



Villagers massacred by Pakistani troops: 'How can any man work himself into such a murderous frenzy?' Photoreporters

CHITTAGONG UNIVERSITY MUSEUM

The Terrible Blood Bath of Tikka Khan

Ever since the Pakistani civil war broke out last March, President Mohammed Yahya Khan has done his utmost to prevent reports on the ruthless behavior of the Pakistani Army in putting down the Bengali fight for independence from reaching the outside world. Most foreign journalists have been barred from East Pakistan, and only those West Pakistani newsmen who might be expected to produce "friendly" accounts have been invited to tour East Pakistan and tell their countrymen about the rebellion. In at least one instance, however, that policy backfired. Anthony Mascarenhas, a Karachi newsman who also writes for the London Sunday Times, was so horrified by the events he witnessed that he and his family fled to London to publish the full story. Last week, in the Times, Mascarenhas wrote that he was told repeatedly by Pakistani military and civil authorities in Dacca that the government intends "to cleanse East Pakistan once and for all of the threat of secession, even if it means killing off 2 million people." And the federal army, concluded Mascarenhas, "is doing exactly that with a terrifying thoroughness."

That the Pakistani Army is visiting a dreadful blood bath upon the people of East Pakistan is also affirmed by newsmen and others who have witnessed the flight of 6 million terrified refugees into neighboring India. NEWSWEEK's Tony Clifton recently visited India's refugee-clogged border regions and cabled the following report:

Anyone who goes to the camps and hospitals along India's border with Pakistan comes away believing the Punjabi Army capable of any atrocity. I have seen babies who've been shot, men who have had their backs whipped raw. I've seen people literally struck dumb by the horror of seeing their children murdered in front of them or their daughters dragged off into sexual slavery. I have no doubt at all that there have been a hundred My Lais and Lidices in East Pakistan—and I think there will be more.

My personal reaction is one of wonder more than anything else. I've seen too many bodies to be horrified by anything much any more. But I find myself standing still again and again, wondering how any man can work himself into such a murderous frenzy.

Slaughter: The story of one shy little girl in a torn pink dress with red and green flowers has a peculiar horror. She could not have been a danger to anyone. Yet I met her in a hospital at Krishnagar, hanging nervously back among the other patients, her hand covering the

livid scar on her neck where a Pakistani soldier had cut her throat with his bayonet. "I am Ismatar, the daughter of the late Ishague Ali," she told me formally. "My father was a businessman in Khustia. About two months ago he left our house and went to his shop and I never saw him again. That same night after I went to bed I heard shouts and screaming, and when I went to see what was happening, the Punjabi soldiers were there. My four sisters were lying dead on the floor, and I saw that they had killed my mother. While I was there they shot my brother—he was a bachelor of science. Then a soldier saw me and stabbed me with his knife. I fell to the floor and played dead. When the soldiers left I ran and a man picked me up on his bicycle and I was brought here."

Suddenly, as if she could no longer bear to think about her ordeal, the girl left the room. The hospital doctor was explaining to me that she was brought to the hospital literally soaked in her own blood, when she pushed her way back through the patients and stood directly in front of me. "What am I to do?" she asked. "Once I had five sisters and a brother and a father and a mother. Now I have no family. I am an orphan. Where can I go? What will happen to me?"

Victims: "You'll be all right," I said stupidly. "You're safe here." But what will happen to her and to the thousands of boys and girls and men and women who have managed to drag themselves away from the burning villages whose flames I saw lighting up the East Pakistani sky each night? The hospital in Agartala, the capital city of Tripura, is just half a mile from the border, and it is already overcrowded with the victims of the rampaging Pakistani Army. There is a boy of 4 who survived a bullet through his stomach, and a woman who listlessly relates how the soldiers murdered two of her children in front of her eyes, and then shot her as she held her youngest child in her arms. "The bullet passed through the baby's buttocks and then through her left arm," Dr. R. Datta, the medical superintendent, explains. "But she regained consciousness and dragged herself and the baby to the border." Another woman, the bones in her upper leg shattered by bullets, cradles an infant in her arms. She had given birth prematurely in a paddy field after she was shot. Yet, holding her newborn child in one hand and pulling herself along with the other, she finally reached the border.

