedom to exploit the masses and they did not like it. They did not have the freedom to barter away the national interests for personal gain and they did not like it. So with Machiavellian cunning they started to plot and plan the destruction of Bhutto. They had the resources and the opportunity and they mounted a campaign of vilification with -a vengeance to destabilize the popularly elected government. They succeeded or seemed to have succeeded.

On 4th April, 1979, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was executed, his crime, his love for Pakistan and democracy. What his executioners did not realize was that you cannot destroy an ideal, you cannot kill a dream. There is not sufficient darkness in the universe to quench the tiny spark of freedom that burns in the heart of man. They could not and did not kill Bhutto; they gave him the immortality of martyrdom. Not satisfied with the prosecution of the visionary, relentless persecution of the Bhutto family was embarked upon. Bhutto's courageous widow and illustrious daughter picked up the fallen lance and prepared to fight against the seemingly indomitable foe. The legacy of a great man lay heavy on frail shoulders and yet they continued the battle for freedom, for democracy.

Today as we pay homage to our leader on his tenth death anniversary, the dark clouds are gone; the sun of democracy shines bright over Pakistan under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Ms. Benazir Bhutto.

Bhutto had predicted it. In his book "If I am assassinated", he says, "Sooner or later for every people there comes a day to storm the Bastille. The people of France charged on this symbol of hatred on 14th July, 1789. The people of Pakistan are hound to have their day of Bastille, if not in 1978, in 1989. The day is coming and nobody has yet been born to stop its advent."

The prophecy has come true but let us not relax our vigilance or pat ourselves on the back too soon. The disruptive forces have not given up. They have only retired to the sidelines to continue their nefarious activities. On this day as we bow our heads to pay tributes to Quaid-e-Awam, let us also pledge to stand united behind this great lady who is our Prime Minister, to give her all the support she needs, to make sacrifices where necessary. Let us not flinch from hardships and challenges. Let us all work as one nation under the guidance of

our Prime Minister to leave behind us a heritage of democracy that our future generations will be proud of.

**ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO AS SEEN
BY GENERAL GUL HASSAN**

When Z.A. Bhutto took over the offices of President and Chief Martial Law Administrator from Yahaya Khan, he sent for General Gul Hassan and asked him to take over the Army. The meeting took place in the Punjab House. Gul Hassan agreed after some hesitation but only if certain conditions were met *viz*, (1) that he would serve in the same rank -- Lt. General -- although Commander-in-Chief was always a four star General; (2) Bhutto would arrange disengagement of troops on the border; (3) Martial Law would be lifted; (4) He would not interfere with the running of the Army.

In his address to the nation on assumption of office, Bhutto said: "I have asked General Gul Hassan to be acting Commander-in-Chief. But he will retain the rank of Lt. General. We are not going to make unnecessary promotions. We are a poor country." The next day Gul Hassan rang up President Bhutto and asked why he had told a lie about his rank. He answered that the Commander-in-Chief did not understand politics and that was why he had missed the point! The General asked the President to keep politics out of his dealings with him. But this was not to be. A few days later he asked the General whether he had seen the film of the Dhaka surrender. He invited the Commander-in-Chief to see it. Gul Hassan declined the offer. "He was now the Supreme Commander of our Armed Forces," writes Gul Hassan, "and instead of trying to heal their wounds; he was rubbing salt into them. It was not the Armed Forces alone that had bungled the situation in East Pakistan; the politicians had played a major part in the debacle and he was one of the chief actors, if not the star performer I later found out that he had the film specially flown in from abroad, and I also learnt that it was telecast several times and was stopped only when the public protested."

Bhutto later expressed a desire to accompany the new Commander-in-Chief on his tour to meet the troops. General Gul Hassan put his foot down. He recalls: "If I had acquiesced in and consented to his accompanying me, he, being a demagogue, was quite capable of telling the troops that he was around at my behest because I had got cold feet after which either I toed his line or quit. In the former case I would merely be masquerading as the Commander-in-Chief, under Bhutto's benign shadow; in the latter instance he would have propagated that I could not take it any more. He would be the winner on both scores, gaining political mileage on my account."

Friction between the two grew. The flash point came soon. Gul Hassan had refused the use of the Army for civil purposes. Similar demands had been declined by the Air Chief, Rahim Khan. Both were summoned to the President's House. Gul Hassan answered the charge of non-cooperation by saying: "I am afraid non-cooperation from the Army will continue if the demands placed upon it are not lawful. As far as I am concerned I am fed up and if anyone can give me a piece of paper and a pencil, I am prepared to quit right now." Little did he know that the resignations had already been typed out! The drama was unnecessary. This is how General Gul Hassan recalls it:

"As soon as the signing ceremony was over, Bhutto got up. The Air Chief asked me, who do we hand over to? I used a tour letter word that I thought most befitting to furnish an epilogue to the end of Act One."

Both the Army and the Air Chief were driven to Lahore by Khar, the Provincial Governor. Mumtaz Bhutto sat next to him. The Army Chief sat at the back with the Air Chief on his left, and Minister Mustafa Jatoi on his right. Jatoi was carrying a revolver in his pocket. The party was escorted by a bevy of policemen. Jatoi fell asleep on the way and started snoring. Says Gul Hassan: "I hoped Jatoi had engaged the safety catch of the gun securely, otherwise an accident would have disturbed his slumber with every possibility of putting the wind up our driver!"

Both the Army and the Air Chiefs were assigned abroad as Ambassadors. Our diplomatic mission provides the much-needed safety valve to politicians who use them frequently for their own convenience. Gul Hassan who was Ambassador at Athens and later at Vienna resigned at the latter post because he was disgusted with the policies pursued by Bhutto. He sent a telegram to the Chief of Staff asking him to oust Bhutto before he could destroy Pakistan. With all the stormy relations with Bhutto, General Gul Hassan calmly sums up the character and contribution of Bhutto as follows:

"He was the most charismatic personality on our political scene ... he could, or rather should, have left his mark on the history of Pakistan. Nevertheless the fact is that he did not. He became a victim of his own vanity, egocentrism, and extreme arrogance ... He also succumbed to the dense air of sycophancy that sustained him throughout his term of office. He was encouraged by his associates - - politicians, bureaucrats, senior army officers and friends -- to consider himself above the law ... he came to regard himself as infallible."

General Gul Hassan goes on to offer a fairly perceptive analysis of the phenomenon that was Bhutto:

“In a way, Bhutto was his own Rasputin. He was driven relentlessly by his volcanic ambition and unbounded egoism which kept him on the go all the time. The word ‘relax’ did not exist in his vocabulary and, if it did, he concealed it, as it ran counter to his mode of operation, which was to play to the gallery and depict himself as being totally immersed in solving all the problems of Pakistan and those of all the people of Pakistan. Also, I do not think he ever played any game; his only hobby was politics, and the dirtier the environment, the better it suited his genius.”

In 1977 some compatriots asked General Gul Hassan why he had not ousted Bhutto in March 1972, when he was well aware of what Bhutto was up to. The General replied that he knew that Bhutto would accomplish the feat without any help from him! He believes that his judgment was vindicated by the turmoil that ensued in the wake of electoral rigging in March 1977.

General Gul Hassan, who was ADC to the Quaid-i-Azam, retired from service in March 1972. He was the last Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army. He had an eventful career which he recapitulates with candid sincerity in his Memoirs which have just been released by the Oxford University Press. The autobiography is indeed interesting.

TWO LANDMARKS

Eleven years after his judicial murder, as one looks back on the life and achievements of late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, two achievements stand out prominently as great landmarks of his times. Both these landmarks have not only survived but gained added lustre in course of time because they were built on consensus and not on partisan politics. It seems that Bhutto deliberately chose to delink these achievements from his own person and instead made them rest on national consensus. History had taught him the fragility of structures dependent upon individuals.

The first of these achievements was the Constitution of 1973 which was unanimously adopted by all the political leaders of all the provinces of the country. Its unanimous adoption gave it strength so that the dictator could not abrogate it but merely 'held in abeyance'. The Supreme Court upheld it and while giving powers to the CMLA to amend it, retained the powers of judicial review of any amendments made. General Zia could not abrogate it although he derided the Constitution in his now most infamous interview with a Tehran based newspaper in these words, "What is a Constitution? A 15-page document, if I want I can tear it any time and all the politicians will be following me wagging their tails." Even the distortions made in it through the Eighth Amendment have not wiped it out. The name of the 1973 Constitution and national urge to restore it to its original form still survives.

The Constitution of 1973 was worked out by a National Assembly which was elected on the basis of one man, one vote. It was different from the 1962 Constitution which was imposed by a military dictator without consulting the people. Consequently when the end came, Field Marshal Ayub Khan violated his own Constitution by handing over power to General Yahya Khan instead of the Speaker of the National Assembly. The 1973 Constitution was also different from the Constitution of 1956 which had been drawn by a Constituent Assembly formed undemocratically on the basis of indirect elections.

General Zia-ul-Haq suppressed the Constitution of 1973 and promulgated the Constitutional Order 1981 to give himself the powers to make the constitution and give laws. It is a sad reflection on our national life that a document amenable to amendment by a single person actually passed for a Constitution. When it was challenged, General Zia used the pretext of a hijack incident in March that year

and robbed the Supreme Court of the powers to question his personal judgment with regard to amendment in the Constitution.

The second most important achievement of late Bhutto, which was again based on national consensus, has been the nuclear programme of Pakistan. Soon after taking over power he convened a meeting of the country's scientists and engineers at Multan in March 1972 and placed before them his desire to make Pakistan self reliant in science and technology particularly nuclear technology. The meeting lasted several hours. All the scientists and engineers present pledged their whole hearted support to the government in the acquisition and development of sophisticated technologies. It was for the first time in the country's history that local talent had been relied upon and given a plan of action.

Bhutto's passion for nuclear technology predates his assumption of office of President in 1971. Munir Ahmad Khan, Chairman of the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission has recalled in a recent interview an interesting episode which took place in 1965 when late Bhutto served as Foreign Minister in Field Marshal Ayub Khan's Cabinet. Munir Ahmad Khan then was serving as a Senior Executive in the Vienna based International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Munir Ahmad Khan recalls how Mr. Bhutto had arranged his (Mr. Khan's meeting in London with the President during Ayub Khan's visit to U.K. in mid 1965. Mr. Z.A. Bhutto was trying to persuade the Field Marshal to go for sophisticated nuclear technology and acquire nuclear reprocessing plant to help bring Pakistan on the nuclear map of the world. Bhutto was averse to the thought that while major civilizations had acquired nuclear know-how, Muslims were still behind in this field. Munir-Ayub meeting had been arranged by him in the hope that the Field Marshal might listen to a leading nuclear engineer and be persuaded to go for the acquisition of nuclear technology.

The Munir-Ayub meeting took place in the Dorchester Hotel of London. According to Mr. Khan, Ayub Khan patiently listened to his proposal about the acquisition of needed nuclear technologies but was apparently not convinced. The field Marshal also did not agree to the proposal to buy a nuclear reprocessing plant which then was available very cheap from West Germany and without any safeguards. Mr. Khan says that President Ayub Khan thought that Pakistan could always count on Chinese support in the event of any eventuality and that there was no need for Pakistan to develop an independent nuclear capability.

When a disappointed Munir Khan came out of the meeting, an impatient Bhutto was already waiting for him. When Munir Ahmad Khan told him of the cold response of Field Marshal Ayub Khan, Bhutto only said "Don't worry. Our turn will come."

Bhutto's turn did come indeed. And when his turn came, he not only sought the needed nuclear technologies for Pakistan but also sought to build a national consensus for it so that no future government could reverse the process once set in motion.

Bhutto ordered the shifting of the head office of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission from Karachi to Islamabad and kept the portfolio of atomic energy directly under his charge. The Commission was expanded and a massive programme of training of manpower, acquisition of technologies from abroad and development of indigenous technologies undertaken. Within a few years the Commission was expanded manifold and Pakistani scientists and engineers succeeded in uranium exploration and mining for nuclear power plants. Work on the uranium enrichment was also undertaken during Z.A. Bhutto's time.

While work on the enrichment of uranium was undertaken, Bhutto vigorously pursued negotiations for a reprocessing plant from France. In fact Bhutto started negotiation with France almost after a year of coming into power. The contract was signed in 1976 and what happened after that is a matter of history too well known to be recounted here.

However, what is not widely known is the meeting between U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, Mr. Byroade with Mr. Bhutto and the pressure exerted by the United States on Pakistan to abandon the reprocessing plant project. In December, 1976 Ambassador Byroade called on Bhutto and said that U.S. economic aid and military supplies to Pakistan would be cut off if Pakistan insisted on the plant. When on December 23, 1976 Canada unilaterally decided to cut off supplies of fuels and spare parts for the Karachi nuclear power plant (Kanuhp), Bhutto ordered the Commission to go alone and run the plant through indigenously developed fuel.

On January 6, 1977, a few months before Bhutto government was toppled, Ambassador Byroade again called on the Prime Minister and repeated the earlier warning. This was hit too much for Bhutto. Point blank he told the ambassador that if Pakistan felt it was being pressurized too much, then the "dynamics of super power politics might come into play." The ambassador retorted that he was "certain that the plant would not be built in Pakistan." Five days later Henry Kissinger warned Pakistan of the draconian effects of going ahead with the deal. According to the report then two friendly countries also informed Pakistan that the U.S. will ensure that Pakistan does not get the reprocessing plant.

No wonder that when Bhutto government was toppled in July 1977, little was heard of the reprocessing plant thereafter. However, the national consensus

which had been built for the acquisition of nuclear technologies did not permit the rulers to openly give up the plant. The nuclear programme received a major set back but could not be scuttled because Pakistan had advanced so much through indigenous efforts that no government could retrace the steps already taken for fear of serious domestic political repercussions.

These then are the landmark achievements of Bhutto. It is because of such achievements that even eleven years after this judicial murder his name still excites passion with indescribable intensity

PURE POPULIST POLITICIAN

Before his life was put to an untimely end on April 4, 1979, Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had enthused an entire people with a vision, a dream that will live on far beyond his death and, through the medium of civilized consciousness, into the entire reach of historical time. April 4, saw the death of the physical being. It could not put an end to the consciousness and awareness that had been created. It could not cause the demise of the thought and enlightenment that he had generated.

There are men who are created by history. There are others who are not even noticed by it. To this last category belongs the vast multitude. But there are a few, the shining exceptions, who shape and determine history. To them belongs a special place in the annals of history. Such a one was Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Even Mr. Bhutto's worst, most irascible detractors will admit that he gave a critical fillip to the conscious awareness of the mass of the Pakistani people. Even his most uncompromising critics cannot deny that he came as a watershed in the history of Pakistan, the great divide that has spelt a vital change in the politics of Pakistan, the originator of the populist politics that has changed the entire face of the political order. Herein lies his most significant contribution. All who follow him must adjust to the new era, the new environment that is the product of his politics. No realist can escape this fact and such facts will live far beyond the death of the man who is their author and creator.

BHUTTO: SOME RECOLLECTIONS

He has made a chasm, which not only nothing can fill up, but which nothing has a tendency to fill up. Let us go to the next best there is no-body Boswell's life of Johnson.

Late Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto does not know me personally nor have I been actively involved in his People's Party. During his life time I had some opportunities to observe him as an ordinary man standing on the side line.

The first glimpse I had of this extraordinary man was in Abbottahad Circuit House. It was early sixties when I was a school boy. I happen to be staying there accompanying my father who was on an official tour. The gardener of the Circuit House was not too pleased with my boyish adventure of exploring the nook and corner of the Circuit House. He said, 'Minister Sahib is around, do not disturb'. This made me all the more inquisitive and I ventured to know what a 'Minister Sahib' was like. There in the lush green lawn I saw a handsome young man wearing a trim suit talking to some foreigners. That was Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Minister of Fuel, Power and Natural Resources with a foreign delegation of Russian oil explorers. This later I believe led to an oil agreement with the Soviet Union. Pakistan's relation with the Soviet Union, most unsatisfactory until then, began to improve.

As years passed, I forgot all about him. I was occupied with my studies. My next three encounters with this great leader were between 1968 and 1970 when I was a student of Edwards College, Peshawar. The Pakistan People's Party was launched and Mr. Bhutto was on tour of NWFP. A delegation of lawyers visited our campus and invited the students to hear him at a local hotel. All of us readily accepted the invitation despite the watchful eyes of intelligence. Mr. Bhutto was not the same 'man in trim suit' but a leader with a vision, charismatic, eloquent and persuasive in speech. He won the day and there was a loud applause of 'Pakistan Zindabad, Bhutto Zindabad'.

I still remember the mammoth public meeting at Peshawar Shahi Bagh where Mr. Bhutto boldly proclaimed for the government authorities to come forward and put him in jail. A sudden hush followed and then he retorted 'won't you all go with me'? A thundering response came from the crowd, 'we are with you, we are with you'.

My next encounter was more fruitful. It was in Peshawar Saddar Bazaar in 1968 or 1969. A car happened to stop near a fruit juice shop. Suddenly I noticed a few passersby moving towards the car. There I saw Mr. Bhutto probably with Mr. Hayat Khan Sherpao enjoying a glass of pomegranate juice. He shook hands with the people around. While I extended my hand which he warmly received, I said 'Sir, you will be our next President.' He gave his typical half smile which to this day is etched in my mind.

In 1971, Mr. Bhutto was the President of Pakistan. As he puts it, 'I started with a broken people and a baffled country.' I graduated from Peshawar University and joined the Civil Services of Pakistan. The well-known Administrative Reforms were being implemented which was an earnest step to end the colonial concept of bureaucracy. While under training at the Academy for Administrative Training, Lahore, I had the next glimpse of my leader. It was in 1974 at the Shalimar Gardens. He was like a flower amidst great leaders of the Muslim Ummah who had gathered there for the historic Islamic Summit Conference.

The general elections of 1977 and PNA agitation to dislodge a lawful government was keenly observed by me. By then, I had joined the Police Service as ASP posted in Peshawar. My first duty was in the police control room monitoring reports of law and order situation in the NWFP. I also had the opportunity to hear various PNA meetings. It is needless to say that the only bond which held this party together was an intense jealousy of this great political leader. All the PNA leaders were mere pygmies. It was a colossal conspiracy to strangulate democracy and oust an elected leader.

My following memories of my leader are indeed painful. In 1977-78, I was under training at Police Training College, Sihala. I was lodged in the infamous Police rest house but soon had to vacate the premises. A hush fell over the police campus and the two rest houses were well guarded. One of the visitors was Masood Mahmood, the FSF Chief. He was lodged in a room and scores of government and military officials were seen visiting him. I do not know what was cooking up. Were they padding up the murder case against Mr. Bhutto?

The last glimpse I had of my beloved leader was through a thick curtain. I could not see him but his profile was in my imagination. Mr. Bhutto was whisked away from the police rest house, Sahala in a small corolla car with curtains all around. He was summoned by the Supreme Court of Pakistan, Rawalpindi.

I was perhaps one of the few lucky ones who managed to lay hands on Mr. Bhutto's great book 'If I am Assassinated.....', no sooner was it published abroad, the book was banned by the Martial Law government. A copy of it was smuggled into Pakistan by an airline pilot friend of mine who was on a flight to

Delhi. Many photostat copies were made and distributed to eager readers. I cannot help remembering one of my college day's friend, late Pervez Shinwari. He claimed to have clandestinely assisted in typing out the original hand written script of this great book. The book was written on bits and pieces of paper from the jail. Parvez Shinwari was later deported out of Pakistan by the Martial Law government during the famous PIA hijacking.

