

Editorial

Sunday, April 7, 2019

Dirty Dancing

By-Dr Nunglekam Premi Devi
Independent Scholar

You know, we all know happy and joy;
Laughter and smiles, with hairs down,
Bouncing and jumping up and open;
Floating and swinging, in and out swiping;
Shirts and pants; buttons and trousers;
Jeans and t-shirts; phaneks and blouses;
Heels and snickers; leathers and boots;
Fancy and brighter; cut and deeper;
Shorter and jumper; crazy and little;
Cars and autos; glasses and bottles;
Stickers and levels; colors and blacks;
Seats and couches; battle and peace;
We all mingle, we all touched and we all love it;
Happy as I sing and happy as I hum;
Rain rain go away, come again another day.

Something's not right, something's burden;
Yeah! I know we all make rules, as do I have one;
Making me bounded; making me nervous;
Half a walk and half a run; shoes and slippers;
All torn apart, all tearing up little and parts;
I make sense to self, happy as I bounce;
Joy as I jump up and down, all fluttering hairs and clothes;
Thunder and clouds; lightening and laughers;
Clashing and falling; tumbling and easy;
Tables and tools; chairs and stools;
Clock and timers; songs and speakers;
Thundering and roaring, beating and woofing;
Loud and noisy; clashing and cheering;
Humming and tuning; bathing and shampooing;
Like as I say, weak and feeble, I dance so upset;
No steps so correct, no moves too good;
I fall and I stand, dirty as I hum to life's song.

Life's magic, Glitters and gold, metal and silver;
Cars and scooters; jeeps and taxis;
Drinks and foods; biscuits and cakes;
Birthday and wishes; gifts and dresses;
Wine and beers; cold and sexy;
Champagne and glasses; shots and cocktails;
Oh! I whisper, so bright and so clear;
Mind's so meditating, Mind's so alluring;
Smokes and cigarettes; fire and woods;
Butterflies and flowers; stars and stars;
Believe me and believe me not;
I flung and I swing, high and great;
Thud! I fall down again, dirty and muddy;
Oh! I remember something so secretly;
Laugh and they laugh at; Life's a dirty dancing.

CBI moves SC seeking arrest of Rajeev Kumar in Saradha chit fund case

Agency
New Delhi April 07,

The CBI has filed a fresh plea in Supreme Court seeking arrest and custodial interrogation of former Kolkata Police Commissioner Rajeev Kumar in the Saradha Chit Fund scam. In its application, the CBI urged the Apex Court to modify its earlier order giving protection to Kumar from arrest and other coercive action. On February 5, Supreme Court had said that the probe agency should not take any coercive step against the former

Kolkata top cop. The CBI has accused Kumar of not revealing things and said it would be better if he is questioned in the probe agency's custody.

The CBI has sought removal of 'No Coercive Action' clause against Rajeev Kumar. The probe agency said a lot of evidence has gone missing in the case.

Rajeev Kumar was heading the Special Investigating Team (SIT) of West Bengal Police which probed the Sharda Chit Fund scam. It was later handed over to the CBI.

Letters, Feedback and Suggestions to 'Imphal Times'
can be sent to our e-mail : imphaltimes@gmail.com.
For advertisement kindly contact: - 0385-2425159 (O).
For time being readers can reach the office at Cell
Phone No. 9862860745 for any purpose.

By- Praveen Elangbam

These days, when I walk across the streets, markets and other public places, I can hear from some people giving vent to their feelings about the imminent Lok Sabha election that they won't give vote to Tomba or Chaoba even though he is a good, well-educated, social-minded and a veteran politician for he is poor and does not represent an affluent political party. And some others opine that the impending election will be contested by

Let's Stop Being A Sleepyhead

only two or three well off candidates backed by strong and well heeled political parties. Dealing out three or four thousand rupees to each and everyone of us won't be a difficult task for them. Nevertheless, shall we remain cock-a-hoop with that money in this coeval world? (When some dog breeds even cost lakhs of rupees)

Instead of conjecturing "the person to be voted" precipitously on the basis of the above mental pictures, it is more advisable to vote for the one who will

speak, wrangle and bring off anything for a better change of our crushed society.

Further, it is fatuous to be in a brown study whether he or she will contest the election representing brawny political party or he is wealthy. Moreover, from among the spirited candidates, we need to come down in favour of the more experienced one who has greater participation in the political arena. Also, a brief and clear "Conspicuum" on the candidate's deeds for the people's welfare in the last few years and

his party's policies "is highly recommendable."