"Although I know these people, I am continually amazed at how tough they are," says Datta. Still, there are some who cannot cope. I step over two small

boys lying on the floor, clinging to each other like monkeys. "Refugees say their village was burned about a week ago and everyone in it was killed except these two," the doctor says. "We have had them for three days and we don't know who they are. They are so terrified by what they saw they are unable to speak. They just lie there holding onto each other. It is almost impossible to get them apart even long enough to feed them. It is hard to say when they will regain their speech or be able to live normal lives again."

New Jersey Congressman Cornelius Gallagher, who visited the Argata hospital, says he came to India thinking the atrocity stories were exaggerated. But when he actually saw the wounded he began to believe that, if anything, the reports had been toned down. A much-decorated officer with Patton in Europe during World War II, Gallagher told me: "In the war, I saw the worst areas of France—the killing grounds in Normandy—but I never saw anything like that. It took all of my strength to keep from breaking down and crying."

Rape: Other foreigners, too, were dubious about the atrocities at first, but the endless repetition of stories from different sources convinced them. "I am certain that troops have thrown babies into the air and caught them on their bayonets," says Briton, John Hastings, a Methodist missionary who has lived in Bengal for twenty years. "I am certain that troops have raped girls repeatedly, then killed them by pushing their bayonets up between their legs."

All this savagery suggests that the Pakistani Army is either crazed by blood lust or, more likely, is carrying out a calculated policy of terror amounting to genocide against the whole Bengali population. The architect appears to be Lt. Gen. Tikka Khan, the military governor of East Pakistan. Presumably, Pakistan's President knows something about what is going on, but he may not realize that babies are being burned alive, girls sold into virtual slavery and whole families murdered. He told the military governor to put down a rebellion, and Tikka Khan has done it—efficiently and ruthlessly. As a result, East Pakistan is still nominally part of Pakistan. But the brutality inflicted by West on East in the last three months has made it certain that it will only be a matter of time before Pakistan becomes two countries. And those two countries will be irreparably split—at least until the last of today's maimed and brutalized children grow old and die with their memories of what happened when Yahya Khan decided to preserve their country.

U.S. Says It Will Continue Aid to Pakistan Despite Cutoff Urged by Other Nations

By TAD SZULC

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 28—The Nixon Administration reaffirmed today that it intended to provide economic aid to Pakistan despite international pressures to halt foreign assistance until the central Government reached a political accommodation with East Pakistan.

Most of the 11 nations forming the Aid to Pakistan Consortium have concluded that assistance, running at about \$500-million a year, should be withheld pending a political settlement of the crisis that has resulted in the death of an estimated 200,000 East Pakistanis and the flight to India of about six million refugees.

The World Bank, which coordinates assistance to Pakistan, has recommended against further aid. Britain, Canada and Belgium, among other members of the consortium, have taken a similar stance.

Their positions emerged at an informal meeting of the consortium held in Paris last Monday to receive the report of a World Bank mission that toured Pakistan. Robert S. McNamara, the president of the bank, was reported to have approved this policy last Thursday.

Administration officials reported at Senate hearings today that the United States said in Paris that it disapproved of the policy of denying economic aid to Pakistan as a political instrument of pressure. This view was reaffirmed here today.

Testifying today before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Christopher Van Hollen, said that by providing economic aid the United States would have "leverage in persuading President Yahya Khan to seek a "political accommodation" in East Pakistan on the basis of autonomy and to create

conditions allowing the refugees to return.

He admitted, however, that such "leverage" was not yet measurable and that few refugees had returned home.

Mr. Van Hollen also announced that the Administration had no plans for placing a full embargo on shipments of military equipment to Pakistan.

He told the subcommittee, headed by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, that it was "likely that additional military equipment will be shipped to Pakistan."

He explained that while the Administration had halted the granting of export licenses for military items under its four-year-old program of credit and cash sales after the outbreak of hostilities in East Pakistan last March 25, the permits issued before that date would not be revoked.

Other Administration sources had reported, however, that this decision was made only last week by the National Security Council after newspaper disclosures showed that at least three Pakistani ships carried military equipment from New York to Karachi despite what the State Department had originally described as a ban on all shipments.

Kennedy Protests

The State Department later issued a clarification, saying that the ban did not apply to equipment purchased by the Pakistanis before March. Under questioning by Senator Kennedy, Mr. Van Hollen conceded that the State Department's earlier public statements on the matter were "confusing" and "misleading."