Although I did not read the book again, I hope my memory will not fail me. How prophetic was this great leader when he wrote no sooner or later 'the storming of Bastille' will take place and it did take place in 1989 and how he believed that nature follows 'the law of retribution' and that 'Pakistan and people need Pakistan People's Party'. A dictator's all-out effort for over a decade to smother people's will was all in vain.

As a young police officer and being in the government service, my hands were not tied either. By now, I had my own political conviction and belief. Perhaps, I owned a small tribute to this great man while thousands of his party workers were being harassed, jailed and flogged by the Martial Law Government.

As a last homage to this great leader, in April, 1979, while thousands of people gathered peacefully in Jinnah Park, Peshawar, to perform '*Ghaibana Namaz-i-Janaza*' for the Shaheed leader, I refused to participate in the so called 'riot control' to 'lathi-charge and teargas' the mourners. My conscience did not allow me to take such brush action. After four months my services were terminated. Later, the Federal Services Tribunal reinstated me but the Martial Law government moved the Supreme Court of Pakistan to uphold the termination order.

I have at present two precious possessions to cherish the memory of my beloved leader. One is a portrait of Mr. Z. A. Bhutto which once adored the Mess of a prestigious Army Unit. The portrait was salvaged out of the Mess store where it was put away and now duly restored.

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO AND KASHMIR

Eulogized by millions and censured by many was the man who had been the Foreign Minister, President and Prime Minister of Pakistan and Founder Chairman of the Pakistan People's Party. He was Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. He was sent to the gallows at midnight on April 3, 4, 1979 by General Zia-ul-Haq who had deposed him through a military *coup d'etat* in the darkness on the midnight of 4-5 July, 1977. The General was so ruthless and merciless that, on the one hand, he did not allow Bhutto's daughter and widow to have his last glimpse and, on the other, created such awe and terror that his (Bhutto's) death could not be mourned in a befitting manner.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed was an illustrious son of the soil and was the most respected and popularly elected political leader of the people of Pakistan after the death of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah -- the Founder of Pakistan. He rose on the political horizon of Pakistan like a shining star but was eclipsed by those who wanted to keep Pakistan in the darkness of ignorance, poverty and political wilderness. In his short-lived sojourn in this world, he rendered yeoman's services to the cause of his people and Pakistan. Indeed, he was a man who had a burning desire to see the people of Pakistan prosperous and Pakistan as one of the greatest nations of the world.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was highly educated and was endowed with the qualities of 'head and heart'. He was an inspiring and dynamic personality. At the age of 29, he had the unique honour and proud privilege to represent and lead the Pakistan delegation at the United Nations General Assembly in October 1957, where he made a mark by his excellent performance and impressive debut with his statement on defining "aggression." He was the greatest, the most enthusiastic and unparalleled advocate and champion of the just and righteous cause of the subjugated and approved people all over the world in general and those of the people of the Muslim-majority State of Jammu and Kashmir in particular. He was forceful and steadfast. In this, he never faltered and continued to champion their cause dauntlessly and fearlessly. This made him a hero and legendary figure in the eyes of the people of Kashmir and Pakistan. His services to the cause of Kashmiris right of self-determination are, so far, unsurpassable. It is in this context that some excerpts from his speeches, statements and writings are given below to enable the readers to judge whether the venomous propaganda

spread against Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, in so far as the Kashmir dispute is concerned, is based on honest analysis of needs to be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

It may be stated that when the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement was signed on March 2, 1963, India sent a protest letter to the President of the Security Council of the United Nations on March 16, 1963, and charged that "by entering into a Boundary Agreement with the People's Republic of China, the Government of Pakistan has unilaterally altered, not only in its own favour but also in favour of another aggressor, China, the basis of the Security Council Resolution of 17 January, 1948, and the UN Commission's resolution of 13 August, 1948". In a sharp and lengthy rejoinder, issued on March 26, 1963, Mr. Bhutto demolished the basis of Indian protest and gave a befitting reply. In his rejoinder, Mr. Bhutto said:

"My Government is bound by its duty to declare before the Security Council that, pending determination of the future of Kashmir through the will of the people impartially ascertained, no position taken or adjustments made by either of the parties to the present controversy between India and China or any similar controversy in the future shall be valid or affect the status of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir pending demilitarization and self determination of the State of Jammu and Kashmir laid down in the resolutions, (*viz* decisions of the Security Council embodied in its resolutions of 21 April, 1948, 30 March, 1951, 24 January, 1957 and in resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, dated 13th August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949, which have been jointly accepted by both India and Pakistan and by which both Governments, according to their repeated declarations, stand engaged."

In July, 1963, Pandit Nehru and Krishna Menon, the Prime Minister and Defence Minister of India, respectively, made disparaging and deleterious remarks about Pakistan in so far as Kashmir was concerned.. The President of Pakistan was then on an official visit to the United States. In a lengthy statement made at Lahore, on 14 July, 1963, Mr. Bhutto said:

"Let it be known beyond doubt that Kashmir is to Pakistan what Berlin is to the West, and that without a fair and proper settlement of this issue the people of Pakistan will not consider the crusade for Pakistan as complete. There can be no two questions about Kashmir being an issue which threatens the peace and security of the world. Kashmir is an issue which hangs heavily on the conscience of mankind."

On behalf of the people of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto declared:

“I would like to make it clear beyond all doubt that the people of this country will not forsake a righteous cause merely because more bayonets and bullets may be supplied to India from any source to consolidate her usurpation of Kashmir. Such issues which strike at the core of honour and dignity of a people are not solved by the threat or use of force, but by the dauntless spirit and fortitude of a people.”

Speaking in the National Assembly of Pakistan on 24 July, 1963, Mr. Bhutto, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, said:

“India has offered Pakistan a ‘No War’ pack. We do not see the hand of friendship in this offer. While the Kashmir dispute exists, it is inconceivable that we should accept India’s offer of a “No-War Pact.” if we accept it, we shall in effect accept the cease-fire line as the final boundary between India and Pakistan in Kashmir. In other words, we shall be agreeing to the settlement of the Kashmir question through partition on the basis of the status quo as India desires. Thus a ‘No-War Pact,’ under the present circumstances, would mean the settlement of the problem of Kashmir on the basis of status quo, without reference to its people to which Pakistan will never agree today, tomorrow, or a hundred years hence.”

In his Address to the Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on Sept 30, 1963, Mr. Bhutto said:

“Pakistan seeks no concession but the right of the people of Kashmir to settle their own future. Let me state clearly and unambiguously from this rostrum that we shall not, now or ever, barter away the rights of the people of Kashmir in return of a settlement on the basis of a division of spoils.

The Kashmir dispute remains the basic cause of conflicts between Pakistan and India. The other frictions and differences between the two countries are not comparable in magnitude and gravity to this essential issue which impinges on the viability and future of Pakistan itself. We are confident that all the other outstanding problems between us and our neighbor can be settled amicably if only the Kashmir quarrel is settled.

“The hands of India are soiled with the blood of the people of Kashmir. Let their conscience be clear on this matter. All we ask for in Kashmir is that India honours its pledges. India should stand by its pledges; and no pretext should be advanced to interfere with a humanitarian outcome of this dispute. The people of Kashmir, like the people of the rest of Asia and Africa should be permitted to decide their own future according to their own free will.”

In a rebuttal of the points raised by the Indian Delegate’s speech, Mr. Bhutto said:

It has been said that India exercises sovereignty over the State of Jammu and Kashmir and that this sovereignty is total and complete. It is so total and complete that we had six rounds of negotiations with the Government of India, in which I participated, on the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is a disputed territory, and it will always remain a disputed territory until justice is done to the people of Kashmir. We shall never agree to a solution which is based on expediency and on brute force. Justice is bound to be done to the people of Kashmir ultimately."

And, at the end of his address, Mr. Bhutto declared:

"I pledge here, on behalf of the 100 million people of Pakistan, that the right of self-determination, which is a right which India has agreed to give to the people of Kashmir, will be achieved and that the people of Kashmir will become the recipients of justice, because that is the law of equity and that is the law of fraternity."

In his address to the Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1963, Mr. Bhutto spoke at length on the Kashmir dispute and forcefully pleaded the Kashmiris' right of self-determination. He declared:

"The people of Kashmir are our blood and therefore we will struggle for this right, and this right is bound to be achieved because it is a right which cannot be denied to the people of Kashmir. Some voices may be silent today on this issue but we know that international opinion will spread concerning this matter and that it will become the concern of the world because it is a grave issue which divides two great powers and holds the people of Kashmir in bondage."

In his address at the 1087th meeting of the Security Council on February 3, 1964, Mr. Bhutto declared:

"Freedom can be delayed by oppression, but it cannot ultimately be denied. The course of history is relentlessly so set. And so I say that the people of Kashmir will one day be free. Whether their freedom will come through violence or upheaval, or whether it will come through peaceful means and civilized conduct, depends largely on the decisions this body (Security Council) makes and the respect we show for its decisions."

Speaking before the national Press Club, Washington, on April 27, 1964, Mr. Bhutto dwelt at length on the Kashmir dispute. He made it clear that:

"For us the Kashmir dispute is a simple one. It involves two fundamental elements. One is that there is an agreement, an international agreement, between

India and Pakistan, endorsed by the United Nations, and this agreement calls for the implementation of the right of self-determination. There is the sanctity of an international agreement involved and, secondly, there is an important fundamental principle of twentieth century the right of self-determination, in whose evolution the United States, through its great statesman, President Woodrow Wilson made an important contribution.”

Speaking in the Security Council on Sept. 22, 1965, on Indian aggression against Pakistan, in so far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, Mr. Bhutto said:

“Jammu and Kashmir is not an integral part of India and has never been an integral part of India. Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory between India and Pakistan. It is more a part of Pakistan than it can ever be of India, despite India’s eloquence and all its extravagance with words. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are part of the people of Pakistan in blood, in flesh, in life, in Culture, in geography, in history and in every way and in every form. They are a part of the people of Pakistan.

In this address to the United Nations General Assembly, on Sept. 28, 1965, Mr. Bhutto spoke on the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and said:

“Pakistan demands that a plebiscite be held under United Nations auspices in the State of Jammu and Kashmir to enable those people to decide for themselves whether their State should accede to India or to Pakistan; in other words that the people of Jammu and Kashmir should be granted the right of self-determination.”

In this address to the United Nations General Assembly, on Oct. 15, 1965, Mr. Bhutto pleaded for plebiscite in Kashmir, and at the end of his speech, he said:

It is our conviction, it is our belief in God, it is belief in international morality and in the conscience of mankind that the people of Jammu and Kashmir shall not be an exception to this long and glorious march of mankind for justice, for peace and for honour, and as far as Pakistan is concerned, it is pledged, it is honour-bound to fulfill this promise to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We shall never tire. We shall never rest. We shall continue relentlessly and dauntlessly for the achievement of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and for the fulfillment of international obligations entered into solemnly by sovereign states and sanctified and baptized by the United Nations. This is our right and this we shall fight for, irrespective of consequence.”

In his address to the Security Council on Oct. 25, 1965, Mr. Bhutto said:

(i) What is the difference between the extermination of the Jews in Europe by Hitler and the extermination of Muslims by Indian bayonets in Asia? Is there any difference? Are we to have a double standard? Is torture in Europe different from torture in Asia? Is death in Europe different from death in Asia? If people die in Europe, is it different from people dying in Asia? Are they not human beings in Asia? Do they not feel the same pain? Pakistan will not stand by and allow India to carry on these monstrous acts in Jammu and Kashmir, where 5 million (now 10 million) people live. If the United Nations remains unmoved, Pakistan will take up the challenge and will be prepared for the ultimate consequence of life or destruction, of extermination or honour."

(ii) Mr. Bhutto further said: "We believe in the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, and in so doing we take the rough with the smooth. We do not flinch from sacrificing a position of advantage if justice so requires. We are fortified by the faith that despite India's arrogance and obduracy, despite its flouting all canons of civilized conduct, despite the armed might which it displays against Kashmir's helpless people, this long-drawn out tragedy can end only in the victory of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and in the vindication of the honorable position which our country and our people have taken."

(iii) In his address, Mr. Bhutto finally declared: We shall face complete extermination; we shall face destruction, we shall never dishonor our pledge. We shall tight by the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and we shall honour that pledge irrespective of what the Security Council does, irrespective of what the great powers do. This is a part of our faith, it is ingrained and enshrined in our very civilization. And we know it each and every Pakistani knows it, men, women and children. That is why we are able to face aggression from a country six times our size. We have fought it heroically, bravely; and when the history of that is written, it will be enshrined in the annals of mankind."

Simla Agreement and Mr. Bhutto

Mr. Bhutto went to Simla not as a victor, but as the leader of a defeated nation. However, he did not compromise on either the integrity, ideology and sovereignty of Pakistan or Pakistan's principled stand on the Kashmir dispute. Not only this, even much before his departure for Simla for a Summit Conference with Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Bhutto, as the representative of his people and as President of Pakistan, had stated on March 19, 1972, at Lahore:

“We want peace with India, but we cannot forget Kashmir. If we forget the Kashmir issue the Kashmiris will not. We would not accept any humiliating solution.”

In April, 1972, while talking to foreign and Pakistani correspondents in Rawalpindi, Mr. Bhutto, said:

“Kashmir is a problem of self-determination. It is their right. We cannot take it away from them, inherently it belongs to them.”

In his interview with the ABC (American Broadcasting Corporation), which also appeared in the Hindustan Times of May, 15, 1972, Mr. Bhutto spoke on the forthcoming Summit in Simla in the following words:

“If India tries to impose an unequal treaty on Pakistan, in that event the whole of Pakistan will turn an arsenal of defence. We will adopt a flexible posture. But at the same time we will not compromise on our inherent and fundamental principles.”

Before going to Simla, he addressed the people at Hussainiwala and other forward areas on June 27, 1972, and repeated “his affirmation of the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir.” This statement also appeared in the India Express of June 28, 1972.

In spite of the fact that as a result of Indian intervention and naked armed aggression in East Pakistan in November-December, 1971, Pakistan had been dismembered, Mr. Bhutto did not let down the honour of the people of Pakistan. He has been much criticized and maligned on the signing of the Simla Agreement, in so far as the Kashmir dispute is concerned. In this connection, it may not be out of place to mention that the Simla Agreement, signed between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India clearly stated: “that the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations shall govern the relations between the two countries.”

It was against this background that India and Pakistan~ had discussed and the question of Jammu and Kashmir. And in this connection, it may he stated that the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations impose an obligation on Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means which are listed in Article 33 of its Charter. This Article says:

(i) The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiations, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial

settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice,

(ii) The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.”

The Simla Agreement was signed on July 2, 1972. After his arrival in Lahore on July 3, 1972 Mr. Bhutto said: “The right of self-determination is the Kashmiris right and no one can take it away from them.” This statement also appeared in Daily Telegraph of July 4, 1972.

In an official communication to the Government of India, Mr. Bhutto said on March 5, 1973:

“It is evident from the Security Council resolutions, as indeed from the nature and history of the (Kashmir) dispute, that there are three parties to it India, Pakistan and, above all, the people of Kashmir. No settlement of this dispute which attempts to by-pass one of the parties or is not acceptable to all three, can be final or enduring.

“Pakistan will continue to stand by its commitments to the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir because the question is not of territory nor of frontiers but one which involves a people’s integrity, life and historic destiny. This is the recognized position of Pakistan which has been explicitly safeguarded by the Simla Agreement.”

Mr. Bhutto was so devoted and dedicated to the cause of the Kashmiri’s right of self-determination that on Feb. 24, 1975, he issued a call for *hartal* (general strike) on Feb. 28, 1975. This was completely observed by all the people of Jammu and Kashmir, both in Indian-occupied area and in Azad Kashmir, but also throughout the world wherever the Kashmiri brethren were on this historic occasion with full vigor and dedication.

Speaking in Peking on May 29, 1975, Mr. Bhutto categorically stated, that:

“It must be clearly understood by all concerned that normalization of relations (between Pakistan and India) does not mean that Pakistan should abandon its traditional support for the right of the Kashmiris. Though Pakistan is willing to advance from the stage of normalization to peaceful coexistence, such a relationship is predicated upon a settlement of the Kashmir question.”

And on August 8; 1976, while speaking at a function in honour of the visiting U.S. Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Prime Minister Bhutto said in Lahore that:

“all the problems with India except the fundamental issue of Kashmir have been resolved.”

In regard to Indian occupation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Mr. Bhutto writes:

“Why does India want Jammu and Kashmir? She holds them because their valley is the handsome head of the body of Pakistan. Its possession enables her to cripple the economy of West Pakistan and, militarily to dominate the country. India retains Jammu and Kashmir because she wants to increase her strategic importance by having common borders with the Soviet Union and China and correspondingly denying Pakistan these frontiers. Above all, she retains the state against all norms of morality because she wants to negate the two-nation theory, the basis of Pakistan. If a Muslim majority area can remain a part of India, then the *raison d’etre* of Pakistan collapses. These are the reasons why India wants to continue her domination of Jammu and Kashmir, defies international opinion and violates her pledges. For the same reason, Pakistan must, continue unremittingly her struggle for the right of self-determination of this subject people. Pakistan is incomplete without Jammu and Kashmir both territorially and ideologically. Recovering them, she would recover her head and be made whole, stronger, and more viable. It would be fatal if, in sheer exhaustion or out of intimidation, Pakistan were to abandon the struggle, and a bad compromise would be tantamount to abandonment; which might, in turn, lead to the collapse of Pakistan. If, however, we settle for tranquil relations, with India, without an equitable resolution of disputes, it would be the first major step-in establishing Indian leadership in our parts, with Pakistan and other neighbouring states becoming Indian satellites.”

In short, throughout his political career, Mr. Bhutto never flinched from the ideal to secure for the people of Jammu and Kashmir their inalienable right of self-determination. Let us see how Mr. Bhutto’s brilliant daughter, Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, proves worthy of his trust and vindicates the pledge, honour and prestige of her illustrious father, insofar as Kashmir is concerned.

BHUTTO AND THE MAKING OF 1973 CONSTITUTION

General Yahya Khan proclaimed and clamped the second Martial Law in East and West Pakistan on March 25, 1969. The Constitution of 1962 given by General Ayub Khan, the previous self-styled President and military ruler, was abrogated. Within twenty one months of Yahya's rule the truncated Pakistan was mutilated by external aggression in the wake of internal civil strife. East Pakistan seceded to form an independent Bangladesh in December 1971.

Humbled and shattered by an ill-deserved defeat, defection and political disaster, we were without a constitution to govern and regulate the affairs of the country. Not a single political institution existed in West Pakistan at that time. Only a group of 138 members of the National Assembly, elected in the first ever party-based general elections of 1970 on the basis of universal adult franchise, had survived. Amongst this group of elected members, the Pakistan People's Party, headed by Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, was the single largest political party which enjoyed majority of 82 seats.

