

making

main hopelessly obscured. One of the major imponderables involved is the question of just how interested in all of this the Americans are going to be on election day. The answer to that probably lies in events which haven't yet occurred.

Will there be hostilities involving large American casualties? If so, how will the voters react? If there are military operations, will Islamic-American forces be able to claim victory? If so, patriotic pride might well wash away much of the grief of less.

If there are no significant military conflicts, what will be the status of the Iraqi-held hostages at that time, and how will the public view that status? Will energy prices rise so high as to become their own (negative) factor, or will they be moderate enough to be viewed as an appropriate cost of civilisation? Will the obvious political marriage between environmentalists concerned for ecology and voters concerned about rising energy costs finally be made? If so, what will be the electoral implications? And will producers like Saudi Arabia be able to convince this marriage that it is in their own best interests with their blessing?

In some respects the timing of these events is fortuitous. Questions of foreign affairs are rarely electoral issues in the US and, when they have been, it has not benefited US-Arab relations. Although no one would wish for the present circumstances, by happening so close to an election they could have the effect of putting improved US-Arab relations much higher on the American political agenda by bringing the need for improvement directly to the attention of the average American. If that does happen it will be a significant improvement both for US and the Arab World, and it could provide a new platform from which to address the other long-festering problems in the region.

One could wish for the best, by happening on the day they could bring about a better world. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble.

One could wish for the best, by happening on the day they could bring about a better world. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble. It is not surprising that the world is so full of trouble.

Benazir and if she is not allowed to participate (in the October 24 elections in Pakistan), I am sure he will take strong action and cut off the aid to Pakistan.

—Mark Siegel



Washington

THREATENING words these, especially coming from the very man who just a short time ago was being paid \$22,500 monthly, plus expenses, to represent the government of Pakistan with the American Congress and White House.

But lobbyist Mark Siegel is no longer welcome at the Pakistani embassy here in Washington. Actually, he spends most of his time these days trying to convince Washington officials to cut rather than increase aid to his former client.

Meanwhile the portfolio to lobby on behalf of Pakistan is in the process of being switched back to Neill and Company, a firm where it was before Benazir Bhutto came to power in Islamabad nearly two years ago.

Plus, of course, Pakistani ambassador Zulfikar Ali Khan and Information Minister Irfan Hussein are leaving — Benazir's appointees being moved out by the new interim government in Islamabad.

As for Washington operative Mark Siegel, he is now apparently on the payroll of the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) working closely with his long-time friend from college days, Benazir Bhutto, to bring her back to the prime ministership.

Thus the struggle for power in Pakistan now has its Washington dimension as well. Mark Siegel still works for Benazir Bhutto, but now his work is against the government of Pakistan and in opposition to Neil and Company which will soon be working on behalf of the interim Pakistani government primarily trying to undo Siegel's efforts.

This writer has a special relationship to these developments because it was in this column in May last year that the personal connection of Mark Siegel with the Israeli-Zionist lobby was first exposed.

It was at that time, when Benazir Bhutto was riding high, that the story was first told of how, shortly after taking office, Benazir broke the contract with Neil and Company and gave the Pakistani portfolio to her personal friend Siegel even though she was aware of his anti-Arab and pro-Israeli background.

At that time I wrote "what may be among Benazir Bhutto's greatest political mistakes since taking office a few months ago



Benazir Bhutto has instructed Mark Siegel to build as much pressure here as possible to force the Islamabad interim government to drop corruption charges against her and let her run in the elections next month; or else face a cut off of American aid to Pakistan. Siegel is attempting to help bring Bhutto back to the prime minister's office through Washington's fiscal whip.

SIEGEL WORKS NOW FOR BHUTTO

AND HER PARTY SUPPORTS SADDAM!

By Muhammad Ashraf Shad
Special to Saudi Gazette

THE whole world, including Pakistan, is supporting Saudi Arabia for the defensive measures it has taken following the August 2 Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait and massing of the Iraqi troops on the Saudi borders. But there is one person and one party in Pakistan which strangely though opposes Saudi Arabia's right to defend itself in the manner it considers best for itself, and which is in favour of the Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein, and his unlawful actions.

This person is Benazir Bhutto, the former prime minister of Pakistan, and this party is her Pakistan People's Party (PPP).

The PPP's media mouthpiece, the Urdu daily *Masawat* published from Lahore, is

caused resentment among Pakistani community, particularly in Saudi Arabia, which they consider their second home.

An interesting thing about the *Masawat* reports is that it has simultaneously launched a bitter campaign against the American troops deployed in Saudi Arabia much on the lines of Saddam's rhetorics. The PPP organ conveniently ignored the fact that the troops of Arab, Islamic and friendly countries have been invited by King Fahad, the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, to help the Saudi forces in defence of this country's integrity, sovereignty and security threatened by Saddam. These multinational troops include Pakistani soldiers also, but the *Masawat* has demanded that instead of sending them for the defence of the Holy Lands, the Pakistani troops should have been sent to Kashmir.