Lastly, I would like to make an impetuation to the people to single out the true leader who has the passionate amount of potential to set alight for the amelioration of our state and its people. And let us get ready to feel proud to be among those flinging spears into the omphalos of the "Crabs' culture", which have been prostrated as one of the break-neck stumbling blocks to the growth and development of the "KANGLEIPAK".

Bangladesh war: The article that changed history

Courtesy Were
By Mark Dummett BBC News

On 13 June 1971, an article in the UK's Sunday Times exposed the brutality of Pakistan's suppression of the Bangladeshi uprising. It forced the reporter's family into hiding and changed history.

Abdul Bar had run out of luck. Like thousands of other people in East Bengal, he had made the mistake - the fatal mistake - of running within sight of a Pakistani patrol. He was 24 years old, a slight man surrounded by soldiers. He was trembling because he was about to be shot.

So starts one of the most influential pieces of South Asian journalism of the past half century.

Written by Anthony Mascarenhas, a Pakistani reporter, and printed in the UK's Sunday Times, it exposed for the first time the scale of the Pakistan army's brutal campaign to suppress its breakaway eastern province in 1971. Nobody knows exactly how many people were killed, but certainly a huge number of people lost their lives. Independent researchers think that between 300,000 and 500,000 died. The Bangladesh government puts the figure at three million. The strategy failed, and Bangladeshis are now celebrating the 40th anniversary of the birth of their country. Meanwhile, the first

trial of those accused of committing war crimes has recently begun in Dhaka.

There is little doubt that Mascarenhas' reportage played its part in ending the war. It helped turn world opinion against Pakistan and encouraged India to play a decisive role.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi told the then editor of the Sunday Times, Harold Evans, that the article had shocked her so deeply it had set her "on a campaign of personal diplomacy in the European capitals and Moscow to prepare the ground for India's armed intervention," he recalled.

Not that this was ever Mascarenhas' intention. He was, Evans wrote in his memoirs, "just a very good reporter doing an honest job".

He was also very brave. Pakistan, at the time, was run by the military, and he knew that he would have to get himself and his family out of the country before the story could be published - not an easy task in those days.

"His mother always told him to stand up and speak the truth and be counted," Mascarenhas's widow, Yvonne, recalled (he died in 1986). "He used to tell me, put a mountain before me and I'll climb it. He was never daunted."

When the war in what was then East Pakistan broke out in March 1971, Mascarenhas was a respected

journalist in Karachi, the main city in the country's dominant western wing, on good terms with the country's ruling elite. He was a member of the city's small community of Goan Christians, and he and Yvonne had five children. The conflict was sparked by elections, which were won by an East Pakistani party, the Awami League, which wanted greater autonomy for the region.

While the political parties and the military argued over the formation of a new government, many Bengalis became convinced that West Pakistan was deliberately blocking their ambitions.

The situation started to become violent. The Awami League launched a campaign of civil disobedience, its supporters attacked many non-Bengali civilians, and the army flew in thousands of reinforcements.

On the evening of 25 March it launched a pre-emptive strike against the Awami League, and other perceived opponents, including members of the intelligentsia and the Hindu community, who at that time made up about 20% of the province's 75 million people. In the first of many notorious war crimes, soldiers attacked Dhaka University, lining up and executing students and professors.

Their campaign of terror then moved into the countryside, where they battled local troops who had mutinied. Initially, the plan seemed to work, and the army decided it would be a good idea to invite some Pakistani reporters

to the region to show them how they had successfully dealt with the "freedom fighters".

Foreign journalists had already been expelled, and Pakistan was also keen to publicise atrocities committed by the other side. Awami League supporters had massacred tens of thousands of civilians whose loyalty they suspected, a war crime that is still denied by many today in Bangladesh.

Eight journalists, including Mascarenhas, were given a 10-day tour of the province. When they returned home, seven of them duly wrote what they were told to.

But one of them refused.

Yvonne Mascarenhas remembers him coming back distraught: "I'd never seen my husband looking in such a state. He was absolutely shocked, stressed, upset and terribly emotional," she says, speaking from her home in west London.

"He told me that if he couldn't write the story of what he'd seen he'd never be able to write another word again."

Clearly it would not be possible to do so in Pakistan. All newspaper articles were checked by the military censor, and Mascarenhas told his wife he was certain he would be shot if he tried.

Pretending he was visiting his sick sister, Mascarenhas then travelled to London, where he headed straight to the Sunday Times and the editor's office.

(Continue on page 3)

Contd. from Yesterday Issue

We Made Plastic. We Depend on It. Now We're Drowning in it

The miracle material has made modern life possible. But more than 40 percent of it is used just once, and it's choking our waterways.