After- the fall of Dacca, General Yahya was forced to step down and Mr. Bhutto assumed political control of the country on 21st December, 1971 as the first elected civilian President of Pakistan. Within four months of assumption of office Mr. Bhutto issued the National Assembly (Short Session) Order, 1972 and convened the first session of the National Assembly to transact business relating to Interim Constitution and the appointment of a committee to prepare a draft of the permanent constitution for Pakistan. Interim Constitution was enforced on 21st April 1972 whereas the permanent constitution was launched amongst unprecedented jubilations, on 14 August 1973.

Notwithstanding sharp ideological differences between various political parties represented in the whilom National Assembly, it is indeed creditable that Mr. Bhutto succeeded in producing a consensus constitutional apparatus. He achieved a monumental task for providing a sound and a progressive basis for the development of constitutional and legal order in new Pakistan.

1973 constitution is a living tribute to the sagacity of Mr. Bhutto and a compliment to the robust commonsense of the members of the first elected parliament who worked as a team in the higher national interest, under the leadership of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, to produce the first consensus document in

a record period of one year. The 1973 Constitution has the distinction that during Zia's longest military rule all the political parties and democratic forces agreed and worked for its restoration. Never before in the course of various political movements and the turbulent periods of our history, the political parties made the restoration of any other constitution as the pivotal point of their struggle.

Two successive military rulers during the period 1958-1971 made conscious efforts to depoliticise the Society. The civilian rule of December 1971 commencing after 13 years of despotic period, may be termed as the return of elected representatives and the , politicians. The remarkable thing achieved during the initial period of civilian rule was to initiate the process of repoliticising the social set up and the coming into force of the 1973 Constitution was a notable landmark in this direction.

The pointed reference in the preamble of the 1973 Constitution of the resolve to protect the national and political unity and solidarity by creating an egalitarian society through a new order indicated the desire of the representatives to make the constitution a living and a progressive document. The 1973 Constitution continues to provide a wide base for the development of political process in the country. In order to defeat this purpose, General Zia imposed Martial Law, suspended the constitution, effected large scale and unilateral amendments and made efforts to brutalize the society so that the process of depoliticisation is accelerated this time with the active support of clergy and pseudo politicians.

In order therefore to fully appreciate the efforts of late Prime Minister Z. A. Bhutto in the field of constitution making and to ascertain the reasons as to why 1973 Constitution became the rallying point of the major political parties during their prolonged protest against the dictatorial rule of General Zia, it would be advantageous to review in brief the principles that Quaid-e-Azam projected throughout his political career. Such an exercise even if otherwise relevant because the first Constituent Assembly in spite of nearness, in point of time, to the freedom Movement, failed to frame a constitution for seven years till it was dissolved by Governor General Ghulam Mohammad on 24 October 1954. It fell to the lot of next generation, symbolized by Mr. Bhutto, to prepare a constitution as near as was possible to the principles enunciated by the father of the nation.

Jinnah on Constitutional Guarantees

“We want to go before our people with our policies and programmes, and we want to ask the electors to elect fairly and squarely anyone like that-- “September 1936-Central Legislature.”

“We come back with that mandate of the electorates, who are the real masters, after all and we want them to be the real masters because without them no scheme is worth the paper on which it is written.” Central Legislative Assembly, 1924.

No man’s liberty should be taken away for a single minute without judicial inquiry”. Central Legislative Council, September 1918.

“If you give me the freedom of speech I have the freedom to publish it, otherwise the privilege is useless”. Legislative Assembly, February, 1936.

“Sir, I am not one of those men who encourage any crime or any Offence, but I do maintain, and I have drunk deep at the fountain of constitutional law, that the liberty of a man is the dearest thing in the law of any constitution and it should not be taken away in this fashion” Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923.

“You know that there is a universal feeling throughout India that it is a disgrace and a slur upon the honour of our soldiers who are called upon to fight for what, against those who have been struggling for their freedom and Independence” 12 January 1946, Indian Legislative Assembly.

The man who goes on hunger strike has a soul. He is moved by that soul and he believes in the justice of his cause”. September 1929, Indian Legislative Assembly.

“I say it is incumbent, it is absolutely obligatory, on the Government to grant that liberty of conscience to individuals. Even on the ground of equity and fairness, let those who wish to contract marriages unfettered by the shackles of caste or any other shackles do so.... I am a Musalman. This is a question which I know concerns the Hindus, but as a Member of this council I have to record my vote, and I cannot simply sit quite and record it one way or the other. I am as much interested, my lord, in coming to the rescue of the Hindu minority suffering today because of this law as anybody else would be interested in coming to the rescue of a Musalman minority if it was suffering. Therefore, I strongly urge upon the Government to allow this bill to go out to the country and let us collect opinion upon it.” 1921-Legislative Assembly.

“It is of very great importance to us, because I believe that it is absolutely essential for us to give every opportunity to our women to participate in our struggle of life and work”. 23 March 1940.

“Even today, the economic position of a woman is the foundation of her being recognised as equal of man and share the life of man to the fullest extent”. Central Legislative Assembly September 1939.

“In reply to a question by Reuter’s correspondent Doon Cambell about his views in regard to the protection of minorities in Pakistani territories, the Qauid on May 21, 1947 stated categorically.

“There is only one answer. The minorities must be protected and safeguarded. The minorities in Pakistan will be citizens of Pakistan and will enjoy all the rights, privileges and obligations of citizenship without any distinction of caste, creed or sect.

They will be treated justly and fairly. The Government will run the Administration and control the legislative measures by its parliament. The collective conscience of Parliament, itself will be a guarantee that the minorities need not have any apprehensions of any injustice being done to them.

Over and above that, there will be provisions for the protection and safeguard of the minorities which in my opinion must be embodied in the Constitution itself. This will leave no doubt as to the fundamental rights of the citizens, protection of religion and faith of every section, freedom of thought and expression; and protection of their cultural and social life.

Every one of you, no matter to what community he belongs, no matter what relations he had with you in the past, no matter what is his colour, caste or creed, is first, second and last citizen of this state with equal rights, privileges and obligation You may belong to any religion, caste or creed that has nothing to do with the business of the state....We are starting in the days when there is no discrimination, no distinction between one community and another, no discrimination between one caste or creed and another. We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are citizens and equal citizens of one state. Central Legislative Assembly” -- August 11, 1947.

Characteristics of 1973 constitution:

In this background we now propose to consider some of the salient features of the 1973 constitution.

- A. The state shall ensure the elimination of all forms of exploitation and the gradual fulfillment of the fundamental principles, from each according to his ability, to each according to his work. Art 3.
- B. 1. The dignity of man and subject to law, the privacy of home, shall be inviolable.

2. No body shall be subjected to torture for the purpose of extracting evidence. Art 14.

Similarly, under Article 13 a very valuable protection has been guaranteed against double punishment. It states that no person shall be prosecuted or punished for the same offence more than once. This is indeed a great advance upon the old principle that no one formerly convicted or acquitted shall be disturbed again. The guarantee contemplates that state with all its resources and power should not be allowed to make repeated attempts even for prosecution thus compelling a person to live under continuing state of anxiety or enhancing the possibility that even though innocent he may somehow or other be found guilty.

This article further guarantees that the accused person shall not be compelled to be a witness against himself.

C. Every citizen, not being in the service of Pakistan, shall have the right to form or be a member of a political party. Art 17 (2).

D. Every citizen shall have the right to freedom of speech and expression and there shall be freedom of Press, subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law in the interest of glory of Islam....Art 19.

E. No child below the age of fourteen years shall be engaged in any factory or mine or any other hazardous employment. Article 11 (3).

F. In addition to the constitutional guarantee of equality before law, as recognised in 1956 constitution, Art: 4 declared further that:

(1) to enjoy the protection of law and to be treated in accordance with law is the inalienable right of every citizen, wherever he may be, and of every other person for the time being within Pakistan.

(2) In particular:

(a) no action detrimental to life, liberty, body, reputation or property of any person shall be taken except in accordance with law.

(b) no person shall be prevented from or be hindered in doing that which is not prohibited by law; and

(c) no person shall be compelled to do that which the law does not require him to do.

G In the principles of Policy, Chapter 2, Article 34 was introduced to the effect that "steps shall be taken to ensure full participation of women in all spheres of national life."

H. As regards the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive the 1956 Constitution had not fixed a specific period during which this step has to be undertaken by the state but Art. 175 (3) of 1973 Constitution contemplates a specific time limit during which the judiciary had to be separated from the executive.

I. In so far as the question of languages is concerned, the 1956 Constitution vide Article 214 provided that the provincial government would be competent to replace the English language by Urdu or Bengali but no provision for adoption of Pakistani languages was contemplated. For the first time article 251 of the 1973 Constitution visualized that without prejudice to the status of National language, a Provincial Assembly may by law prescribe measures for the teaching, promotion and use of a provincial language in addition to the national language.

J. Loyalty to state and obedience to constitution and law was made the basic obligation of every citizen under Article 5 of 1973 Constitution. It was also for the first time that abrogation, or attempts or conspiracy to abrogate, subvert or attempts to abrogate to subvert the constitution by use of force or show of force or by other unconstitutional means was declared high treason and any person aiding or abetting this act was declared likewise to be guilty of high treason.

K. The 1973 Constitution for the first time authorised the Parliament to prescribe by law the maximum limits as to property or any class thereof which may be owned, held, possessed or controlled by any person.

L. The old Muslim concept of administrative accountability through the institution of Ombudsman was introduced in the Interim Constitution of 1972 and then included in the 1973 Constitution as well. This aspect had not been touched at constitutional level before. Now a regular law is in existence under which the Federal Ombudsman is functioning since a few years.

M. It might as well be stated that the 1973 Constitution for the first time in its principles of policy. (Article 32) enshrined the principle that the State shall encourage local Government institutions composed of elected representatives of areas concerned and in such institutions special representation will be given to peasants, workers and women.

It will therefore be seen that not only was the development of local bodies institutions made a state obligation but steps were also taken for the progressive and uniform development of the

Federation and the 1973 Constitution

In furtherance of the spirit of Lahore Resolution of 23 March 1940, certain progressive measures to strengthen the hands of Federating units were adopted for the first time in 1973 Constitution by evolving the institution of Senate and the Council of Common Interests. The concept of National Economic Council had already been spelled out in the 1956 Constitution which has been retained in 1973 Constitution in the interest of the provinces.

Senate

In view of the natural disparity in the number of seats allocated to each province in the National Assembly, the institution of Senate was devised to ensure equal representation to the Provinces. Representation was also secured for Federal Capital and Federally Administered Tribal Area. The significant aspect of the Senate is that though the National Assembly could be dissolved at any time the Senate was exempt from the process of dissolution. The term of office was fixed at the expiry of which the Provincial Assembly would elect the appropriate number on the system of proportional representation of the single transferable vote. The element of Provincial representation, continuity and certainty was thus achieved through the institution of Senate.

It was further stipulated that the Bill to amend the constitution if passed by the votes of not less than two thirds of the total membership of the National Assembly shall be transmitted to the Senate. Before presenting the Bill to the President for authentication the Senate must approve it and in case the Senate seeks to amend the Bill the National Assembly is under a constitutional obligation to reconsider the amendments.

All constitutional amendments have political consequences and it was deemed just and proper that the provinces should have an equal say in so far as constitutional and legal amendments are concerned. In order therefore to safeguard the interests of the provinces, the 1973 Constitution incorporated salutary provisions.

A Council of Common Interests was also created vide articles 153/154 of the Constitution comprising the Chief Ministers of the Provinces with equal number of members from the Federal Government to be nominated by the Prime Minister with the object of formulating and regulating policies in relation to Part

11 of the Federal Legislative List etc. and to exercise supervision and control over related institutions. The decisions of the council are required to be expressed in terms of the opinion of the majority but if the Federal or Provincial Government is dissatisfied with the decision of the council, it may refer the matter to the Parliament in a joint sitting whose decision in this behalf shall be final.

The council had also been authorised to receive complaints from the provinces as regards water from any natural source of supply.

Article 155 further contemplates:

- (1) If the interests of a Province the Federal Capital or the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, or any of the inhabitants thereof, in water from any natural source of supply have been or are likely to be affected prejudicially by:-
- (a) any executive act or legislation taken or passed or proposed to be taken or passed, or
 - (b) the failure of any authority to exercise any of its powers with respect to the use and distribution or control of water from that source, the Federal Government or the Provincial Government concerned may make a complaint in writing to the Council.

BHUTTO CHARTER FOR BENAZIR

In his death cell Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wrote two major documents. One was a long statement for submission to the Supreme Court and which was subsequently published in a book form under the title "If I am assassinated". Many consider it as Bhutto's last testament. This is a work meant to be pondered by the public or anyone abroad who wishes to judge the author and his place in Pakistan's political history.

The other work was a long letter written by the late Prime Minister to his daughter, Benazir Bhutto, on June 21, 1978, on her 25th birth anniversary, and which has been published in the form of a booklet. This is a more intimate essay in which Zulfikar Ali Bhutto offers his daughter the benefits of his perceptions and experience, to help her in her political career of which he undoubtedly had high hopes.

The document should be read with due consideration for the conditions in which it was written. Bhutto admits that "what I write is full of infirmities". He had been in the death cell for three months and had extremely limited access to books and journals and it was very difficult to rely on a fading memory in such physical and mental conditions.

Before expressing his views on the ways of politics in Pakistan, Bhutto takes a panoramic view of the world. He begins by recalling the letters from prison written by Jawaharlal Nehru to his daughter which were published as *Glimpses of World History*, a book Bhutto describes as "masterful" and which he had read four times in his early twenties. He mentions Nehru with respect but rates Indira Gandhi much lower than her father, and has "no hesitation in saying that my daughter is more than a match for the daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru." He is quite confident of his own stature, too, and declares that with the exception of the Quaid-i-Azam and himself, and perhaps Suhrawardy, the country has been run by "either charlatans or captains" and adds, "perhaps it 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."

Bhutto has only one message to give his daughter and describes it as the message of morrow, the message of history; "believe only in the people, work only for their emancipation and equality." No politician can be big unless he or she is prepared to kiss the ground. Nobody can defend the soil "unless he knows the smell of the soil. 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."

The author then elaborates his message in a few stirring lines: "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 most powerful. By progressive and powerful 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 recognised its ethos, and comes 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 review of the world situation begins with Africa and Bhutto recalls his views expressed in 1965 that "Africa, dark and dreary, neglected and ridiculed, would come to the centre of the world stage in less than two decades." According to him, 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 West failed to identify itself with the aspirations, of the African people just as the Americans made the "disastrous mistake" in Vietnam by over-simplifying the concept of Asian nationalism.

Bhutto rejects the criticism of Cuba over the presence of its troops in Africa on the principle 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 alignment or selfish interests." According to him, the Western attitude towards Africa must change: "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."

Bhutto was obviously inspired by the upsurge of European youth in the sixties and saw Western Europe through their eyes. The modern generation is fed up with the status quo and has been disillusioned by the tactical compromises of Euro communism. "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."

In the Middle East the problem, according to Bhutto, is not the challenge of communism but one of evolving a plausible system, by which he means the traditional system adopted and run sensibly by enlightened and patriotic leadership. The immediate danger to the oil state is from military juntas in the neighbourhood and Israel. In Iran, Bhutto predicted the Tude coming on top in the event of the Shah's fall as the religious leaders and the military could not fill the vacuum.

Latin America has suffered a long period of tyranny, according to Bhutto, first under the colonialism of Spain and Portugal and then under the tutelage of the United States but "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."

As regards global confrontation and superpower competition, Bhutto reiterates his belief that there are "three formidable forces at work, sometimes competing, sometimes conflicting, sometimes cooperating, sometimes coming into confrontation. "These forces were religion, communism and nationalism. He is unimpressed by disarmament conferences because "a fetishistic armament competition of a megalomaniac magnitude is taking place." Figures of armament supplies are given in support. Bhutto's advice is "let there be a modus operandi without capitulation, to restructure the world order on the basis of new and equitable values."

Turning to the sub-continent, Bhutto declares that the biggest problem here is neither over-population nor poverty, nor even lack of technology. These problems can be solved if the people are mobilized and given a correct direction. But the people will be mobilized if they are made full partners and if they are made to participate fully ... The GNP rat-race and IMF standby credits will not do. It is stupidly inadequate."

In the Asian scene, which Bhutto finds dominated by an almost all-embracing form of nationalism, "the most delicate aspect is the place of sub-nationalism

within its framework." At one time it was thought that a federation could resolve ethnic and linguistic issues but confidence in this system has been shaken. However, there is "nothing more inimical to the pacification of sub-national sentiments than domination by a military junta ... In concrete terms, the decisive aspect of the relationship (between various ethnic groups) lies in autonomy and in the quantum of economy." In India, nationalism thrives on an autonomous structure (for ethnic entities). China has solved the problem of sub-nationalities through party ideology, and autonomy. Burma failed and declined because it was kept under a junta for long and so has Indonesia. Malaysia, too, has this problem but political efforts are being made to overcome it.

Reverting to India, Bhutto says the country's unity depends on the existence of many small and big provinces. No single province has a monopoly in the armed forces or the civil service. The Indian leaders have exploited the 'threat' from Pakistan and China, and also the "failure of Pakistan" -- the contrast between Indian democracy and the dictatorship in Pakistan. However, despite its achievements India still faces a threat to its unity. Religious intolerance threatens a fratricidal bloodbath which Nehru feared "was a pattern of Indian history." India has the modern means 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 religions?"

What is the situation in Pakistan which came into being as "a triumph of the will and the spirit of the Muslim masses led by an indomitable leader." Bhutto notes that the Pakistan resolution had two salient features -- a Muslim homeland in majority areas and autonomy to the provinces -- and says that in the subcontinent, from the earliest times, "autonomy has been the cause of the more serious conflicts." Indeed, the Indian Muslims pressed for Pakistan because "the autonomy (to provinces) granted in the 1935 Act was not sufficient to safeguard their rights." Thus, "from the very first autonomy has been the primary issue in the tangled web of the politics of Pakistan."

The autonomy question was bungled by the ruling coterie in the fifties by devising One Unit and the parity formula, which meant two states, one dominating the other. However, "the instrument of domination over both West and East Pakistan was the same reactionary coterie." Under Ayub the problem of autonomy became more aggravated. Yahya manipulated "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." Bhutto briefly explains his stand in 1970-71. He says Mujib's six points implied a confederal structure. "We made it plain to Mujibur Rahman that we would not only be happy but honored 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." Mujib did not relent and Yahya saw in the deadlock a way to perpetuate his rule. The country was dismembered.

What Bhutto did after taking over in December 1971 is briefly recounted. "Among the first tasks I turned to was constitution making with a democratic consensus on the vexatious question of autonomy." Economy was revamped, social and economic reforms were introduced, Bangladesh was recognised, Simla Accord was signed, Islamic Summit was held in Lahore, the US was persuaded to lift the arms embargo -- but the "greatest satisfaction lay in giving the country an all-party constitution by democratic means."

Bhutto deals at length with his conflict with the NAP leadership in NWFP and Balochistan, and declares: "It is absurd to maintain, indeed it is preposterous to argue, that I engineered the downfall of the NAP-JUI governments in NWFP and Balochistan." The problem was of a wider dimension. While he (Bhutto) "was trying to seduce NAP into a historic compromise," the NAP leaders thought that with the fall of Dhaka and Daud's rise in Kabul "their hour had arrived."