Later in the day, State Department officials confirmed reports that the Pakistani freighter Kaptai, due in New York today, would sail for Karachi about July 2, "presumably with items on the munitions control list,"

and that between four and five other ships would sail with similar cargos before mid-August.

This information led Senator Kennedy late in the afternoon to telephone Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, to protest the new shipments.

Mr. Kennedy then issued a statement charging that the hearings before his subcommittee this morning had indicated that the Administration's policy on military supplies to Pakistan was "misleading and contradictory."

"In violation of the understanding conveyed to me and others in Congress, our Government has freely tolerated at least three shipments of military equipment to Pakistan over the past two months," he said.

"Today, after the hearings, we learned that still another ship, the Kaptai, is docking in New York to be loaded with still more military hardware for Pakistan and four to five more ships are expected to be loaded in the coming weeks.

"I've asked the Administration to stop the policy of shipping arms to Pakistan."

At the subcommittee hearing, Mr. Von Hollen justified the decision to continue economic aid to Pakistan and to maintain the validity of the military export licenses on the ground that to do otherwise in a situation of "civil strife" in East Pakistan would "be seen as sanctions and intrusion in internal problems."

He said that the United States had decided to keep selling "nonlethal" military items to Pakistan so that President Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan would not turn to other sources of supply, such as Communist China.

He acknowledged, however, that China had been supplying arms to Pakistan all along.

Why Aid Pakistan?

After months of equivocation and evasion, the State Department has finally made it clear that the Administration intends to keep on furnishing military and economic assistance to the Government of Pakistan despite continuing acts of repression in East Pakistan that have shocked the world. This incredible policy decision defies understanding.

The admission that aid is continuing as before undermines the credibility of the United States Government at home and abroad. The public, members of Congress and at least one vitally interested foreign government (India) had been led to believe—although always in evasive language—that all military assistance and any new development assistance for Pakistan would be held in abeyance until there was progress toward a political resolution of the crisis in East Pakistan. The exposure of this deception is likely to be particularly damaging to United States relations with India, whose foreign minister left Washington a few days ago with what he believed were firm assurances concerning American policy toward Pakistan that have now been thoroughly discredited.

The decision to continue economic aid puts the United States in defiance of the World Bank and the eleven-nation Aid to Pakistan Consortium, which has decided informally to refrain from making new aid commitments to Islamabad at this time. The Nixon Administration repeatedly in the past has indicated its policy would be to channel more and more United States aid through such international means in order to avoid the kind of unilateral decision it is now making in respect to Pakistan.

Today American arms and aid make it possible for West Pakistan to continue a military reign of terror which amounts to genocide unparalleled in scale since the Nazi extermination programs of World War II. To hasten the end of this medieval barbarity, to spare America the shame of being the only financial and military underwriter of mass murder in East Pakistan, to keep America's foot out of the door of another Vietnam, we urge you to:

- wire the State Department protesting the reversal of its officially stated policy of non-involvement in the tragedy of East Pakistan;
- wire your representatives to support the Saxbe-Church amendment in the Senate and the Gallagher amendment in the House banning all arms aid to Pakistan from the Foreign Assistance Act;
- demand the President reverse America from this tragic, shameful course.

Administration officials say they opposed the consortium decision because it amounts to using aid as a political instrument. But at the same time they argue that the United States must continue aid in order to gain leverage to persuade President Yahya Khan to seek a political solution in the East. They can't have it both ways.

Perpetuation of American aid to Pakistan is not, in fact, likely to help persuade the military regime there to move toward restoration of genuine democratic government any more than continuing American support for the Athens junta has helped restore democratic rights to the Greek people. It will, however, put the United States in the untenable position of underwriting policies of repression, which have led to the ruthless and continuing slaughter of hundreds of thousands of Bengalis in East Pakistan. These policies have already driven more than six million East Pakistanis into exile in India where their presence creates grave political, social and economic tensions and a rising threat of domestic and even international conflict.

President Yahya's recent proposals for restoration of civilian rule offer little hope for significant change since they continue to exclude the outlawed Awami League, the party which won an overwhelming majority of the votes in East Pakistan and an absolute majority of the seats in the unconvened National Assembly in last December's elections. Under these circumstances, can anyone in Washington explain how additional military or developmental aid to Pakistan can be justified morally or in terms of this country's pragmatic self-interest in peaceful, democratic development on the Indian sub-continent?