

Mrs. D. C. Dunham
520 East 86th St.
New York City, N.Y.

October 6, 1971

The New York Times

To the editor:

John Carey has ably defended the UN (Letter to the editor, Oct. 6) against the criticism or implied criticism of John Salzberg from the International Commission of Jurists. However, Mr. Carey ended his defense with two quotations and a statement of his own which reflect an approach we find unsound in the particular case of Pakistan. We have heard this approach expounded by those defending our government's policies towards Pakistan, and a similar attitude is implied in the UN's silence concerning the causes of the sufferings in East Pakistan. Even if all the world were to send all the help it could to save "those victims who still cling to life" the problem is worse than ever if those saved continue to be as oppressed as they have been in the past. So "recriminalizing over those it is too late to save", as Mr. Carey says, may have more use than would seem to him at first. We beg Mr. Carey, the U.S. government, the UN, and the Pakistani government to consider a little "recreation", and to look more closely at the real suffering yet to come from

wounds to^o_h deep for monetary and material aid to heal.

We wish we could understand why past mistakes would not improve the future if they are held up for world inspection and review. I am speaking for all those Americans who have lived and worked in Pakistan for a number of years. We know the psychology of the Pakistan government from close experience. There have been times when criticism and public opinion have been effective. The Pakistan government can take criticism if it is forthright rather than implied with threats, bribes, "leverage" tactics, etc. The West Pakistani reactions may at first be stubborn, but when they can appreciate the practicalities of a change in their own terms, sometimes a change has come about. The change we would like to see this time could have been more easily effected by some healthy criticism in the UN years ago. This is no reason for the UN to continue to sit back.

At the same time the U.S. government could be criticized in open session for the years in which causes of the present suffering were mounting rapidly in East Pakistan. We have seen over and over the careless distribution of aid which only increased the economic and cultural dichotomy between East and West Pakistan. Although East Pakistan could be kept at a survival level by outside funds, many of the conditions described these days in the refugee camps were seen by us ten years ago in the villages and city slums of East Pakistan. Unless we look at our past mistakes and analyze them, we will continue to commit them. We^u could also do with some self~~reflex~~ recriminating. In open session it might impress the Pakistan delegates.

~~wounds too deep for monetary and material aid to heal.~~

Something has to stop the continued exertion of the old, relatively unquestioned, uncriticized, often obscure outside pressures which had their adverse effects on the ignorant and basically a-political population of rural East Pakistan. The fact remains that East Pakistan, for numerous complex reasons, has been ruled as a sub-province by the central Pakistani government, mainly West Pakistanis with few emotional ties ~~of~~ with or interest in East Pakistan. Just as even the most thoughtful Americans tend to think of the world as developing naturally in our own image, so West Pakistanis tend to expect the East Pakistanis, another race, to look like themselves. This is a physical and mental impossibility. The change would take many ~~dec~~ generations. To do it quickly it must be done artificially and by economic and military coercion. Therefore, the real charity, the real form of aid to Pakistan for the future is to communicate in such a way with those in power that they understand the impossibility of their dream. This means communicating in as dignified and rational a manner as possible, and the UN is supposed to be where this kind of thing is done. Of course there will be "recriminations"

but the over-all discussions should encourage a closer, more sensible look on the part of all nations at the unique experiment which is Pakistan and ^{to consider} whether it is worth continuing an experiment that has failed so obviously and so miserably.

We realize that for world safety the UN and the US can not open sore wounds or dig up an explosive past. But then perhaps President' Nixon's silence is preferable to hiding our sins of omission with boasts of charity being distributed now. This approach only serves to encourage the Pakistan government to continue a forced and artificial pursuit of national unity.

The basic problem which we think Mr. Carey could point out to critics such as Mr. Salzberg is that the major world powers do not really care about what happens to the East Pakistanis themselves, and that at least the UN and Mr. Thant personally have done something to show they cared. But Mr. Carey must also show that these efforts have gone to worthy causes and worthy people- towards the recognition of certain human needs among the East Pakistanis and to the East Pakistanis in prisons and in the hinterlands as well as in accessible areas. We fear that Americans and UN officials who have not actually seen East Pakistan at close range nor studied its long history of oppression are easily duped. We need reassurance from both the UN and our government that this is not the case. Then gladly we can forget "to investigate the responsibility for crimes and terrors of the past", and do "something better" for the future. But to try ~~and~~ patch up the future with no sound examination of past mistakes is to

invite further chaos. It would seem that such an examination under an international agency is called for in the case of Pakistan to-day. Some problems may be found, thereby, to solve themselves.