It is conceded that "the insurgency in Balochistan was a hard nut to crack. It took three tedious years before it was broken. It becomes inescapable to involve the military to cope with the insurgency. The military role kept expanding. The tentacles spread to civilian functions." Bhutto points out that unlike Tikka Khan, who did not make political or administrative recommendations, Gen. Zia was "obsessed with entrapping individuals in the Hyderabad trial. He kept asking for permission to follow the insurgents into Afghanistan." But he (Bhutto) had decided to pull back the army after the March 1977 elections.

According to Bhutto, his success in bringing the situation in NWFP and Balochistan under control convinced Sardar Daud of the need to make up with Pakistan and by August 1976 a settlement was reached whereby Afghanistan accepted the Durand Line.

However, the Balochistan issue remained to be solved. It was a delicate issue. Reversion to status quo ante was impossible. There were quiet negotiations. "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 Balochistan in a foiled insurgency." However, Bhutto had quite an open mind: "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.”

These ideas could not be tested as events after the March 1977 elections took a new turn.

However, besides NWFP and Balochistan, Sindh was also demanding autonomy. Indeed, according to Bhutto “from the political and intellectual point of view, Sindh was ahead of Balochistan and NWFP in the manifestation of these sentiments. “ Sindh’s aspirations were neglected because it was thought in view of the existence of a sizable and powerful non Sindhi population “Sindh’s sub-nationalist outbursts could be controlled and managed without difficulty.” Bhutto squarely blames India for a hand in stoking Sindhi nationalism. However, his party defeated the advocates of Sindhu Desh in the 1970 elections and “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.” But under the military regime, the Sindhu Desh movement regained strength.

Bhutto ascribes this development to Gen. Zia’s reliance “on brute force and playing up to India.” He is convinced that the General’s antics would not make India give up her designs on Pakistan.

The denunciation of the military regime is total and occurs in extremely hard-hitting words. This martial law regime has been a Frankenstein’s experiment. Its intrusion on the political scene had destabilized Pakistan and the region. A bitter harvest has still to be reaped.”

At the time of writing, Bhutto takes a thought-provoking view of the situation created by the virtual abrogation of the 1973 Constitution, particularly in view of Gen. Zia’s announcement that he would become president on September 16, 1978. The moral and 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 reason.”

Bhutto blames what he calls “the coterie” for all of Pakistan’s ills. Its misdeeds include making Ayub Khan a minister in 1954, authoring the One Unit scheme in London, alienating Sindh and Balochistan. The coterie decided to liquidate him

because, by going to the people, he had broken its hold over the Punjab. The coterie wanted to dominate the Punjab and thereby consolidate its domination over Pakistan. "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."

The policy adopted by Gen. Zia towards Afghanistan is discussed in detail. Bhutto appears sympathetic to the change brought in April 1978 (he was writing before the Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, about which he expressed his views later) and criticizes Zia for delaying the recognition of Taraki regime and undoing the accord he had signed with Daud.

What should be Pakistan's attitude towards the West? Bhutto does not consider West's conflict with communism permanent. He considers West's antipathy towards the noncommunist friends of the communist powers incongruous, and says: "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." The West is not giving to the third world what is its due. That is why we want the friendship of the East and the West, of both the worlds." However, Pakistan should know how to keep its distance. The West has little respect for the third world but it smiles if a Khrushchev hangs his shoe on the table.

In several passages Bhutto expresses himself on the need for saving revolutionary changes from getting wiped out by violence and vengeance. The French revolutionaries made the orgy of bloodletting the index of the revolution and failed to sufficiently consolidate into sober institutions the ideals of "liberty, equality and fraternity." The result was that the "revolution killed the king and the queen, but the kings and queens came back to the thrones of France." In the Russian revolution the Czar was killed but the revolution was not affected because it was not "built and strengthened on that act." Gamal Nasser allowed Farooq to sail away into safety and "his revolution did not suffer for being tempered with mercy." In Turkey, the generals thought the people would forget the execution of Menderes; they did not. Bhutto says he had told Gursel before Menderes was hanged 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."

This brings him to his own fate, the unavoidable indignation and personal anger "for what these barbarians have done to me" the family friends and party loyalists, but national interests have suffered more. "There is a personal

bitterness no doubt, but the impersonal hurt predominates over my personal feelings. These individuals have taken Pakistan back to 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."

Bhutto was apparently convinced of the correctness of Deng Hsiao-Ping's warning in June 1978 that the Third World War was about to start. He found that "tension of the existing nightmare is without sublimation, without an outlet Capitalism is at the end of the road. Communism has been by passed and is suffering from internal conflict. The third world has become the football of military dictators with the boots. The football is kicked around without the goal in sight." He agrees that he has "made this melancholy analysis in anguish. Yet he does not "want to see the whole world in a death cell merely because I am in a death cell."

How does Pakistan (or Benazir) prepare for the situation? Bhutto's reply: "You prepare for it not by siding with capitalism or communism, not by identifying yourself with one superpower 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 homo-sapiens. Follow the footprints of the hare-footed ones. The lice in the hair of a poor child are your weapon. The dirty smell in the mud but 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."

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto says he does not want to evade the theoretical line, and advises Benazir "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." He cautions his daughter not only against an outright pragmatist approach, but also against an outright populist approach. "Neither pragmatism nor populism are fundamental political and socio-economic doctrines. Nor do I say that you should play it by the ear."

After confessing his partiality to the pantheism of Shelley, extolling beauty, describing life as a love affair, and expressing his belief that "I still have a role to play," Bhutto wants his daughter to be ready for the task "if I have to bow out", armed with his feelings that will enable her "to fight the tight better than me."

Although it would he had politics to summaries a dynamic situation. Bhutto again advises Benazir to "have faith in mankind and its mission" and concludes:

“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 his 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.

This is the portrait of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto as he sat in the death cell, about nine months before he was liquidated. His ideas have been reproduced here without adjectives or praise or criticism, both being unnecessary, as a politician is understood and judged best by his own words. There will be people who will dismiss this document as Bhutto’s attempt to defend himself with mere rhetoric or passionate identification with cause he did not respect in practice. Quite a few of Bhutto’s prognoses have not come true but then no one in 1978 could foresee what the world was going to be like in 1989. Some will find the narrative rambling and some expressions that should have been revised on second reading or the explanations of some political phenomena too simplistic. But this only confirms that Bhutto wrote as the ideas came to him. There are passages which lack freedom from subjective influences, but there are many that stand out for lucidity. There are sentences molded by anger but also many epigrammatic turns of the phrase and quotable quotes. However, no one will be able to dispute the fact that the writer emerges here as a man of vast study gifted with a capacity to analyze social currents and the movement of history, a genuine citizen of the third world and a politician with an abiding concern for the poor.

Much may have changed since Bhutto wrote this letter but it still has the essentials of a sound approach to politics that could serve Benazir Bhutto and her party as their basic charter. The path delineated by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto for his daughter is -neither short nor smooth Mr. Yahya Bakhtiar, in the foreword to this booklet, does not exaggerate when he describes her “uphill task” as “unenviable” and says, “one can only wish her Godspeed.”

One hopes those surrounding her will do more than wish her Godspeed.

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 similarly, 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 knew her 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 heat 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 problem, the genesis of the challenge 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. detente in an interview at Larkana on December 20, 1967 and later in “[Myth of Independence](#),”). 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-India 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 his 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 effort 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 aspirations 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 heterogeneous 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 honorable 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 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 skepticism over the role of Euro-communism as a viable and vibrant alternative to decaying capitalism. Euro-communism has been electrolyzed 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 romanticists feel the oppression and the suffocation of the State more acutely. They hanker for a new alternative to fulfill 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 favorite 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 un-conceived 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 amphibious 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 because 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 turmoil 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 traditions of liberal democracy. It might work and monarchy vesting democratic powers in a Parliament I would come tumbling down soon without a supervisory control. In the first place, the greedy generals would 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 tradition of indigenous monarch 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 suppliants 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. Ceausescu is busy building bridges between the East and the West and between the East and the East. The Ostpolitik of Brandt had 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 Superpowers 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 a 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, Zhigniew Brzezinski, the national Security Adviser to President Carter went to China and spoke as if an entente was developing between the United State 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 means 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 tantalizing 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 detente 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 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-alignments 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's 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 a 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 fulfill 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 had 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 detente. We witness at the moment a rising tide of disappointment with detente. 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-detente, 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 detente might be partly rehabilitated in the quasi-confrontation or quasi-detente milieu. On the other hand, the alignments 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 cooperating 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 or 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 para-trooping 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 cease-fire without conceding ideological territory. We need a cease-fire to bury dead thoughts and to overcome fatigue. The *modus vivendi* has to be honorable and above board. Both sides have lost or, should I say, neither side can win. During the cease-fire 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 stockpile 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 Mohutu, when Mohutu 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 and if 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 Nee 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 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 peril 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 bill 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 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 was 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 religions?

This is not a letter on Pakistan. If it were, I could have written a small hook entitled "Glimpses of Pakistan 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 RN 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 extraordinary 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-i-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 Ben; 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 Ali Bakhsh but he was assassinated in 1943 and G. M. Syed pick up his mantle. In the Frontier Province the rejection was spearheaded by Abdul Ghaftar Khan, the Frontier Gandhi. So much so, that it 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 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 province 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 fervor 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 constitutional 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. This 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-Rahman 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-Rahman that we would not only be happy but honored 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-Rahman compromised his Six-points to the extent of having a federal structure, he was welcome to form the Federal Government. But 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-Rahman would not budge an inch on 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 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 thousand 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 the threatened war trials. I held the Islamic Summit Conference in Lahore. I got America to lift the arms embargo. I mobilized 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 expectations and a 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 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 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 for 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 hold 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 inerasable 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 extra-ordinary 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 JUL. 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 endeavors to extend the hand of cooperation 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 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 has 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 of Jhelewan. In some parts of Serevan also NAP had a good following. Its influence was negligible in Lasbella, 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 heterogeneous sections 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 Akbar 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 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 to 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 Akbar Bugti as Governor of Baluchistan. Akbar Buati 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 expanding. 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 tube-wells, 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, 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 coexistence.

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 Ahmad 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 detail. 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. I 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, 1971 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 honorable 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 communiqué when President Daud visited Pakistan. If, after thirty years of tension and deadlock, sometimes rising very sharply, I could extract a joint communiqué 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-communiqués. If a more significant secret written agreement had been reached between them, there was all the more reason to reiterate the Kabul communiqué 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. May he it was such a big achievement that joint-communiqués 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 “Bid, 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 patronizing 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-communiqué 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 communiqué of June, 1976. He could not produce any document or quote any agreement or communiqué 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 endeavors 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 has 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 Superpower. 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 bazars 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 the logic of its methods. Its logic is the epitome of logic.

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— hearing. The discussions conducted between Britain and Afghanistan before the independence of India and Pakistan has 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 governments 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 important cities of Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur. Even in the smaller cities and towns, the non-Sindhis

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 Sindhu Desh 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 majority in some of the subdivisions. The Thakors or the Ranas of Tharparkar are very influential in their region. They have marital 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 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 hounded and packed in chaddars. The bureaucrats and the police are functioning without supervisor 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 neighbor" that the present leadership of India would stand by and watch others carve out Pakistan. Whatever General Zia-ul-Haq may do to 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 Ladakh. 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 Darn 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 Vajpai are uttering words of milk and honey into the "*kan ka kacha*" ears of the martial law rulers. It is solely a tactical device. Vajpai 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 Vallabhbhai 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 learnt 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 appear 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 Janated 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 reason. 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 her 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 vanclalistic 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 COTRIE 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 has “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 massager 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 nationhood, 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 All 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'être*. 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 neighbor 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 Subcontinent 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 simply 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 hook by James Morris entitled "Farewell the Trumpets", the author has stated:

"The rule of law proved transitory when the imperial policemen were withdrawn, and 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 modeled 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 considerations 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 honored 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 larger 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 larger section of the population is affected more by unemployment than by inflation. Besides, in developing countries, there are no worth while social security schemes for the unemployed. The choice between inflation and unemployment is not a simple one. Neither of them is 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 choose 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 he 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 inconceivable 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 cozy 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 Kot Lakhpat Jail. When these individuals destroy their own Country's interests and future, it is a wicked myth for the Western Powers to think that they can protect Western interests.

Two countries in Asia excel 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 all the responsibility of 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 more 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 perverse 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 immortal 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 eventuality, 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 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 Indian 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 un-illustrious 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 he 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 of 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 noncommunist states friendly or sympathetic to communist states. Those states were the "*follow travellers*". " But after detente, 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 detente and the Shanghai

communiqué every state becomes a fellow traveler in its 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 detente and the Shanghai Communiqué. This is the spirit of Helsinki and the meaning behind Brezezinski'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's 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 detente 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 noncommunist 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 President 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 maneuvers. Pakistan, a faithful ally and, according to Nehru, the most aligned ally was punished for her 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 dehumanize human beings. Thus, Brazil's military junta has brought terrorism under control. How would Brazinski 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 teachings 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 teachings and directives of Christ are more sacred than those of a Messenger of God. According to the Christians, those teachings 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 wants 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 every thing 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 honorable 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 neighbor 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 Dulles refused to shake hands with Prime Minister Chou En-Li. 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 chiefly 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 endeavors 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 hoots.” My Country, my hoots 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 judgment 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 in 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 eve of the birth. We need not go far back into the past. Abortions of revolution took place in France 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.” Any 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 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 Abdel 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 honors. 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 Menders. 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". Either, 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 didn't happen because the Americans behaved like the Italians. The AlCapones, 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. This 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 had 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 honorable *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 fathers 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 arrangements 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 hoots. 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 hare footed ones. The lice in the hair of a poor child is your weapon. The dirty smell in the mud but 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 Bakhsh 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 Srinagar, 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 theater. 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 how 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

blessings of the most blessed mission. This is the only present I can give You on your birthday.

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 rid 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 American has become the castanets 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 ethereal terms the whole world is beautiful. In physical terms I have rarely seen more scenic beauty than in California or in Texas. 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 it link between God 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 it 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 rancor 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 Akbar Bugti. I kept calling for Akhar Bugti and Khair Bakhsh Marri. How strange are the zigzags of historical events? ¹ 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 valorously 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 excuse for my deficiencies but it is very difficult to rely on a fading memory in such physical and mental conditions.

¹ These zigzags play such pranks that on 18th June 1978 a former manager of PIA had the nerve to say that he and a Commerce Minister concluded the agreement on the most vital and strategic building of Karakoram Highway.

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 stakes too high, to bequeath to the coming 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?’ “*

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto
District Jail Rawalpindi
June 21, 1978.

**ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO:
THE VICTIM OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM**

A few months before his death Zulfikar Ali Bhutto cried bloody hounds wanted to kill him. His intuition gave him the indication that he was going to be killed. Why was he sure of his death? Because he introduced a few plans to unite Muslims of the world. In this direction he had many other plans which also were to be implemented. He was waiting for the right moment. But like many other militant Muslim leaders of twentieth century he too became the victim of so-called secular humanism of the Western bloc which never can tolerate an independent Muslim bloc and a league of Muslim nations of; which great contemporary Muslim leaders dreamt.

It is not possible for the imperialist forces to apply the theory of Divide and Rule unless there is some flaw in the system and conditions locally prevalent. They have created such situations in the Muslim world that now it has become_ allergic even to the very concept of unity. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was fully aware of the reality that the main feature of history of the twentieth century was nothing but to suppress the Muslim world. He was convinced by the core of his heart that Muslims in our century were passing through a period of new crusades. The imperialist powers with the help of their resourceful planning's were capturing all the markets of Muslim zones. And the poor natives were overpowered to purchase their desirable or undesirable commodities and ideas.

Like every devoted leader of Ummah, he too was aware of the fact that early in this century the caliphate had been banned in Turkey. Western powers divided European states in such a way that the Muslims of those areas became the victims of partition. They were given the gift of materialist dependence.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was categorically against this policy of divide and rule. He knew that with the initiative of religious minded imperialist forces Palestine was enslaved by the Zionist forces.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto challenged the "White elephant" which by the voodoo of its policies was going to destroy the great Muslim powers in the East.

Bhutto declared in the Islamic Summit that Muslims of the world should be united to secure their interests. He instigated Arabs to use oil weapon against

Western imperialism. Bhutto showed Pakistani nation the path of Atomic energy. He was of the opinion that big Muslim powers should achieve atomic technology for their security purposes.

Now his daughter Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto is crying for justice in Muslim Countries. She went to Bosnia and saw there with her own eyes the helplessness of the Muslim population. Muslims are surrounded and killed brutally by the Serbs in Bosnia Hercegovina.

From Bhutto's period to the present regime, Western powers are taking measures to prevent Pakistan from becoming an atomic power.

Bhutto continuously exposed those Western powers who were using Machiavellian policies of divide and rule. No Muslim of the subcontinent forgot that in 1857 the great Muslim empire in India was captured by the religious minded traders and through their missionaries they tried to abolish local cultures. In 1947 a part of that empire was returned to Muslims of the sub-continent but in such a way that its basic units of energy and power remained in India. And in 1971 with an illegal invasion, bringing Bangla Desh into existence they divided the largest Muslim strength. Isn't it a period of crusades? Yes it is! Bhutto thought in this direction and he raised the issues of Indian Muslims, Kashmir, Palestine, in such an effective manner at national and international forums that he became the great leader-of present day Muslim world. Being a Pakistani politician he told the nation clearly that the problem of Pakistan's integrity and solidarity was the problem concerning its life and death.

He identified that extremists from the left and opportunists from the right have their well planned views on the problems of national security and existence.

A nationalist Pakistani had nothing to do with them. He told positively that Pakistan had a great strategic position. So Indian expansionists, social revisionists and Western imperialists were conspiring against it. Still this danger is on. We should search the path of national security and keep this in mind that it won't be possible without a solid Muslim bloc and unity among Muslim nations and in the contemporary century this message belongs to no one else but Jamal-ud-Din Afghani, Allama Iqbal, Dr. Ali Shariati and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

ZAB: THE ARCHITECT OF ISLAMIC SOCIALISM

The personality of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is highly important as far as political history of Pakistan is concerned. Bhutto emerged on the political scene of Pakistan as a minister but he rose to the position of prime minister and popular leader of the nation:-His rise as popular leader was mainly due to the resistance movement against Ayub Khan regime and inherent attributes of leadership. Bhutto played a dynamic role in the formulation of foreign policy of Ayub Khan. At the same time he paid great attention towards projecting these policies. Bhutto declared that these policies reflected the will of the people after the adoption of defined strategy against Ayub Khan. Appeal is now directed to the youth and the masses with a socialist programme the contents not an importation from the West but are inherent in Islam itself. The main feature of his political philosophy is Islamic socialism. He is of the view that if there is no conflict between democracy and Islam, there is no clash between Islam and equality. Since equality is one of the cardinal principles of Islam, our economy should be based on socialism. Islamic socialism is the only solution to the problems facing the common man. He used to admire national development programme of Iraq, Syria, Libya and Algeria and he was of the view that Pakistani nation should also benefit from these precedents of development in the Muslim countries through the programme launched under the Islamic socialism. Social and economic emancipation of the masses could only be achieved by overthrowing the condition created by capitalists and feudals. Pakistani people were grooving under the miseries of poverty, ignorance and disease since the creation of Pakistan. The main Objective of founding the separate state was the attainment of honour, dignity, prosperity and social justice for the masses who could develop their lives in the culture of deep-rooted historical conditions. Bhutto wanted to put an end to the control of a few capitalists over the wealth of the country.