PPP, it is obvious that Bhutto as co-chairperson of the PPP, is not only aware of the campaign against Saudi Arabia and the US, but has given her consent for it.

This turn-around is rather enigmatic since it is widely believed in Pakistan that Bhutto gained power after the death of President Zia-ul-Haq with the help of the US. Like her father, initially she was against the US, but after her visit to that country when Zia was still alive, things changed and she became prime minister of Pakistan.

Now after her ouster, she has once again turned against the US and allowed her party organ to attack her benefactor. However, what is more painful is that Bhutto has permitted *Masawat* to denigrate the Holy Land for favour of Saddam Hussein who and whose immoral soldiers have little respect for the sanctity and peace of the Sacred Land of

ould wish for the
s, by happening
on they could
tting improved
ch higher on the
nda by bringing
ment directly to
rage American.
h it will be a
nt both for the
d, and it could
from which to
ng-festering
region.

undue Siegel's efforts.

This writer has a special relationship to these developments because it was in this column in May last year that the personal connection of Mark Siegel with the Israeli-Zionist lobby was first exposed.

It was at that time, when Benazir Bhutto was riding highest, that the story was first told of how, shortly after taking office, Benazir broke the contract with Neil and Company and gave the Pakistani portfolio to her personal friend Siegel even though she was aware of his anti-Arab and pro-Israeli background.

At that time I wrote "what may be among Benazir Bhutto's greatest political mistakes since taking office a few months ago has taken place here in Washington rather than in Pakistan itself."

As pointed out at the time, Siegel had resigned in March of 1978 as Jewish liaison in the Carter White House specifically over the sale of American arms to Saudi Arabia. The resignation followed a particularly upsetting incident, which I witnessed, in which Siegel was booed and heckled when he appeared before a United Jewish Appeal meeting trying to "defend" Carter administration policies.

"As an American I am dismayed and saddened that my government now wishes to sell the most lethal offensive instruments of the American arsenal to Saudi Arabia," Siegel then wrote, in bitter protest, in an Op Ed that appeared in *The New York Times*.

At the time my original column about Siegel was published, the government of Pakistan — under direct instructions to lie that came from Prime Minister Bhutto herself, I later learned — rather incompetently denied everything and attempted to dis-

AND HER PARTY SUPPORTS SADDAM!

By Muhammad Ashraf Shad
Special to Saudi Gazete

THE whole world, including Pakistan, is supporting Saudi Arabia for the defensive measures it has taken following the August 2 Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait and massing of the Iraqi troops on the Saudi borders. But there is one person and one party in Pakistan which strangely though opposes Saudi Arabia's right to defend itself in the manner it considers best for itself, and which is in favour of the Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein, and his unlawful actions.

This person is Benazir Bhutto, the former prime minister of Pakistan, and this party is her Pakistan People's Party (PPP).

The PPP's media mouthpiece, the Urdu daily *Masawat* published from Lahore, is these days highlighting "reports" that have

caused resentment among Pakistani community, particularly in Saudi Arabia, which they consider their second home.

An interesting thing about the *Masawat* reports is that it has simultaneously launched a bitter campaign against the American troops deployed in Saudi Arabia much on the lines of Saddam's rhetorics. The PPP organ conveniently ignored the fact that the troops of Arab, Islamic and friendly countries have been invited by King Fahad, the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, to help the Saudi forces in defence of this country's integrity, sovereignty and security threatened by Saddam. These multinational troops include Pakistani soldiers also, but the *Masawat* has demanded that instead of sending them for the defence of the Holy Lands, the Pakistani troops should have been sent to Kashmir.

Since *Masawat* represents the views of the

PPP, it is obvious that Bhutto as co-chairperson of the PPP, is not only aware of the campaign against Saudi Arabia and the US, but has given her consent for it.

This turn-around is rather enigmatic since it is widely believed in Pakistan that Bhutto gained power after the death of President Zia-ul-Haq with the help of the US. Like her father, initially she was against the US, but after her visit to that country when Zia was still alive, things changed and she became prime minister of Pakistan.

Now after her ouster, she has once again turned against the US and allowed her party organ to attack her benefactor. However, what is more painful is that Bhutto has permitted *Masawat* to denigrate the Holy Land for favour of Saddam Hussein who and whose immoral soldiers have little respect for the sanctity and peace of the Sacred Land of Peace.

credit the messenger.

Among other steps, a press statement was issued insisting that "the ambassador of Pakistan in Washington has never discussed the subject with the author of the article" — even though the meeting had taken place publicly a few days before in the ambassador's office at the embassy.

Once the story broke, various other attempts were made to discredit the writer and to deny Mark Siegel's important connection with the new Bhutto government — pleas were made directly to me by Siegel, as well as Bhutto's important Capitol Hill friend on the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Peter Galbraith, that writing about these matters would "endanger democracy" in Pakistan and were not in the interest of better US-Pakistani relations.

Shocked by the turn of events in Pakistan, these days Siegel is working through two fronts

attempting to help bring Bhutto back to the prime minister's office through Washington's fiscal whip.