When Greenpeace cleaned the Freedom Island beach, it posted a tally of the brand names of the sachets its volunteers had collected. Nestle ranked first, Unilever second. Litterbugs aren't the only ones at fault, says Greenpeace's Abigail Aguilar: "We believe that the ones producing and promoting the use of single-use plastics have a major role in the whole problem." A Unilever spokeswoman in Manila told me the company is developing a recyclable sachet.

After Malaysia Airlines Flight 370 disappeared from radar screens in March 2014 while on its way from Kuala Lumpur to Beijing, the search for it extended from Indonesia to the southern Indian Ocean. It captivated a global audience for weeks. No sign of the wreckage appeared. On several occasions, when satellite images revealed collections of objects floating on the sea surface, hopes soared that they would turn out to be aircraft parts. They weren't. It was all trash—pieces of broken shipping containers, abandoned fishing gear, and of course, plastic shopping bags.

Kathleen Dohan, a scientist and the president of Earth and Space Research in Seattle, saw opportunity in the horror. The images from space were pushing a problem into view that had long been neglected. "This is the first time the whole world is watching," she told me at the time. "It's a good time for people to understand that our oceans are garbage dumps." Dohan sensed a

tipping point in public awareness—and the events since suggest she may have been right.

The most heartening thing about the plastic waste problem is the recent explosion of attention to it, and even of serious, if scattered, efforts to address it. A partial list of the good news since 2014 would include, in no particular order: Kenya joined a growing list of nations that have banned plastic bags, imposing steep fines and jail time on violators. France said it would ban plastic plates and cups by 2020. Bans on plastic microbeads in cosmetics (they're exfoliants) take effect this year in the U.S., Canada, the U.K., and four other countries. The industry is phasing them out.

Corporations are responding to public opinion. Coca-Cola, which also produces Dasani water, announced a goal "collect and recycle the equivalent of" 100 percent of its packaging by 2030. It and other multinationals, including PepsiCo, Amcor, and Unilever, have pledged to convert to 100 percent reusable, recyclable, or compostable packaging by 2025. And Johnson & Johnson is switching from plastic back to paper stems on its cotton swabs.

Individuals are making a difference too. Ellen MacArthur, a British yachtswoman, has created a foundation to promote the vision of a "circular economy," in which all materials, including plastics, are designed to be reused or recycled, not dumped. Actor Adrian Grenier has lent

his celebrity to the campaign against the plastic drinking straw. And Boyan Slat, 23, from the Netherlands, is charging ahead with his teenage vow to clean up the largest garbage patch in the North Pacific. His organization has raised more than \$30 million to construct an ocean-sweeping machine that is still under development.

All of these measures help at some level—even beach cleanups, futile as they sometimes seem. A beach cleanup hooked Richard Thompson on the plastic problem a quarter century ago. But the real solution, he now thinks, is to stop plastic from entering the ocean in the first place—and then to rethink our whole approach to the amazing stuff. "We've done a lot of work making sure plastic does its job, but very little amount of work on what happens to that product at the end of its lifetime," he says. "I'm not saying plastics are the enemy, but there is a lot the industry can do to help solve the problem."

There are two fundamental ways industry can help, if it wants or is forced to. First, along with academic scientists such as Jambeck, it can design new plastics and new plastic products that are either biodegradable or more recyclable (see *You Can Help Turn the Tide on Plastic. Here's How.*). New materials and more recycling, along with simply avoiding unnecessary uses of the stuff, are the long-term solutions to the plastic waste problem. But the fastest way to make a big difference, Siegler says, is low tech. It's more garbage trucks and landfills. "Everyone wants a sexy answer," he

says. "The reality is, we need to just collect the trash. Most countries that I work in, you can't even get it off the street. We need garbage trucks and help institutionalizing the fact that this waste needs to be collected on a regular basis and landfilled/recycled, or burned so that it doesn't end up going all over the place."

That's the second way industry could help: It could pony up. Siegler has proposed a worldwide tax of a penny on every pound of plastic resin manufactured. The tax would raise roughly six billion dollars a year that could be used to finance garbage collection systems in developing nations. The idea never caught on. In the fall of 2017, though, a group of scientists revived the concept of a global fund. The group called for an international agreement patterned after the Paris climate accord.

At the Nairobi meeting in December, 193 nations, including the U.S., actually passed one. The United Nations Clean Seas agreement doesn't impose a tax on plastic. It's nonbinding and toothless. It's really just a declaration of a good intention—the intention to end ocean plastic pollution. In that way it's less like the Paris Agreement and more like the Rio de Janeiro treaty, in which the world pledged to combat dangerous climate change—back in 1992. Norway's environment minister, Vidar Helgesen, called this new agreement a strong first step. (Councluded)