Although Ayub Khan launched a number of developmental projects in the country but his developmental strategies were not aimed at provision of its benefits to all sections of societies peculiar development society exercised deep and far reaching impact in concentrating the national resources in few hands. New class of industrial barons emerged out of the developmental venture of

Ayub Khan. Newly adopted development strategy resulted in tremendous disparity among the territorial regions and classes.

Press freedom was carved to the enormous degree and creative process of society was deliberately suppressed and conditions essential for intellectual stagnation were created through the dictates of authoritarian rule. The way Ayub Khan manipulated the president election which forced Fatima Jinnah out of political scene of country was highly deplorable. Human rights violation was the order of the day. Some opportunists' type of political activists used to take lot of benefits in the form of political and economic gains. East Pakistani felt alienated during the Ayub Khan regime and seed of separation started germinating during the dictatorial rule. Participating of the participation in the state affairs was non-existent as there was no democratic institution based on popular will. Resentment against the government was increasing day by day. Condition I was ripe for massive revolt against the established authority of the dictator.

Industrialization policy of Ayub Khan had generated series of changes in the social structure of Pakistan which is characterized as social mobilization by social scientists.

Social mobilization has been defined as the process in which major lusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people became available for new pattern of socialization and behavior.

State promoted capitalism in Third World countries heightened consciousness of social injustice because of growing inequalities.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had a full grasp of situation and realization of the forces unleashed by the process of social mobilization. He also realized the deepening ideological crisis that Pakistan faced as religion was no longer the cementing force of the nation.

Decade of development was termed as decade of exploitation, disgruntled labour class, uneasy younger generation and aspirant of better quality of life are the targets.

For the first time since the creation of state, populism introduced in the political spectrum of the country.

Bhutto presented himself as radical socialist during the election campaign of 1970. Slogan of food, clothing and shelter was raised and it attracted millions of poor and downtrodden.

ZAB emerged on the national scene as a minister in the Ayub cabinet. He was picked up because of his intellect, enlightenment and command on the subject of foreign affairs. Bhutto had a lucid perception of people's problems. Progressive outlook with Western education carved his way. Disillusioned masses were looking for a leader who could redress their grievances.

ZAB overcame the differences within the party that arose on the questions like radical land reforms and divergent expectations of left and right wings.

After becoming the head of government he introduced far reaching administrative, economic and political reforms in the country. He infused new kind of consciousness among the masses. Such consciousness became the asset of democracy and the people were ready to face any threat or challenge posed by the dictatorial rule through the awareness of being significant entity of society. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto gave consensus Constitution of 1973 which was mutilated by Gen Zia later on. Western leaders became jealous of the popularity of Bhutto of global level.

He led the Muslim states in heroic manner and organised Islamic summit conference in 1974. He developed equation with the leaders like Shah Faisal, Col Gaddafi and Yasser Arafat. Western forces were apprehensive of his expanding influence at national and international level.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto will be long remembered particularly in relation to his contribution in launching automatic energy programme despite intense opposition of Western and American forces. Prolonged rule of Zia-ul-Haq along with its disinformation and character assassination campaign against Bhutto's personality. The name of Z.A. Bhutto could not be scrapped from the heart of the people. Although Zia succeeded in eliminating Bhutto physically but his ideas vision and radical outlook cannot be banished from the political scenario of the state. His intellectual influence combined with charismatic leadership can he still felt in the political scene. The party which was created by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has attained majority in recent election. But the government of PPP has not been fully able to launch a gigantic programme of reconstruction and development in consonance with the ideas of his leader despite many achievements in reforming national institutions and controlling the energy crisis.

If we analyze the attributes of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto we are bound to arrive at the conclusion that he evolved a new mechanism in running the state. Bhutto controlled the Bureaucracy and compelled the bureaucratic institutions to act in subservience to the directions of the politicians. He attempted to reduce the influence of army in the decision-making process of the country. But presently the establishment has become vitally important in shaping the political events,

although incompetence of politicians combined with the lack of harmony has paved the way for extra constitutional interference in the state matters.

After the execution of Bhutto the forces of establishment had started to play a dominant role in the country.

Comparative study of ZAB and his daughter reveals that he was primarily idealist and emotional person. Whereas there is lot of stability, consistency in the temperament of Benazir Bhutto, she is highly pragmatic in dealing with the national issues. She adopted conformist attitude to some extent by realizing political realities of our system and she managed to evolve a new political strategy in conformity with the political considerations of different political elements.

The government should take revolutionary steps in executing the ideas of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and it must be reflected in the policy structure of the government. There is a great need to initiate radical measures in reducing the disparity among different classes and regions in Pakistan. Manifestation of the rationale behind the creation of PPP will generate strength of the Government. PPP government has taken bold initiative in creating conditions essential for the human rights and freedom of expression but it is also obligatory on the part of the present leadership to launch development programme of action with revolutionary zeal. The leadership of PPP should also act in the direction of organizing the party at grass-root level and demonstrate unified approach at government level which is prerequisite for attaining lofty objective of socioeconomic revolution in the country.

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO SHAHEED A GREAT INTELLECTUAL

Undoubtedly it was many years after the untimely death of the Founder of Pakistan and Father of the nation, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah that Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto emerged as the only leader who could be acknowledged as a genuine and popular national leader of the Pakistani masses. The tragedy of this great follower of Quaid-i-Azam was however, that he rose to power in Pakistan at the most critical juncture of our history, when, as a result of misdeeds of the past rulers of Pakistan and those of the dictatorial regimes, Pakistan was divided into two as a result of international intrigues of the Super Powers and naked armed aggression of India.

It is an irony of fate that politicians with vested interests, their supporters and hand picked intellectuals in Pakistan have spared no effort in the character assassination of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed. However, the question that arises is as to what were those rare qualities of Mr. Bhutto Shaheed that he lives in the hearts of the millions of Pakistanis despite negative propaganda against him.

Much before the founding of Pakistan Peoples' Party in October 1967, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed had acquired a distinguished status in international politics. However, as Foreign Minister he had risen to heights and emerged on the international scene as a great leader when within and outside the Security Council he pleaded the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir with great ability, devotion and enthusiasm. In fact his forceful advocacy of the Kashmir dispute earned him international recognition, on the one hand, and, on the other, he became a hero of the Pakistani Youth and the people of Kashmir.

The role played by Mr. Bhutto Shaheed in strengthening Pakistan's relations with its great neighbor the People's Republic of China, would also go down in the history of Pakistan as a unique event to be written in the letters of gold. In fact, he was the architect of friendly relations between the two countries.

Like all great personalities, Mr. Bhutto was also a controversial figure. However, the biggest factor responsible for making Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Shaheed as a controversial personality in the national politics and history of Pakistan was the establishment of the Pakistan People's party itself. Although the establishment of

any political party cannot be considered as an unusual event in Pakistan politics but the establishment of Pakistan People's Party was more than an earthquake for the traditional politicians, civil and military bureaucracy and landed aristocracy. The manifesto of the newly established Pakistan People's Party was a harbinger of a real revolution, which struck at the roots of the vested interests.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the first genuine leader in the history of Pakistan who emphasised on the sovereign will of the people and made it clear that it is the people who are the fountain-head of power. He created a consciousness among the people and made them realize that it is they for whom Quaid-i-Azam had created Pakistan, and it is they who are the masters and real heirs of the legacy of Quaid-i-Azam's Pakistan. It is thus evident that such was this consciousness that gave a severe blow to the vested interests. In retaliation therefore, these powerful groups joined hands together and made a united front against him. However, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, during his short period of power in Pakistan, introduced and implemented far reaching and revolutionary reforms in all walks of life which benefited the people and were detrimental to the vested interests and the supporters of dictatorial system.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto introduced reforms, especially in the fields of agriculture and industry which changed the lot of the common man. He introduced reforms in the health and education sectors, which brought a qualitative and quantitative change in the social structure.

He increased military strength and started projects to increase military productions, and above all to counter and foil the nefarious designs of Pakistan's enemy--India. He launched with full force the programme of nuclear power, which ultimately took his life.

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto rendered glorious and invaluable services for the cause of the solidarity and unity of the world of Islam. It is for these distinguished services that he is even now greatly respected among the people and governments of the Islamic World. It was he who, in February 1974, brought together the heads of State and Government of the Muslim countries in Lahore, the heart of Pakistan and held the Islamic Summit Conference. This Islamic Summit was a milestone in the realization of the centuries old dream of the solidarity and unity of Muslim world. The Poet-Philosopher of Islam, Allama Iqbal, who conceived the idea and demand of Pakistan,- was a great advocate of Muslim unity, it was a tribute to Iqbal that leaders of the Muslim World assembled in Lahore where he lies buried.

Although Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has left his lasting imprint in the history of Pakistan but he has to his credit a great achievement that he gave this country a

unanimously adopted constitution of 1973. However, dictator Zia-ul-Haq made many amendments in this constitution to perpetuate his rule. Today every person in Pakistan admits that the constitution of 1973 is the symbol of the solidarity, territorial integrity, national unity and ideological guarantee of the God gifted State of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This is the very reason that despite political differences, all leaders and sections of society and the patriotic people of Pakistan are unanimous in their demand that the constitution of 1973 should be restored to its original form.

To conclude, I would like to say that the greatest tribute which we can pay and should be acknowledged by every one is that Mr. Bhutto kissed the gallows but did not surrender before the will of a dictator. He has earned the eternal love of the people of Pakistan and lives in their hearts.

LEADER OF THE DOWNTRODDEN

Today we observe Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's 15th death anniversary. But the slaves of the Western powers who destroyed his body failed to destroy his soul and only liberated his spirit which is so much alive and visible; its life form echoes in the voices of crowds chanting Jiye Bhutto, Jiye Bhutto.

A seriously ill Bhutto was hanged to death by a handful of shameless pigmies, of whom there is no dearth in our motherland; who are always ready to trade their loyalties for material gains.

Cronies of Gen Zia tried every method to make Bhutto give up his plan of forging unity in the Muslim world and to liberate his countrymen from the clutches of the Western powers which are no less than parasites eating away the riches of the Muslim world. Their failure to subdue Bhutto left them with no other alternative but to remove him from the scene and finally on the darkest day of our national history on the 4th of April 1979 they committed a judicial murder and hanged Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. With Bhutto's death a world of hopes came to an end, dreams which were yet to be realized were put to sleep. The leader of the poor was eliminated by agents of a Superpower. The plans for the uplift of the suffering masses of the third world came to an abrupt halt. The programme to unify the Muslim world was put to naught. The Mir Jaffers of his age again succeeded in snatching away the freedom which had only seen the dawn of day. Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the first elected prime minister of the country and a leader of millions of workers, laborers, party workers and others who longed for read freedom. But as it has always happened sycophants always find their way to the corridors of power and are always dangerous for their benefactors. The above cited example could not find a more appropriate personage than Gen Zia who was handpicked by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto for his fawning loyalty. Little did Mr. Bhutto know that this act of generosity would be the cause of his doom.

I would like to pen down a few facts related with the conspiracy against Shaheed Bhutto which till date have been kept from public eye.

After the PNA agitation reached its climax on April 9 and 10 in the year 1977, Bhutto knew that the Americans had finally decided to do away with his elected government and the emerging Pan-Islamism and secondly his plan to attain nuclear energy and an atomic reprocessing plant from France.

On 1st July, 1977 Rao Rashid who was then the Director of Intelligence Bureau wrote an 'Eyes Only' memo to Mr. Bhutto suggesting that the army was planning to stage a coup and that Zia-ul-Haq seemed to be the mastermind behind the scheme. Instead of taking remedial measures Bhutto made the fatal mistake of marking the memo to Zia who then made efforts to allay the fears of Mr. Bhutto by saying, "In case the army imposes martial law Mr. Bhutto would be the chief martial law administrator"

Zia also talked to Rao Rashid creating an embarrassing scene and pleading that this memo was due to some misunderstanding. But the final crunch came on 2nd July, 1977 when Zia called a corps commanders meeting. Mr. Bhutto asked General Tikka Khan, the then defence minister that after Zia had completed his meeting he should send the corps commanders to him so that he could talk to them directly regarding the thinking of the Army. When Tikka asked Zia to comply with the directive of the PM, Zia lied to him and said that he forgot and the corps commanders had already left for their bases. On a cross check with IB, Bhutto was stunned when he was informed that the corps commanders were still at the residence of the COAS, and that he had made a false statement regarding their departure. Bhutto immediately asked Zia to appoint Gen Imtiaz as the GOC Rawalpindi, an order which was disobeyed.

The date for implementation of Zia's plan was changed when Air Marshall Asghar Khan (ret'd) dressed as a shepherd in an old Cortina car clandestinely met with Zia along with Gen (ret'd) Rao Farman Ali and convinced Zia that in case he failed to act quickly the PNA may have no choice but to sign the agreement with the government and that no further delay was possible. Bhutto also later came to know that Zia was taken to a palmist in Egypt by the CIA who predicted that one day Zia would be president of Pakistan and since that day had been cultivating and promoting Zia, a fact later confirmed by William Casey, the then CIA chief in his memoirs: all duties assigned to Zia were progressing satisfactorily.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is one of the great heroes born during the current century. In his struggle for justice he sacrificed his life.

His sacrifice symbolizes the truth of great human values. He was born as a necessity for the Pakistani Nation, which had witnessed rapid social and political changes.

He entered Pakistan's political scene during a revolutionary phase. He had a deep understanding of these changing values and thus sided with the oppressed majority and led their struggle with courage and heroism. With his struggle and sacrifice he became a part of the national democratic movement and will always

remain a symbol of struggle for the oppressed and downtrodden. All efforts by the rulers to tarnish his image failed and the way they targeted the great Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is proof enough that he was a champion of the new era. It was he himself who once said: I will prefer to die at the hands of tyrants and refuse to be eliminated historically.

LEGEND OF POPULARITY

Twentieth century occupies its prominent place in our history as a large number of great heroes were born in this period. During the past two centuries alone, mankind achieved unprecedented progress through the development of modern capitalistic system. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is one of those greatest heroes, born in the current century that has his blood and life for the cause of Justice and righteousness. His sacrifice today embodies the truth and great human values. He arose as a historical necessity for Pakistan.

Zia regime tried very hard to finish the Bhutto charisma but failed and was only successful in eliminating him physically.

The way the oppressors and the exploiting forces made ZAB their target was an un-denying proof that he was a champion of the new era, the modern social system and was historical necessity.

ZAB entered the Pakistan political stage during a revolutionary phase. He made deep understanding of the changing values and has led the struggle with courage and heroism.

With his struggle and sacrifice, he became part of national democratic movement and that in an era of extensive and complicated exploitation he won the hearts of the common man.

It is natural that in an era of extensive complicated exploitation of the masses by different groups of oppressors and exploiters, the birth of a popular hero is inevitable.

That was the reason he became a great legend of popularity.

ZAB resigned in December 1967 from the Ayub's cabinet, from the office of the foreign minister.

He was confident when he declared at the PPP inaugural session at Hala: "When I left the Ayub cabinet, I told him very clearly that no one can separate me from my people. I am for the solution of the people's problems in a peaceful and in a

democratic way. But if necessary, I will be the first person to enter the battle grounds. We do not fear revolution.”

The while world then witnessed in September 1968 that a charismatic man launched a powerful people’s movement against the dictatorial regime of Ayub Khan.

He had all the great qualities that made him popular with the masses and they found in him a leader who would lead them to their freedom.

He became a symbol of a message for the oppressed people, a message for their emancipation, a message for a new life, free or exploitation and oppression.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto allowed the history to determine his fate; he refused to allow the enemies of the people to give any verdict on his personality. People never forget these great people who laid down their lives, sacrificed everything for the people and for the struggle of people.

When the enemies of peace and progress fearing the victory of the oppressed people, to eliminate great heroes like, ZAB the strung forces of history provide protection to the hero, it make him a symbol, full of fragrance of popularity.

ZAB was a legendary character, a great phenomenon. The sacrifices of such heroes become symbolic, the historic fight by the oppressed and the exploited people. That is why they always live in the memory of the people despite strong opposition.

He is the only thread of scarlet. One can see in him what Aristotle said in Alexander and Goethe in Napoleon. The philosophic unity of a chaotic and manifold world. But all he had conquered were the minds and hearts of Pakistanis.

Fifteen years have passed today since his execution but he still remains the undisputed focus of our politics. What may be called the Bhutto phenomenon is verily the story of today’s Pakistan. He lives, with a sense of urgency that flows from headlines every morning in the minds of his admirers.

He has become synonymous with Pakistan’s destiny. His name defines the polarization that will decide whether Pakistan can survive as progressive democracy, a federation founded on egalitarian system.

At a time when the country is grouping for a political sense of direction in a deepening darkness, the story should better be told in terms of the party that he formed 27 years ago.

The PPP was born in adversity. It was founded under a tent pitched on the lawns of a private residence in Lahore's Gulberg because nobody was prepared to lend or hire a hall to the rebellious group led by Bhutto. By the means, it was a new kind of party. Its slogans were not meant to camouflage the real issues. It was a social democratic party and its socialist programme placed it to the left of the centre. It was committed to democracy.

Immediately after its formation, the party was thrown into a bitter struggle against Ayub Khan's dictatorial regime. This movement bred what later was attributed as Bhutto's charisma. Bhutto was a charismatic leader and he has touched us all. We must relate to him in an emotional manner.

At a remarkably young age, he had made his mark to the national stage, and had given a new direction to Pakistan's foreign policy in early sixties.

On September 17, 1971, in a message he said: It is not an ultimatum, it is not a threat. I am a humble person, I cannot extend threats. I state only the realities, the facts I close my message on Lenin's great words: "Life is the most precious possession of a person. Because he gets only one opportunity to live, he should therefore lead a life free of cowardice. You should therefore lead a life that you should never repent that it was a purposeless life. You should live in a way that you can tell the death on its face that your whole life and energy was devoted to a great goal, the emancipation of the mankind."

Once he said: "I love my country, my home and earth. I would like to be buried in my country and would sacrifice everything for the people."

After these words we can easily understand why people call him a charismatic leader.

BHUTTO: THE MAN AND THE ENIGMA

On this day fifteen years ago, perished on the gallows one of the most extraordinary and also the most controversial personalities of Pakistan's politics. Liaquat Ali Khan's assassination in October 1951 was the first fatal blow to a nascent democracy, and Bhutto's execution a prelude to a long era of dictatorship. Liaquat was in the second line of leadership after the Quaid. He was a stalwart and an old guard of the freedom movement while Bhutto was the vanguard of the new generation of politicians.

Bhutto's association with Ayub Khan was not an apprenticeship in politics, dictatorship being the very antithesis of democracy. At best, it gave him an insight into the working of the administration and with policy making in the field of foreign affairs. The six years he spent with the martial law government were in a sense a hindrance rather than a help in the struggle for democracy against the very regime he had served. That he disabused the public mind of a commitment to the cult of force, in so remarkably a short time, showed how perceptive and unerring was his grasp of the objective realities of the situation. He left Ayub Khan in 1966 when the regime had still two and a half years to go to start a movement for its overthrow by organizing public opinion in support of a programme never owned and propagated by any political party before: Till then, fed on religious slogans the people were not familiar with the essence of politics.