Siegel has been instructed to try to build as much pressure here as possible to force the Islamabad interim government to drop corruption charges against Bhutto and let her run in the October 24 election; or else face a cut off of American aid to Pakistan and possible covert American behind-the-scenes efforts as well.

"I worked really hard to push the aid to Pakistan through the various committees in Congress", Siegel recently told the correspondent for *India Abroad*. But apparently he still does not understand that he was supposed to be working for the country of Pakistan, not for his personal friend whom he met while attending college.

It now seems this kind of misunderstanding of roles and abuse of authority was rampant

in the Bhutto government and finally helped bring about her downfall.

Front #1 for Siegel is the same international public strategies firm that had been hastily set up in the rather transparent attempt to try to insulate Pakistan a bit from Siegel personally.

The first memo to members of Congress went out from IPS on August 6 urging Senators and Congressmen to "contact President Ghulam Ishaq Khan to demand free, fair and international supervised elections, within ninety days."

"Nothing less than the future of democracy in Pakistan is at stake," the unsigned memo concluded.

Since that time Siegel has been orchestrating the campaign to bring about either a suspension of a "cut-off of funds to Pakistan when Congress reconvenes on September 10.

The second front now established by Siegel — and which

just happens to have the same address as International Public Strategies — is being called the "Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Pakistan."

Nowhere on the committee's stationary does the name of Mark Siegel appear — indeed, all the names listed are clearly Pakistani. But the reality is that Siegel is pulling the strings using this new front group to pepper Congress and the press with pro-Benazir articles and information.

Last June, in a follow-up column which rebutted the Pakistani government's assertions that my original column about Siegel "was not based on fact," I quoted a Pakistani writer colleague of mine who while very much in favour of democracy in his country had already become very worried about Benazir's incompetence, nepotism, and corruption.

"What Benazir is doing is simply too much," this colleague noted even then. "Although her book is billed as *Daughter of Destiny* she may end up being *Daughter of Disaster* as her policies may produce consequences very injurious to both Pakistan and the Muslim World."

Looking back, the way the Siegel matter was handled, and continues to be handled, is quite illustrative of so much that was improper during the 20 months of Bhutto rule.

Benazir inherited her father's name and possibly some of his charisma. But she clearly lacked the sophistication, maturity, and subtle finesse for manoeuvring within the labyrinths of Pakistani politics.

Congress reconvenes here soon. It will be Mark Siegel's International Public Strategies versus Neil and Company — both are gearing up to do battle. Pakistan now has competing lobbyists in this capital.



Stereotype under fire in Kashmir

at twice the going rate. Indians attribute the revolt solely to the on of militants from which has fought three India purely or partly control of the Himalayan

bad denies it is aiding is, although militants admit to at least using territory.

ri Muslims are unanimous their struggle is the of 40 years of Indian ncy about their de a democratic vote on future.

's Hindu Prince, loath between India and when the subcontinent

was divided as the British withdrew in August 1947, opted for India to get military aid when Pakistani tribesmen invaded a few weeks later.

Kashmiris say India agreed to UN resolutions in 1948 and 1949 called for a plebiscite to determine Kashmir's future.

Delhi says the plebiscite proposal was overtaken in 1972 by an agreement between India and Pakistan that the Kashmir question should be settled bilaterally.

The Prince's act of accession helped create an Indian stereotype of Kashmiris as peace-loving.

In practice there are thousands of Kashmiri youths, without jobs and swept up in the

anti-Indian fervour, ready to pick up the guns which both sides agree have been smuggled into the valley in large quantities.

There are also at least 25,000 Indian paramilitary police in Kashmir and plenty more ready to join them from a country of 850 million people and mass under-employment.

The Kashmiris are inexperienced in handling firearms and often miss.

So do security forces, whose collective experience of four wars and umpteen sectarian riots are of little use in old Srinagar, a warren of interconnecting house where militants can scramble away undetected across a dozen

attics in minutes.

Some 1,000 people have been killed since the Muslims of the Kashmir valley rose in January against Indian rule.

Both sides agree most of the dead were civilians but everything else is disputed. Kashmiris say most died when security forces fired on demonstrators, rampaged through homes in revenge, or seized young men from the streets of Srinagar to shoot them dead as "intruders" on the Pakistani border.

Both sides dispute any suggestion of a military stalemate.

"In the last two months we have captured well over 400 Kashmiris...many start talking before we start asking ques-

tions," said Kashmir Governor Girish Saxena. "On the ground it's going to end only one way."

"We have pistols, assault rifles, grenade launchers," said "Baber Badar" (lion of the battlefield), commander-in-chief of the Muslim Janbaz force. "We have recruits—college students, workers, everybody."

Two nights later Janbaz targetted at least five rockets on one of the hotels whose owners, deprived of the tourist trade, have had to hand over their rooms to paramilitary police.

One rocket hit home, injuring some policemen.

There fell short, owner had preferred no custom at all to incurring militant wrath.