Economics could not be divorced from it without making politics a sport for the adventurers who enter its arena, whatever the philosophy to which they subscribe. To the downfall of Ayub's regime the contribution of Mujibur Rahman and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was unquestionably great. Bhutto's electoral victory though not equally sweeping in West Pakistan, the PPP had nevertheless almost swept off the board the denominational parties in whose political dictionary there was no room for secularism and socialism, which they thought were alien to the spirit of the Islamic polity. *Roil, Kapra our Makan* were the very stuff of politics even in a state which called itself Islamic.

More than a year had to elapse before Bhutto could begin the fulfillment of his promise. In the intervening period, rightly or wrongly charges of complicity were leveled against him in the occurrence of the catalytic events that shook and dismembered the country. Despite the tirade of his opponents, his stock

remained high. In those dark days of disillusionment and despair, he appeared to be the only hope of piecing together the shattered threads of the country's politics bullied from within and battered from without. He proved to be a master craftsman in the handling of the external situation, and no less skilful in the management of its internal affairs.

Perhaps his crowning achievement was the unanimous passage of the 1973 constitution through the National Assembly to which every member without exception was a signatory. No other Prime Minister had a more decisive popular mandate and incontestable majority in the Parliament for the effective governance of the country. Yet, he took resort to extra-constitutional devices and emergency measures were adopted by him in the suspension of fundamental rights and dismissal of governments in Baluchistan and the Frontier.

There was no need for legislation through ordinances to present the national Assembly with a fait accompli or to short-circuit the discussion or restrict the time of the speeches, to disallow privilege and adjournment motions, to arrest members of the Assembly when the rules permit immunity from an unlawful detention during the pendency of sessions called for debates on important policy matters on foreign or internal affairs. And yet, all these things were allowed to happen, creating bickering and had blood between the government and the opposition. It was a shocking spectacle of tiny minority facing a tyrannical majority.

Taking the Assembly for granted the members of the majority took the liberty of absenting themselves from the session, as if by an arrangement with the rest of the colleagues to provide the quorum whenever the Speaker rang the bell.

Not that the Parliament was completely bereft of talent. Some of its members were highly qualified but they were few and far between. It is mediocrity that reigned supreme.

The law relating to land reforms on which the Prime Minister had spoken with matchless eloquence in his broadcast turned out to be the most insipid piece of legislation. It was not reformist in content. The opposition members were not wanting in pointing out that it was used more as a weapon on vendetta and vindictiveness against the opponents of the government than as a vehicle of the much desired social change in the interest of the small peasants.

Feudalism and the Sardari System, in all their stark reality with all their oppressiveness, still exist, while the reforms on paper limit the size of agricultural holding to only 100 acres. Bhutto's land legislation had not fulfilled the promise of a fair deal to the workers on the land, and the workers in the

factories who benefited from a code of progressive laws enacted by him, soon discovered that their money wages had not enhanced their living standards, which were further depressed by the high cost of living entailed by the rising prices. The 32 industries taken over by the state had not appreciably reduced the excessive concentration of wealth in the hands of the industrialists, who had found new avenues of self-enrichment. The bureaucrats, who managed these units, had no managerial experience and expertise to run them as going and growing concerns.

Nationalization of banks loudly proclaimed as a great step forward towards the revitalization of the economy had not opened the door to a wider distribution of bank credit to the poorly provided and semi starved segments of the economy, which are a source of livelihood to the small businessmen who still suffer from the dearth of finance and marketing facilities. Those who came after him, far from effecting improvement in the working of the system by making them more efficient instruments of service to the community, freely used the resources of the state for their political aggrandizement. Our ruling elite has been more fond of forms and formalities, with which they have continued to experiment in the hope that all will be well in the end, and allergic to the spirit which they have allowed to go down the drains.

Pakistan has not produced a crop of leadership in the post independence period that could extricate the country out of the morass into which it has sunk and is still sinking by their mistaken policies and malafide intentions. What this country needs more than anything else is a leader of outstanding caliber imbued with the highest sense of patriotism, a genuine concern for the well being of its population, an iron will to overcome the most dogged resistance of the vested interests who have been living merrily at its expense as businessmen, bureaucrats, hankers, industrialists, speculators, land and license grabbers, black marketers and currency racketeers and a whole lot of parasites that have eaten into its vitals. A class of the new rich in addition to the old which has joined its ranks is engaged in the amassment of wealth without fear of punishment. There is no realization that a harvest of prosperity they accumulated has impoverished the country to the edge of bankruptcy.

Such a caliber Pakistan had expected of Mr. Bhutto to provide. For, he had in him all the qualities that go into the making of a leader of men and the builder of a nation. His academic achievements and intellectual attainments, his parliamentary talent and his charismatic personality, which could hold spellbound the masses of humanity who thronged the public meetings to listen to him, to capacity to organise a party machine were rue among his contemporaries.

He could rise to great heights as an orator, and yet fall to very low depths in dealing, with his colleagues who did not see eye to eye with him. His most serious drawback was his innate lust for power. Power, he said, must flow from the people, but did not intentionally clarify that it had to flow into his hands. Institutions were important to him only if they subserved his ends. Feudalism and democracy go ill-together and Bhutto remained a feudal at heart. A modern outlook and medieval heritage could not co-exist. The loyalties that he had initially evoked could not be eventually sustained when the new aspirants for power had struck the blow to bring about his fall.

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO NOT AN ORDINARY MAN

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto president and later prime minister of Pakistan, overthrown by a few generals on 5th July 1977, met death on the gallows in early morning hours of April 4, 1979. Upon hearing of his execution hundreds of thousands of Pakistanis wept: a few rejoiced. Fifteen years after his death crowds still shout "*Jiye Bhutto*" (long live Bhutto)) while other loathe and fear his legacy. At the tenth anniversary of his death, a seminar was held wherein his widow Begum Nusrat Bhutto remarked that neither in life nor in death had he been an ordinary man. That is true because his leadership and rule were fraught with momentous consequence for politics in Pakistan.

Many books have been written on late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, his politics and philosophy behind his politics. I have also made a humble contribution towards that. The junta had leveled many charges against the first ever elected prime minister of Pakistan which were rebutted by him while in the death cell and after his judicial murder, the historians, have tried successfully to find out the realities.

The fact remains that late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the victim of a two-layered conspiracy hatched and carried out against him because he had refused to compromise on his country's vital interests. In April, 1977, late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had warned in Parliament that the bloodhounds are after my blood." Bhutto became the target of an international conspiracy aimed at destabilizing his elected government, because Bhutto had refused to cancel or modify the Nuclear Reprocessing Plant Agreement, which he had signed with France. In the very same city of Lahore where the death sentence was pronounced against him, Bhutto was warned by a Super power in August, 1976, that if he did not change his position on the Nuclear Reprocessing Plant, then "a horrible example will be made out of you." This Super power felt that if Pakistan acquired nuclear technology, the oil fields upon which the entire Western civilization depended, would be so well fortified that in the event of another oil embargo, they would be beyond the reach and might of the West. A Superpower felt that the civilization of the "advanced West" could not be placed at the "whim" of the "Backward Muslim nations." Although the Reprocessing Agreement included cast iron "safeguards" to ensure that the Plant acquired for peaceful purposes did not lead to proliferation of the Nuclear weapons, the Superpower believed that even the minimum risk of Pakistan acquiring nuclear weapons could not be

entertained. That is why the decision was taken to destabilize the government of the man whose services to Pakistan, the Islamic World and the Third World were internationally acknowledged and respected.

A combination of Foreign Power and obstructionist internal elements spearheaded by a few generals overthrew the legitimate, popularly elected government of late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in the early hours of July 15th, 1977 through a nocturnal coup. The first layer of the conspiracy came to a conclusion with the destabilization and fall of the PPP government headed by late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Seeking to consolidate their newly acquired positions of power resting not on the will and consent of the people, but on brute force, General Zia embarked on a road of systematic terror and repression, which had found its logical conclusion in the threat of destabilization of not only Pakistan, but of the entire region.

The subcontinent witnessed the ugliest character assassination campaign and the most vicious vendetta against late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, his family, his cabinet colleagues and his party. Driven by senseless, primitive passions the Junta had crossed all levels of human decency and civilized conduct to destroy and eliminate late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

The Junta had hatched the conspiracy to murder its undisputed political rival through the ingenious method of accusing, trying and sentencing the popular leader to death on, ironically, a charge of murder. The farce that took place in the Lahore High Court called the trial of murder was in fact a murder of trial.

With the exception of Ahmed Raza Kasuri whose father's death, the court was theoretically investigating, each and every one of over 40 prosecution witnesses was a government servant, at the mercy of the Junta. All of the top, key witnesses had spent many months in military and police custody before they "testified."

Mr. Ahmad Raza Kasuri, wrongly labeled Late Mr. Bhutto's political opponent, was also a de facto government servant. Neither he nor his family had won a single election either national provincial or municipal other than the one Mr. Kasuri won when Chairman Bhutto granted him a Pakistan People Party ticket in the 1970 elections.

Mr. Bhutto's Pakistan Peoples Party was founded in 1967 and at the time of its inception it was infiltrated by the agents of the then President Yahya Khan. When the PPP assumed power in December 1971, I came across evidence that Mr. Kasuri was on the payroll of the intelligence agencies and acting on their orders. Just as he co-operated in exchange for monetary remuneration with the military

regime of General Yahya Khan likewise Mr. Kasuri was co-operating with the military regime of General Zia-ul-Haq.

Mr. Kasuri has toured the West along with his wife on the country's expense to "educate" the West on the "fairness" of the Lahore High Court judgment. Mr. Kasuri and the Junta justified Mr. Kasuri's claim as a "political Opponent" of Mr. Bhutto's on the ground that Mr. Kasuri criticized the policies the former Prime Minister during his tenure of office. A glance that the proceedings of the Pakistani Parliament show that there were many others who criticized the former Prime Minister, Criticism, debate and sometimes acrimonious exchanges on the floor of parliament, through the media or in public speeches are part and parcel of the make-up of a democratic society, Countries familiar with democratic institutions and traditions had very rightly concluded that the charge was ludicrous and, indeed stupid. It would have become a laughing matter in Pakistan, too,-- if the life of Pakistan's leader had not been at stake.

The entire case was fabricated by a special Martial Law team headed by a Major General and assisted by Saghir Anwar, the Director of the Federal Investigating Agency, the late Mr. Anwar, Special Public Prosecutor and Mr. Justice Maulvi Mushtaq who later presided over the Full Bench trying late Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. The team reported each stage of its manufactured case to Lt. Gen. Faiz Ali Chishti, who headed the "Election Cell" and who, in turn, reported the progress to the Chief Martial Law Administrator.

The fabricated murder case, so specially concerned and manufactured by the full force of the coercive machinery of Martial Law nonetheless had inherent contradictions which revealed the falsity of the charge. It was perhaps the first case in the annals of criminal law which had two official Approvers and three un-official Approvers. The three un-official Approvers were the confessing accused, who said that they actually had committed the murder although their recollection of the event was at variance with each other's and mutually destructive. For their "Confession" extracted after torture at the famous dungeons of Lahore Fort, the three had been assured that they would not be sent to the gallows. For "confessing" their "crime" they would be given their liberty in about a year and handsomely rewarded financially. Thus for all purposes the three "Confessing" accused were Approvers in the case along with three official Approvers. (There were three if one includes Saeed Ahmad).

Mian Abbas, the fourth confessing accused who later retracted his statement and later retracted his retraction, had given a detailed account of how his "confession" was extracted. The biased and prejudiced Bench had ensured that this account did not see the light of day by declaring that the proceedings would

he held in camera when the accused gave their statements under Criminal Procedure Code's Section 342.

The entire Prosecution case with its lurid tales of a Pakistan by a modern Borgia Prince were sensationalized Pakistan and dramatized in the controlled papers, journals and the radio and television, in an attempt to create a climate of hysteria against the former Prime Minister. As soon as the time came for defence proceedings, (only Mian Abbas gave a defence. Late Mr. Bhutto boycotted the proceedings in protest over its blatant bias and prejudice.), the court was converted into a dark room for camera proceedings.

The trial bench made a ferce even of Camera Proceedings by permitting full publicity on the media to the diametric falsehoods of the three confessing accused and prohibiting the statements of the former Prime Minister from coming on the media. The Bench even refused to supply him with copies of his own statements.

Every legal system recognizes the right of an accused in a murder charge to a public trial. The concept of a public trial is inherent in Islamic jurisprudence and in the common law traditions on which Pakistan's legal system is based. The Sixth Amendment of the American Constitution also makes provisions for a public trial as an integral part of justice. The right to a public trial is a fundamental pillar of all legal systems not in order for the accused to receive undue publicity, as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court snidely remarked; but so that, under the full glare of public.

Scrutiny, the judges do not commit injustice. The Lahore High Court brazenly and blatantly overrode this inviolable principle, common to all civilized judicial systems, so that in the darkness or the camera proceedings, the court could commit murder by sentencing to death an innocent man, the authentic leader of the people.

The hypocrisy of the Lahore High Court was obvious when one recalls that, after declaring, for international ears, that the trial would take place "in the full light of day", the Bench transformed it into a closed Court. Mr. Justice, Maulvi Mushtaq, promoted to Chief Justice during the trial, twice superseded by Mr. Bhutto, handpicked his favorite colleagues to sit in judgment of the former Prime Minister. He did not include in this Bench the two judges who had granted Mr. Bhutto bail on Raza Kasuri's private complaint. This had been turned into a State case after the two judges on the Divisional Bench had dared to ensure justice and set Mr. Bhutto at liberty.

By trying the case immediately at the High Court level and not at the Sessions Court level, the Junta and the Lahore High Court deliberately deprived Mr. Bhutto of his first right of Appeal. This was the first in many serious departures from legal procedures.

The chronicle of the judge's behavior during the trial proceedings before the Lahore High Court was a sickening tale of the travesty of justice.

It was best summed up in the words of the former Governor and Chief Minister of Punjab, Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Khar, who stated at that time in London that Maulvi Mushtaq had told Khar in 1975, that the only way to get rid of Bhutto is to put a bullet through his head." This very same man insisted on sitting in judgment of the former Prime Minister and passing the death sentence against him.

BHUTTO'S CHARISMA LIVES ON

Fifteen years after the execution of Pakistan's first elected prime minister, described by some as a "judicial murder" on a four-three Supreme Court judgment of April 4, 1979, the popularity of Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto continues to hold its sway on the minds and souls of the downtrodden, shirtless and the homeless. Historiographer Oriana Fallaci had rightly remarked in her book, "Interview With History" that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was "undoubtedly one of the most complex leaders of our time and the only interesting one that this country has so far produced!"

Oriana, who had seen the country from very close quarters and had been with Mr. Bhutto for quite some time, believed that besides his fathomless charisma, he was perhaps the only one capable of "saving it (Pakistan), at least for a while." In the conditions that he had assumed the responsibility as the captain of the ship, there was no alternative to him. Oriana had the vision to predict that "Pakistan would suffer unbearable consequences if he goes." He was highly intelligent, astute, horn to charm, hacked powerfully by culture, unmatched memory, flair and great urbanity. "He had intelligence combined with courtesy and a mysterious sadness locked in his eyes and something of shyness about his smile."

Oriana Fallaci who sat face to face with Z. A. Bhutto who was messiah to his people, found in him a man with steel nerves and dauntless determination who would not yield to any pressure and who had the fathomless capacity to resist "everything with the courage of a trapeze artiste with no net to protect him." She found in him and John F. Kennedy a lot of similarities. He grew up in the kind of wealth for which nothing is impossible, not even conquest of political power, cost what it may. Like Kennedy, he had a comfortable happy, privileged childhood. Like Kennedy he began his rise to power very early. He was western educated and aristocratic but remained the Muslim Bhutto that no amount of western culture would have basically changed. She had seen in him a proletariat, clenched his fists, tears in his eyes, determined to change for good the prehistoric existence of his peasant population.

Oriana Fallaci who had the necessary foresight to presage that "Pakistan would suffer unbearable consequences if he goes" must have been a satisfied woman. Her prediction made 22 years ago continues to wreak havoc to this day. Kevin

Rafferty writing for the editorial page of London *Observer* in Islamabad on April, 5, 1979, had the following to say: "A battle for the survival of Pakistan which will affect the future shape of the region and the lives of 80 million of the world's poorest people began at 2 a.m. on Wednesday when Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was dropped from the gallows." Equally expressive was the title of the editorial of daily Express, London: "Bhutto dies Pakistan waits." It said: "...Punjab has had two significant politicians killed in her short history, in 1951 Liaqat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister was assassinated by a Muslim fanatic. The death of Bhutto does not seem very different. The evidence against him was sufficiently thin to attract the support only of General Zia's fellow Punjabis in the court of appeal. His treatment and humiliations in the death cell suggest vengeance and not justice. His execution on a cross beam in a prison shed is a hideous waste. It is also a guarantee that sooner or later the Punjabis will lose other provinces of Pakistan, especially Sindh, as surely as the last lot of iron-brained lost Bangladesh."

Indeed, death to Bhutto not "with the due panoply of justice but like a thief in the night, a deed done shamefully, apprehensively, and with desperation" as London's *Guardian* editorialized, has done Pakistan so much of harm that there seems no turning back even now after two decades of the greatest tragedy.

The moving finger writes and having writ moves on, that is history. Only the greatest of men leave indelible imprints on the sands of time. Bhutto picked up the pieces of a destroyed nation; he gave a new lease of life to the lost masses and revived self-confidence in the armed forces of Pakistan after they had surrendered to India. The amount of gratitude the armed forces had for him was, for once, truthfully expressed by Gen. Zia himself who at a dinner in Bhutto's honour at the Command and Staff College Quetta, had the following to say: "Those of us who are aware of the facts and figures can certainly say that the amount of attention which the Pakistan army received since 1971 till to date, has no parallel in the history of Pakistan Army prior to 1971. With all this, Sir, I personally and on behalf of the army, have nothing tangible to offer as yet. All can say is that perhaps one day by the grace of God while you are still present, this Pakistan army can show that all the attention and affection that it received from you did not go waste... I am saying this in very simple and humble words from the bottom of my heart that we thank, Sir, for all that you are doing and what you have done for us in particular." What General Zia did to Bhutto in his 'gratitude' for all that he had done for him personally and for the armed forces as an institution, is a chapter in betrayal which would even put Mir Jaffers, Sadiqs and Quislings to shame. Zia tortured Bhutto beyond human comprehension but he walked to the gallows, head up in the air, giving unparalleled dignity to manhood and courage to his people to wage a relentless struggle against dictatorship.

Shaheed Bhutto was eased out because he wanted the nation to bask in the nuclear glow. He was removed from the scene because he was too big a man for Pakistan's enemies to handle. Men like him were a threat to the vested interest world wide. They had seen in hint grow a colossus, a leader of the third world out there in a crusade to end exploitation of man by man, of nations by nations.

Sir Winston Churchill speaking at a time when the world was moving under the Nazi cloud, had said: "History with its' flickering lamp stumbles along the trail of the past, trying to reconstruct its scenes, to revive its echoes, and kindle with pale gleams the passions of former days. What is the worth of all this?"

"The only guide to man is his conscience. The only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions. It is imprudent to walk through life without this shield, because we are so often mocked by failures of our hopes and upsetting of our calculations: but with this shield, however, the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honour." Surely what Sir Winston Churchill has opined is fully manifested in the recurring confidence of the masses in the Bhutto legacy. Whenever asked to vote, they have shown that Bhutto vote bank remains intact. Obviously, what is demanded as the protective shield to Bhutto's legacy is to stop the ritualistic approach to him and get down to action.

Long periods of dictatorship have eroded the -political will of the people. The masses have lost their self-esteem as well. It also seems that the battle for survival that began in the night of April 4, 1979, is not even half way through yet. Survival to victory in that battle would entirely depend on the extent and quality of repair that could be brought about by Ms. Benazir Bhutto's government to the fragmented and much polarized body-politic of Pakistan. Notwithstanding the strong doses of baradri and ethnic poison injected by General Zia, the primary political task before Ms. Bhutto to save Pakistan is to work on the premise that more of democracy and devolution can minimize ethnic conflicts through accommodating different interest groups in a manner that it is not only seen but is also even handed. That was the spirit behind the 1973 Constitution.

DID HE CONSOLIDATED OR BREAK PAKISTAN?

On Bhutto's 16th death anniversary today, one's thought naturally goes to a must basic question about him: Did he consolidate or break the country? From the very beginning Bhutto seemed to have concluded that the basic cause of the country's ills was lack of people's participation and the absence of a workable Constitution as the fountain of all law and civility. That is why he proclaimed before the National Assembly on August 12, 1973 thus:

"The people are supreme. They make and unmake their leaders. They make and unmake their governments and their own destinies. Our faith is in the people and the Constitution. We shall always be guided by the people's aspirations."

It is this faith in the people which has made Bhutto and Bhuttoism a durable and permanent reality -- much more than a mere transient phenomenon. It is this faith which may help provide some answer to the basic question.

In order to understand this, one has to dwell a bit in history. Out of 47 years of our independent existence we have been ruled for over 25 years by the Army. Out of the remaining 22 years there have been over a dozen governments, none of which completed its mandated term and were forced to quit. One prime minister was murdered, another hanged. Thus far no elected government has been removed through elections. There were no elections on direct adult franchise basis for the first 23 years of Pakistan's independence. There was no Constitution for the first seven years. When the Constitution was finally framed in 1956 and elections scheduled for 1959 a military dictator struck. People's aspiration did not matter. When in the 1954 elections in East Pakistan the ruling party i.e. the Muslim League, won only 9 out of 237 seats in the Provincial Assembly the central government sent the provincial assembly packing home. Who cared about the people anyway?

When the second fairest elections (after the 1946 pre-Partition elections) were held in 1970, the junta refused to transfer power to the elected reps, and the national Assembly session was refused to be convened. Ayub Khan had given in 1962 a one-man Constitution, but abrogated it himself in 1969. Result: Three

martial laws, three wars with India, breakup of the country, intellectual confusion marked by an unending debate whether Pakistan is to be a modern democratic progressive state, or a theocratic one. Worse still, the debate whether we should have a system of parliamentary democracy or presidential or a genuine multinational, democratic and federal system still rages. When the leader of the Opposition still blurts to hell with the Constitution” or says that parliamentary democracy has failed he is only highlighting the fact that even after half a century fundamental political issues have not been resolved.

It is in this context that one can try to understand whether Bhutto consolidated or broke Pakistan. His detractors in the media like Mr. Z.A. Suleri and others have made much of the slogan allegedly coined by Bhutto “*Udhar turn, Idhar hum*” with reference to transfer of power after the 1970 elections to prove their point. Soon after Bhutto’s execution Mr. Suleri wrote in the Pakistan Times under “The death of a traitor”, seeking to prove how a great traitor Bhutto was. His charge-sheet indicating Bhutto rested on two premises: Bhutto’s alleged call for “*Udhar turn, Idhar hum*”, and a supposed conversation between Suleri Dhaka by the same plane on reportedly exclaimed on landing at the Lahore airport “Suleri how beautiful is my county.” Mr. Suleri has since believed that this reference to Lahore treason.

Those who accuse Bhutto of conspiring to break Pakistan often refer to his speech at Nishtar Park, Karachi, on March 14, 1971. A Lahore based Urdu daily Azad the next day carried the speech under the banner headline “*Udhar tum aur idhar ham*” insinuating that Bhutto wanted to break the country into two for his own political ends. Since then the allegation has surfaced off and on, particularly during elections (“*Turn ney Dhaka diya, hum ney Kabul liya*”, IJI’s 1993 election slogan).

What has, however, been patently ignored is the fact that under the headline the daily Azad also carried a second headline reading “*Dono hazoun main aksariyat partion ko iqtidar sonp diya jaaye*”. Headlines of major Urdu dailies like Jang and Nawa-i-Wagt of March 15, 1971, were also similar to Azad’s second headline. Jang said “*Mashriqi aur Maghribi Pakistan ki aksariyati partiyon ko iqtidar muntaqil kar diya jaaye.*” Nawa-i-Wagt’s headline said “*People’s Party Pakistan ko muttahaidda rakhna chahti hai*”. Azad’s third headline read “*Pakistan muttahida rahega our Islami socialist jamhouriya banega*”. But all this was ignored.

English newspapers Dawn, Pakistan Times etc. broadly reported Bhutto’s speech as follows: “*Bhutto stresses general accord. Transfer power to major parties*”. As a matter of fact none of the national dailies reported the words used by Azad in its banner headline as a direct quote because they were never uttered as such.

Bhutto also called a press to clarify the mischievous headline of Azad. The clarification was duly owned and published by Azad under the heading "*Nah Mayn nah turn-Hum Dono u aur aik Pakistan*". If Mr. Suleri never forgave Bhutto for an imaginary crime, there is a reason for it. Mr. Suleri was the first person to be sacked Bhutto on the very day of assuming office, accusing him in his press conference as a "fossil of the past".

Mr. A. H. Kardar has published a book entitled *People's Commitment*. It includes some documents including a draft agreement reached between General Yahya Khan and Shaikh Mujib for the setting up of two Pakistans constitutionally. The document was to be issued as a proclamation: Bhutto's choice being either to sign on the dotted line or convince on his own Shaikh Mujib of the need for one Pakistan. His choice was clear: Negotiate with Shaikh Mujib to settle the matter rather than sign on the dotted line. Bhutto failed and the generals struck.

Let it not be forgotten that the Army Generals more than anyone else were responsible for the debacle. It was easy for the Americans to manipulate them who are beholden to them for favors "ranging from supply of military hardware to admissions of their wards in the universities of California, Boston and Massachusetts". Without the complicity of Pakistani generals the US could not scuttle the nuclear reprocessing plant, could not have bled Russia while in Afghanistan and could not have made Pakistan an American cantonment in the Indian Ocean.

When Bhutto was struggling to give the country a unanimous constitution in 1973, no one raised the issue of "*Udhar tum, idhar hum*". But when he framed the constitution, a unanimous one, with the provision of Article 6 (Constitutional subversion as treason) the bloodhounds were after him. Constitutionalism did not suit them. No wonder as the "fossils" continued to accuse Bhutto it became indistinguishable who consolidated and who broke Pakistan.

BHUTTO'S LEGACY

Today, April 4, marks the 15th death anniversary of late Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. On this day in 1979 he sacrificed his life for the sake of the principles he stood for throughout his political career. To him goes the credit of imparting a new direction and dimension to national politics. He was the first political leader to highlight the plight of the downtrodden and he gave a slogan that touched the inner chords of their being. He created political awareness among the masses and made them conscious of their rights. He took politics to the door-step of the people. It was through his charismatic message that the elitist complexion of our politics was changed and it acquired a populist character. It was a revolutionary change. To the working class he provided the courage and confidence to talk of their rights and voice their grievances. The reforms introduced by him afforded a good measure of relief and succor to factory workers, laborers and farmers. Mr. Bhutto tried his best to break the stifling hold of feudalism and succeeded in this undertaking to a great extent. That he was able to found it political party -- PPP -- with a mass base symbolized another significant achievement. It soon became a force to be reckoned with in national politics. PPP took politics to the homes of the ordinary people. Here was a party that for the first time articulated their aspirations and wishes. Here was a party that reflected their innermost thoughts.

To the country's foreign policy, Mr. Bhutto imparted a new direction and meaning. Its dominant traits were sovereignty, independence and bilateralism. A dynamic projection of the new foreign policy earned Pakistan its rightful place in the comity of nations, especially in the Third World. This was acknowledged without reservation at the world level and even by his political opponents and detractors at home. After his departure from the political scene, some forces in Pakistan tried hard to destroy his image. But they failed because his hold on the people's mind was too intense and powerful to be broken. This was because people equate Z.A. Bhutto's politics with their own rights and privileges. Shaheed Bhutto was also the architect of the country's nuclear programme and pursued it to the end braving all risks and opposition from hostile quarters. No less epochal was the adoption of a constitution that was accepted by the major political parties in the country. Bhutto's legacy is alive and vibrant to this day. And that is why his party has been returned to power twice within the span of five years. The biggest tribute that we can pay to him this day is to resolve to strive ceaselessly for realization of his dream of an exploitation free society in our

country. That dream should not remain unrealized. This we owe to the Shaheed's memory.

That on the death anniversary of Z.A. Bhutto, both his widow and son may not feel free to offer *fateha* at his grave, is only one part of the adversity that has befallen his followers. It is not necessary, of course that a charismatic leader's family should automatically inherit his torch, but in the Third World, particularly in Asia, it is assumed that would be the case. The Nehru dynasty in India, the Bandranaike family of Sri Lanka, the Mujibur Rahman family of Bangladesh, etc., are all illustrative of that. In the case of Pakistan, while members of other prominent families, that of Gen. Zia for example, keep vying for a place on the centre stage, it has so far been only the late Bhutto's family that has managed to retain the limelight. Ms. Benazir Bhutto's struggle to keep that limelight should not be underestimated. Nusrat Bhutto, who suffered equally with her daughter, and her brother Murtaza Bhutto, who remained in political wilderness for fourteen years, however, feel that they have been cheated out of their due share of Bhutto's legacy. In that legacy, or whatever is left of it, the only tangible factor is that of the leadership of the party. The rest of his legacy that of the PPP's philosophy or ideology has eroded with time. The socialistic slogan of *Roti, Kapra, Makan*, whatever its appeal may have been at the time when the late Mr. Bhutto swept the polls with it virtually wiping out the traditional parties, has lost its allure. Not that these issues are no longer relevant but the road leading up to them has been found to be too tortuous. The same has been the fate of the '*Gharibi Hatao*' slogan of Indira Gandhi. Both Bhutto and Nehru, following the socialistic philosophy of those days felt that the road to national prosperity lay in the State control of means of production, particularly for rapid industrialization. Public sector control of major industries was one manifestation of that. It worked to a point more in India, because of political stability there, less in Pakistan, because of Bhutto's early downfall. But even here some huge projects were built by the late Bhutto - the Karachi Steel Mills and the Heavy Mechanical Complex being two of them. The Atomic Energy Commission was founded by him. On the political side, the 1973 Constitution, later distorted by Gen. Zia, after decades of chaos, was a highly cherished gift to the nation.

But when his daughter came to power, after the death of Bhutto's executioner, Gen. Zia, not only was it a different Pakistan, it was a different world. With Soviet Union gone and socialism generally on the retreat, the very foundations on which the PPP philosophy was raised had begun to crumble. Benazir had the party in the palm of her hand, but not its motivational force. When even Socialist giants like Russia and China were talking about privatization and deregulation, she could hardly afford to hang on to a tattered dream of her late father. She began to work on the philosophy of 'development with a social conscience'. But before she could fashion it into a viable tool, she was toppled. She is still

fumbling round it, with one eye on survival, the other on putting together a populist platform that may yet be able to rally her troops. She has the charisma but where is the magic formula that her father had.

NAILS IN THE COFFIN OF DEMOCRACY

You have my admiration for the restful interest you are showing in the shattered mirror of memories of an age which seems to belong to another world.

In the solitude of my tiny cell, I have thought over these and other matters again and again in depth. As the Collector of Larkana, you were on cordial terms with my family and with Khuhawars of Shahdadkot, more so with most others. In my youth I remember meeting our elegant Collector, whose cultured demeanor impressed my young mind.

Many years later, while staying with President Ayub Khan in Nanak House annexe while the Government House of Dacca was being repaired, Ayub Khan was taken aback to find me vigorously aligned with General Azam Khan, the Governor of East Pakistan and not with him, on Syed Hashim Raza's appointment as Chief Secretary of that a sundered province.

If a tyrannical dictator like me had prevailed over the cacophony of his sycophants, today Lord Mountbatten would be addressing you as the former Governor of Sindh in addition to the former Governor of East Pakistan in his correspondence with you.

Being militantly involved in the struggle for Pakistan in the revolutionary meaning of the word, from the days of Direct Action, I am not without my reservations on the role of the last Viceroy of undivided India. In the last eighteen months I have read and re-read considerable literature on the partition period. My experience in the politics of Pakistan, coupled with the benefit of thirty years of hindsight, have compelled me to broaden the perspective analytically. I suppose individuals placed in my present position tend to get generous and forgiving but let me assure you, that I am not becoming a victim of sentiment on nostalgia. My respect for history remains supreme.

Mountbatten followed the traditions of his predecessors and like them, the politics of his Government. In this respect, he was not an exception. Anyone, including Eden, on whom would have fallen the task of partitioning the Subcontinent by constitutional and parliamentary means, would have been exceptional and, perhaps, equally controversial. This was inherent in the objective conditions and inevitable on account of the constitutional, instead of

revolutionary means used to affect the Great Divide duplicity and deception was a part and parcel of the decent approach.

Lord Mountbatten may have been the first Governor-General of divided India, but he was the last Viceroy of undivided India. He was neither a Muslim nor a Hindu. He had a responsibility to imperial Britain, a responsibility which did not cease when Britain was not imperial any longer. Even after partition and independence, we have seen in Pakistan itself on no less than two occasions that an imposed authority, or shall we say democratically speaking, an alien authority has shown a high stake to preserve the power it is transferring. Voluntary transfer of total power is basically an illusion. By agreeing to a transfer of power from wrong hands into right hands without a struggle implies a compromise, a quid pro quo. This is the essence of a negotiated settlement in terms of external colonialism and military dictatorship.

If the node of transfer of power from an external colonial authority or from an internal colonial Junta is a trial of wits, in contradistinction to a trial of strength, the margin of advantage invariably lies with the authority seized of power. In such a situation, it would be unrealistic for the element hankering for power on the cheap, and not blow by blow and measure for measure, to get its full pound of flesh. As long as the man needs the power, the power does not need the man. Perhaps this is why Gandhi, the prophet of non-violence to his admirers, said for God sake, leave us to anarchy. If Mountbatten had not mellowed that spirit with melody, the boundaries may have been drawn by red rivers of blood and not by the red pencil of Radcliffe over a flock of wins.

It would not be fair to state emphatically, but I maintain that my chances of keeping East and West Pakistan together for some time longer would have been much better if the military dictatorship of Yahya Khan had not played 'politics' with Mujibur Rahman and with me in 1970-71 over the transfer of power. Yahya Khan kept jockeying for a position for himself and the military in the power to be transferred. This view is essentially upheld by the Hamoodur Rehman Commission and is not my prejudicial opinion. Tragically, the same sham-enigma is at play today in severed Pakistan with the difference that it is being done more crudely and cruelly. So much so, that I wonder anxiously over the fate of our fragile unity. In 1971, we lost more than Gurdaspur and Kashmir. In 1979 or 1980 we are likely to lose as much, if not more, than we lost nine years ago. I say that my fears are unfounded but where were the Mountbatten's and Radcliffes in 1971?

Britain had stake in the Constitutional power and Mountbatten was 'politicizing' to achieve it. The stake was the membership of India and Pakistan in the then British Commonwealth of Nations. At that time, Britain laid great store by the

Commonwealth. Her leaders thought that it would be a second best substitute for the Empire. This kind of thing, cranks like us call neo-colonialism. Mountbatten's game was fixed on that objective. He was determined to get the consent of both Dominions to join the Commonwealth, and thereby retain strong links with Britain. In the event of failure to get Pakistan's association, he was tenaciously committed to getting that of India, the much larger Dominion. There was therefore more room for give-and-take with India than with Pakistan in a negotiated settlement. The personal factor of Mountbatten's Governor-Generalship should be considered, but it was not all that relevant when he could have remained a Super Governor-General of both Dominions. There must be something wrong with us if, until the night of August 14, 1947, we regarded him to be a great friend of the Muslims and of Pakistan, but the next morning we got up to discover that he had turned out to be a great villain. Our leadership was not that innocent or undiscerning as not to have made a proper assessment of the man responsible for effecting partition and in transferring power to us. With him lay the key to our destiny and that of generations to come. Our leaders held protracted negotiations with him. It would be unkind to infer that they did not take the full measure of the man. It would be an undeserved reflection on our leadership rather than a proof of the perfidy of the last British Viceroy.

Buttressed by the Commonwealth of nations, the British thought that post-war Britain would become to America what Greece has been to Rome. Soon, the British were to find that they were dealing not with modern Romans but good old Italians. Even before the guns were silenced, the American oil interests began to chisel ruthlessly into the established British preserves in the Middle East that is another story. I mention it in passing because world politics is again becoming dangerously greasy.

We have a tendency to very readily blame others for our own failings. We simply cannot reduce complex issues to block letters reading white and black. It might have been different if the state had been wiped clean by the blood of revolution. In that supreme struggle there would have been no opportunity for sordid bargaining and backroom intrigues. It was unrealistic to expect an imperial power to peacefully and willingly hand over her brightest jewel to four hundred million people without attempting to extract a price for the cushy transfer. Please do not think I am being bloodthirsty. The tragedy is that if even a quarter of the blood that was shed in the wake of the 'peaceful transfer' had been sacrificed before partition, we would have had a happier and more stable equilibrium in the Subcontinent. The continuing tensions and uncertainties persist because their greater sacrifices came at the wrong time.

In the correspondence under reference, there is considerable emphasis on 'British puberty' whatever it means in the political application. Mountbatten had a

combination of British, German and Greek blood running in his veins, albeit all royal. Such a combination can be devastating, however no more devastating than the ordinary blood of an ordinary Englishman like Benjamin Disraeli, an outstanding Prime Minister. Disraeli and others like him were known for their skill in politics not for poverty. There is the 'gentleman rogue' in the style of politics. The British politicians are its masters. You were the Private Secretary of the Governor of Sindh, Sir Francis Mudie. How was he rewarded for his services and may be 'puberty' when he became the Governor of the Punjab? Puberty is on the pulpit not in Parliament.

When I was a student at Oxford, my Law Tutor at Christ Church, Mr. Cram Bailey, gave a sumptuous banquet at the Savoy in honour of the Law Lords. He was very kind to give me a high place on the main table next to that of Cyril Radcliffe. Not having seen Radcliffe before, I did not know he was the man who had used the knife to partition the Subcontinent. When he found out that I was from Pakistan, he volunteered to explain at length the factors that influenced his award. He mentioned the integrity of the intricate irrigation canals, the strategic importance of the Chittagong Hill tracts, the shrines of the Sikhs, Sialkot and Gurdaspur cumulatively not separately. He insisted that Gurdaspur was not maliciously awarded to India for the purpose of Kashmir.

After he had finished speaking, I told him that I was more concerned with the future although the past was relevant. I said to him that a great revolution of the people would come to right all the wrongs. I told him further that I was more concerned with the dawn of that day than with the sunset of a faded era. I have remained committed to that cause. It will not be the 'Freedom at Midnight' which Nehru got in Parliament. It will be the victory of the people at High Noon. I dreamed of the glorious victory as it bode on the banks of my beloved Indus. With all the vicissitudes of fortune, not for a moment have I ever lost the vision of that beautiful dream. In this context, neither Radcliffe nor Mountbatten matter. Whatever became of Gurdaspur irrespective of the motive, Kashmir would certainly have been a part of Pakistan in 1962 or latest by 1965. Now we stand to lose all at the rate at which events are moving towards a watershed. What is needed more than debating points of past failures is to give profound thought to the future. The British did not come to our land to do us a favour. Why should we think that they wanted to do us a favour by leaving it? Mountbatten was only an instrument. We were the tools. We stubbornly continue to remain tools after a generation of independence.

Two small but important points before I close, my Father, whom you know very well was persuaded by the Quaid through their mutual friend and Physician, Dr. Jal R. Patel, to go to Junagarh and get its accession--to Pakistan come what may. There were many reasons for it. However, whereas the personal attachment of

Jawaharlal Nehru to Kashmir has been blown out of proportion, the Quaid's personal allotment to Kathiawar has rarely, if at all, been mentioned.

Secondly, please remember we fought for Pakistan to get equality, not less equality, freedom, not less freedom, honour, not less honour, brotherhood not more discrimination. Where all the fears kindled of a United India are visited on our masses in Pakistan more actually than our worst fears, there is then something brewing which no quantum of force will be able to resist. Nor can it be stopped by stopping me. I think the last Viceroy of India is related to Lord Brahorne, the Governor of Bombay. Lord Brahorne was a very class friend of my Father, May he at this moment, that is reason enough for me to tell you that I would like you one day to send a copy of this letter... to Lord Mountbatten of Burma.

THE YOUTHFUL IDEALS OF Z. A. BHUTTO

One of the earliest witnesses of the socio-political growth of Z. A. Bhutto was his school fellow and friend Pilloo Modi. In his book 'Zulfi My Friend' he has drawn a portrait of the young Zulfikar Ali Bhutto which is both authentic and revealing. Modi and Bhutto were together in school in Bombay from 1937 onwards. They came to like one another and became close friends. However their national ideals were separate. While Modi was an Indian nationalist, Bhutto was a staunch follower of Jinnah and an unswerving Pakistani nationalist.

In 1947 both Modi and Bhutto left for America and became students of Berkley University in California. They were students of Political Science. At the same time Bhutto had taken a course in International Law.

Modi has talked about the socialist ideals which were common to both of them at that time. Bhutto was a socialist from the very beginning and was always asserting that socialism did not come to him through books. It was the result of his observation of the abysmal poverty of Sindh. Although he was influenced by Harold Laski's books who at that time was the doyen of socialist intellectuals, his inspiration came from his experience of Sindhi peasant's life. He used to say that one cannot become a socialist by reading- Professor, Laski's books and hearing his lectures.

The noted journalist, Ijaz Rizvi, who has edited a short book in Urdu based on Bhutto's writings as a student in America, has quite naturally used the observation of Pilloo Modi as a prefatory note to the early thoughts of Bhutto. This is the only objective record of Bhutto's life and thought in his teens.

The real value of Ijaz Rizvi's translations of the early writings of Z.A. Bhutto, however, is to be found in a number of essays and addresses written by Bhutto in 1948, the year he left America after completing his studies there.

The book is named after the essays written on the last night Bhutto spent in New York. The essay, like the book, is entitled "A Night in New York", (Frontier Post Publishers Lahore). Instead of being a record of personal thoughts it turns out to be a series of philosophical ruminations.

He is wandering about in the streets of New York late at night, and calling to mind all the days and nights he has spent in this country. There is no longer any impersonal feeling - about "the concrete jungle". It suddenly comes to life and is full of an emotional impact.

But the emotion is contradictory. On the one hand Bhutto feels that the sky scrapers area no longer "cold monuments" but a symbol of something magnificent. They become an expression of human creativity projection of man's own soul, a reminder of our efforts to reach the highest heights."

On the other hand there is a feeling of antipathy. The sky scrapers and the mechanized life that they represent turn into a nightmare and a monstrous creation. They seem to be alienated from man and hence alienating him. It seems as if they have become, independent of their creator and have turned into his enemy, completely gone out of his control. He believed in some eerie way that these creations of man were not only opposed to him but were conspiring against him.

And again he returns to the earlier mood of exultation. He feels one with the concept of man, the creator. There is a pride in him and he recounts the entire human journey from the cave to the sky scrapers -- all the progress and accomplishment of man through centuries and millennia.

Then he thinks about the contradictions besetting humanity -- "the cruel wars that obliterated chunks of the human race. I thought of persecutions and racial theories of supremacy. I thought of the hatred and the bigotry that had emerged. I thought of all the pitiable repercussions of our timesWas this progress or regression?"

The second essay in the book is a talk delivered in the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, in April 1948. Its subject is "The Islamic Heritage", and it reveals an aspect of Bhutto's thinking which molded the essence of his foreign policy, and Which Caused him to organise the Islamic Conference in Lahore in 1974. Already in 1948 we see him demonstrate the necessity of a "Confederation of Muslim countries"-- an ideal that we find being put forward by Muslim leaders like Iqbal and Jinnah.

It is not at all strange to hear Iqbal and Jinnah talk in terms of the unity of Islamic countries, of Islamic renaissance and Pan Islamism. These were immediate problems for Muslims at the time that Jinnah and Iqbal were living and politically active. It is however, strange for a man of the generation of Z. A. Bhutto to be thinking -- and what is more, speaking, and speaking in America of all places on these themes when they had become almost outmoded everywhere,

especially in the Indian Subcontinent.

Again perhaps it is not so strange after all 1948 is the year when Pakistan had been already formed for a year, and people everywhere had not lost the euphoria of 14th August 1947. Pakistan, as the Quaid-i-Azam at one time had said, was the greatest task undertaken by the Muslims since the death of Aurangzeb." Having won the battle for Pakistan the Muslims were thinking of other and more extensive battles throughout the Muslim world. So did Bhutto.

It was not unnatural, nor unreasonable for him to be thinking in these terms. He begins by recounting the humanitarian social and political ideals on which Islam was based by the Prophet (peace be upon him). He quotes him as follows: "Without any nebulous symbolism, without any ostentatious exploitation of altars, Muhammad (PBUH) enshrined an immortal message in the heads of not only his Arabs, but of the entire mankind: Ye people! Harken to my speech and comprehend the same. Know that every Muslim is the brother of every other Muslim. All of you are of the same equality."

Bhutto formulated the political tenets of the Muslims in the following terms; (1) the indivisibility of God; (2) the simplicity of belief; (3) the brotherhood of man. All of these, as Iqbal demonstrated led to the great political concept of human solidarity. This shows that even at the young age of barely twenty-one or twenty-two Bhutto had realized the essential political nature of Islamic religion as a non-racial, non-class and non-tribal faith, devoid of boundaries of nationalism and where, and especially for Indian colour and creed.

Bhutto quotes Nehru to support his idea of Islamic tolerance as the most attractive feature of Islam, especially as compared to Christianity:

"The Christianity that was practised there at that time was narrow and intolerant, and the contrast between this and general toleration, of the Muslim Arabs, with their message of human brotherhood, was marked. It was this that brought whole people, weary of Christian strife, to their side."

After this Bhutto tries to analyze the general antipathy of the Europeans toward the Muslims. He thinks that most of this was due to the long drawn out wars of the Europeans against the Muslims. The crusades become syndrome which has continued to pursue the Europeans and turn themselves against the Muslims through centuries. The first crusade was successful but all the rest, to the number of eight, were failures. This created an image in the European mind of the Muslims as a tearful breed--as something hateful, something monstrous. Of all

the people of the world the Europeans have hated no other people so totally and irretrievably as the Muslims.

Bhutto then goes on to describe the Muslim civilization as a rationalist philosophically minded, scientifically attuned civilization. It contributed these values to Europe and created the original impulse for the Renaissance and for the modern scientific movement. Bhutto quotes Henrietta Wagner in this context as saying:

“We are indebted to the Saracens of Spain for the elements of many of the useful sciences especially chemistry. They introduced the simple Arabic figures which we use in arithmetic. They taught mathematics, astronomy, philosophy and medicine, and were so superior in knowledge to the Christian nations of Europe that many Christians of all nations went to be educated in the Arabian schools of Cordova.”

Bhutto has described at length the achievements of Arab and Muslim science and civilization. This reveals something which has often been forgotten by the West -- the medieval civilization was the Muslim civilization. There was no civilization in the medieval times in Europe. The impulse for the Renaissance in the 15th century Europe and or the modern scientific revolution came from the acme of the Muslim civilization.

From this point Bhutto starts his theme of a reunification of the Muslim world. He discusses the Khilafat Movement briefly and goes on to the growth of national movements in the Islamic world which both divided the Muslim solidarity and at the same time created impetus for a reunification on a new basis. Like Iqbal, Bhutto thinks in terms of a confederation of Islamic nations -- an ideal which many Muslims throughout the world consider viable and necessary.

In this context Bhutto quotes Toynbee:

“Pan Islamism is dormant -- yet we have to reckon with the possibility that the sleeper may awake, if even the cosmopolitan proletariat of a Westernized world revolts against Western domination and cries out for anti-Western leadership. That call might have incalculable psychological effects in evoking the militant spirit of Islam -- even if it has slumbered as long as the Seven Sleepers -- because it might evoke echoes of a heroic age. On two historic occasions in the past, Islam has been the sign in which an oriental society has risen up victoriously against an occidental intruder. If the present situation of mankind were to precipitate a ‘race war’, Islam might be moved to play her historic role again.”

Another theme we find in this short collection of early essays of Bhutto is that of the 'Unity of Mankind' and how to achieve it. He does not mention the origin of this theme coming from his faith in Islam. But it is quite natural that it should have come from the same source. The theme is discussed in two essays, or rather lectures, one entitled "Universal Concept of the World" and the other "Universality of human kind."

The impulse in both essays comes from the destruction and unhappiness let loose on humanity by modern wars. Bhutto talks about the two world wars and the way the victorious nations have tried to reorganize the world and create a new world order. In both cases the efforts to bring peace have resulted in more wars and more destruction.

The First World War was followed by the League of Nations. Like many earlier instances the European powers tried to create a new balance of powers with which to bring about an era of lasting peace. Within two decades this balance of powers was overturned and the nations were once again at war, this time throughout the world. The destruction was many times multiplied and suffering was endless.

With the end of the Second World War the victorious nations once again split among themselves. Weapons of mass destruction never heard of before were created and used. New camps of war came into being as soon as the second war came to an end. And the very instrument formed to organise for peace *i.e.* the U N became an instrument for dividing humanity. The problem then is how to unite humanity. And it is through the solution to this problem that all the other problems can be solved. It is only on the basis of a new social order that we can achieve the unity of mankind.

On this theme which is again a theme arising from an Islamic impulse Bhutto ends his apprenticeship and begins his political career.

PINDI JAIL WAS NOT TOO OLD TO BE DEMOLISHED

The Rawalpindi Jail, where Mr. Bhutto was kept for 323 days and was finally executed, however, lost favour during the last days of General Zia. Zia ordered its demolition in 1988 which has never been explained by anyone.

It was an old structure, but not too old to be demolished, unless political considerations made it necessary. A high official of the jail, who is now serving in the newly constructed Rawalpindi jail on Adiala Road, says: The new building would crumble sooner than the old building would have, if it were not demolished. It could have remained intact for another 100 years.

This statement is substantiated by the fact that the police lines No. 3, adjacent to the old jail, is still in order and being used by police officials. This place is as old as the demolished building was. The officials living in this building are opposed to the demolition order and through their departmental channels, are still resisting the demolition.

The old jail, the police lines No. 2 and other adjoining buildings have so far been demolished and converted into 400 plots of one kanal each. Commercially speaking, it is a valuable place and the plots are selling fast, through the auction carried out by Housing and Physical Planning Department, Government of Punjab the new project is named as "Khayaban-e-Mohammad Ali Jinnah Area Development Scheme, Old Central Jail," It is spread on an area of 80 acres. Its estimated cost is Rs. 180 crore (1800 million). Situated on the Airport road, the place is surrounded by important buildings like district council's office, commissioner's office, the old Presidency (now converted into State Guest House) and the old Prime Minister's Secretariat. The place where Mr. Bhutto's "security ward" was located now lies under the debris of thick concrete walls. Unlike the rest of the ground, it is still higher than the rest of the place, like a platform. Standing on this platform, it is hard to imagine how Mr. Bhutto felt, while he was in his death cell here. It is in fact very difficult to believe that a place like this could have proved so deadly for him. The gallows is located at quite a distance from the death cell, on the other corner of the Old jail. It is a five-minute walk from the death cell to the gallows today, when there is no construction there and it is almost impossible to trace the lane or path which led to the gallows. On the night between April 3 and 4, 1979, it might have taken more time to carry him on a stretcher.

There are no gallows here now. Just a roughly dug ditch remains, of about 6x6 feet, which might have been the well of the gallows. There again, one feels as if something still hangs in the air, some uncovered truth that wants to come out, only if one could understand the whispers of the air.

At the site of the death cell now lies a four-kanal strip close to the road leading to the old Prime Minister's Secretariat. The four kanals strip located right on the roadside has recently been auctioned, but not without trouble.

The buyer had to fight a case against the government, which had refused to hand it over once the auction was, finalized. But this is nothing compared to the trouble that the government is facing with respect to the place of Mr. Bhutto's death cell.

According to local property dealers, it has become impossible for the government to auction the death cell plots. Twice the place was put for auction. On both the occasions, a few interested parties raised the bid to such a high level that seemed incomparable to the last bids offered for other plots in the same area and also to the land price in the adjoining areas. Also, none of the bidders was ready to lose the place. As a result, even the bidding had become uncontrollable. Finally, the department had to close the bidding.

At present, the place of Mr. Bhutto's death cell is not included in the auction list. It appears as if the government had decided to keep it. Only Gen. Zia could have explained why he got the jail demolished.

Throughout the nineteen months of Mr. Bhutto's trial Gen. Zia tried to remain unconcerned with the former's fate. He would always say it was up to the courts to decide. However, the information that later became available proves otherwise. For example, a secret report submitted to Gen. Zia -by-his subordinates in 1978-79 discusses the consequences of Mr. Bhutto's execution in full detail. Brig. (Retd) Salim has volunteered a copy of this secret report for publication.

Following is the full text of the report:

"Top Secret"

Object:

To anticipate likely reactions as a result of revision application in the case of Nawab Mohammad Ahmed Khan filed by the appellants Mr. Z. A. Bhutto and others.

Background:

(a) At the moment although most Bhutto supporters are wrapped in gloom, hope nevertheless persists that the Supreme Court may review the decision modifying the extreme judgment of hanging to life imprisonment. This hope has arisen due to the following factors:

- (i) The extremely close judgment of the Supreme Court.
- (ii) The large number of mercy appeals coming in from abroad.
- (iii) Pressure being exercised by intellectuals, bar associations and from other walks of life within the country.
- (iv) By creation of an impression within as well as outside the country that Mr. Bhutto's hanging would augment the fissiparous tendencies in the country.
- (v) It would create a deep bitterness between the pro and anti Bhutto groups in the country.

(b) On the other hand the arguments of people supporting extreme punishment rest on the following grounds.

- (i) It is morally not correct for government to exercise leniency in a criminal case only because the convict happens to be the ex-prime minister of the country. The grounds for leniency/mercy are usually that convict was forced to do a criminal act by the force of circumstances; thane convict is duly repentant for his actions etc. Mr. Bhutto does not fall within these categories.
- (ii) It would set a dangerous precedent for the future as it would imply that offenders with political motives can be saved by political pressure.
- (iii) Reaction to the judgment within the country has not been violent implying that people have accepted the inevitability of the due process of law.
- (iv) Mr. Bhutto continues to play politics with a criminal case and shall continue to remain a source of instability and give wild hopes to his supporters as long as he is alive.
- (v) With the passage of time in case of Mr. Bhutto being given life imprisonment attempts will continuously be made to get him free by attacking both the institutions of judiciary and the legality of martial law.

Hypothesis-I

(c) The revision application is rejected.

(i) A necessary time lag between the dismissal of revision application and the enforcement of the punishment enables Mr. Bhutto's supporters to make a last ditch effort. Although the PPP high command continues to plead all response within the existing bounds of law, a secret signal could be given to the rank and file to start a civil disobedience movement. Whereas there has been no absence of ambitious saboteurs for Mr. Bhutto's cause, there has been a general absence of person's voluntarily courting arrest. For this the high command could get together approximately two to three thousand persons to form the vanguard of a criminal disobedience movement. They would then hope that the movement would pick up momentum due to police mishandling. It may be recollected that the PNA movement reportedly started with the list of 5000 volunteers courting arrest. The bulk of this nucleus could come from Punjab with back-up from Sindh. Attempt, however, would be to allow Punjab and Karachi to pick up momentum enabling other smaller districts of the two provinces to join in at a later stage. The necessary adjuncts of this movement would be the Awami Mahaz of Meraj Mohammad Khan, the Hari Committee of Rasool Bux Palijo, the Kissan Mazadoor, Conference of Major Ishaque and the Barna group of journalists. As a beginning the prospects of intellectuals of the leftist orientation such as Faiz Ahmad Faiz, Josh Malihabadi, Ghulam Mustafa Shah etc., courting arrests cannot be ruled out. This would also have considerable publicity effect in the media. This movement would then be assisted by back-up from the other pro-left forces within the country. The crucial time period for the movement to exercise sufficient pressure would be between two to three weeks *i.e.* the passing of Supreme Court's orders and enforcement of the punishment. It is thus clear that the PPP will have to move fairly quickly in the initial stages.

Hypothesis - 2

If the Supreme Court revises its judgment as a result of the revision application, the anti Bhutto forces is expected to defer to the orders of the courts. They would, however, try to find a scapegoat it's usual in the bureaucracy and demand that more murder cases should be instituted against Mr. Bhutto.

Hypothesis-3

If the president accepts the mercy petition this would result in considerable agitation in the right-wing forces in Karachi, Hyderabad, Multan, Lahore and Peshawar.

It is plausible that demonstrations arranged by the Noorani and NDP (Pathan) elements in Karachi even if the PNA parties bow to the decision of the government. This reaction, however, will only be muted unless it is the strategy

of government to exhibit the strength of anti-Bhutto forces in the foreign media. The above report explains the mind of Mr. Bhutto's executioners. Strangely, however, in his book from his death cell, Mr. Bhutto does not touch on these aspects. He does not say what would be the consequences of his execution, in personal terms. He talks about what would happen to the country in political terms, and what would be the aftermath of the abolition of 1973 Constitution.

He writes "More than votes are at stake; More than my life is at stake: Make no mistake about it, the future of Pakistan is at stake."

Did Bhutto die on April 3 or on April 4"? What does Hafeez Pirzada say about the last days of Mr. Bhutto and the controversy about his death"? Who were the generals who opposed Mr. Bhutto's execution? Who prepared the burial plan? What happened at Garhi Khuda Bakhsh on the morning of April 4? What kind of ligature mark was found on Mr. Bhutto's neck? What do the forensic experts say about the mark? These and many more questions are to be answered.