

**PRESS CONFERENCE**  
**GENERAL SHEHU MUSA YAR'ADUA**  
**N.U.J. PRESS CENTER, LAGOS**  
**JANUARY 12, 1994**

Ladies and Gentlemen, on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November, 1993, the nation witnessed another military intervention in its political life. The objective of that intervention, as stated by the military leaders in the present administration, was to arrest the social and political drift and the increasing threats emanating from certain quarters about the possibility of a break-up of the nation. **In a traditional and monotonous fashion, the political class which consists of both the electorate and the leadership of political organizations has been blamed for the political conflicts and controversies which prompted the intervention.**

This is unfortunate. It is my view that the political class is being unfairly vilified for the impasse which has been created in the past two years by the military.

The lessons of the last two years cannot be ignored. **The presidential primaries which were cancelled on 17<sup>th</sup> November, 1992 and the annulled results of the presidential elections which were held on the 12<sup>th</sup> of June, 1993, clearly showed that the Nigerian electorate was ready for democracy.** They are no longer impressed by the continued emphasis on primordial sentiments of religion and ethnicity. Also, the political leaders have worked hard to build bridges across the nation, breaking the barriers of religion, ethnicity and other associated primordial influences which have vitiated the development of genuine democracy in previous attempts.

It is the political class that made the June 12 elections possible against all odds, especially, the determined efforts by the previous administration to scuttle the process by consistent interference with the political process. **In spite of the deliberate misinformation and the tendentious insinuations, no civilian could or was in any position to cause or prevent the annulment of that election.**

**Let it be reiterated here that the military bears full responsibility for that act. It is indeed regrettable that the military annulled the June 12 election. Annulled with that election was the confidence of Nigerians in the military and the military-organised form of democracy.**

Today, it is almost two months into the life of the present administration. The people of this country are yet to be fully briefed on the agenda and programmes with which the present regime intends to put the nation back on the path of democracy. No one is in doubt of the seriousness of both the economic and the socio-political problems which the present administration has chosen to grapple with. It requires firmness and determined effort to clear the mess which the military has created over the past few years. There is therefore, the expectation that this regime will strive to restore the dignity of the military and create a permanent and enduring democratic structure based on the popular will of the people. The continued silence of this administration on their programme of activities and the demonstrated inconsistency in policy statements made by highly placed functionaries of the administration remain a source of concern for serious Nigerians. There seems to me an undesirable silence on this issue. I hope it is not an indication that the vocal unit of the political class has now also been firmly "settled".

### **Democratic Environment**

**Each time the military intervenes in the political development of this nation and its leadership is not quite certain of its agenda, it has become a monotonous tactic to ban political parties, to dissolve all associated institutions and to clamp down on freedom of association. This action has always denied the nation the opportunity of sustained and consistent growth of a democratic culture and tradition.**

Genuine political culture can only be developed in an atmosphere characterized by freedom of association and freedom of expression. There must also prevail an environment for free and lawful contentions for leadership. This is more so in the present circumstances as we seek to

re-examine certain fundamental issues in our search for consensus guiding principles for the future existence of our country. Holding a conference of any nature to re-examine such fundamental issues is a major political event in the life of any nation. In fact, nothing can be more political than the processes of choosing representatives to such a conference whether such representation is based on interest, ethnic affiliation or geographical disposition. The processes of choosing delegates and the procedures for the articulation and adoption of a common posture on the fundamental issues to be discussed at the conference can only be effectively accomplished if there is unfettered freedom of association, unrestricted arguments and open canvassing prior to the commencement of a genuine national conference. It is therefore imperative that the present administration facilitate an appropriate democratic environment necessary and desirable for Nigerians to prepare for the national conference.

### **The National Conference**

Arising from the annulment of the June 12 election, there has been the fervent demand for a forum where Nigerians would sort out fundamental issues affecting the Nigerian nation-state. This demand, though not exactly new, has taken on added urgency since the present administration lent its support to the holding of a constitutional conference.

There have been arguments on the type or form of the conference. There have been talks of a national conference, a constitutional conference or a sovereign national conference. Some have argued that the difference between these is merely semantic while others think that the distinctions are more substantial than they are semantic.

At this juncture, I consider it more important to be definitive. **The will of the people is the supreme law. A free and unhindered expression of that will constitutes the sovereignty of the people. If a conference which is free to determine its own agenda, is also free in taking its decisions, and so empowered that its decisions are binding on both the governors and the governed is sovereign, then I am in full support of a sovereign national conference. There should be no no-go areas whatsoever.** Fears have been expressed in some quarters about the dangers inherent in holding a sovereign national conference, particularly the fear that it may lead to the break up of the country. In my view, this fear is unfounded. The real problem may be the capacity of this administration to muster enough determination and develop the right temperament required to administer the conference in view of the expected robust debate that may characterize such a conference. My position is that the advantages for holding a sovereign national conference now far outweigh the advantages of not holding one.

### **The Way Forward**

Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that the future of this country is still very bright notwithstanding the vicissitudes of the recent past. In spite of the cancellations of party primaries, the annulment of the result of the free and fair elections in the recent past, and the dissolution of the democratic institutions by the military, there is still hope for democracy and for the prosperity of the good people of this country. But we must resolve to move forward.

Pursuant to this imperative, I wish to propose the following:

- (i) **This military administration should present to the nation as a matter of urgency, its political agenda and thus put to rest the growing speculations and arguments as to their meaning of “brief”.**
- (ii) The administration should create the appropriate environment for healthy and open debate by **immediately lifting the ban** on political activities and thus restoring freedom of associations which will allow free consultations and open debates on the issues that are fundamental to the harmonious co- existence of all Nigerians.
- (iii) The sovereign national conference should take off as soon as possible but not later than **1<sup>st</sup> March, 1994.**

- (iv) **Representation at this conference should be wholly by direct election. There should be no representation by appointment.** All those seeking to be delegates to the conference should obtain the mandate of those on behalf of whom they want to speak. Whatever the affiliation of any Nigerian, every Nigerian has a constituency. In short, every Nigerian comes from somewhere.
- (v) The composition of the conference should be **three** elected members per senatorial district; that is a total of 273 members. This would ensure **a fair representation** of whatever ethnic and religious diversity that may exist and will facilitate the evolution of reasonable consensus within the senatorial districts.
- (vi) The duration of the conference should not exceed **three months**.
- (vii) Between June and December 1994, renewed electoral activities as defined and sanctioned by the sovereign national conference should take place. **The administration must do all in its power to ensure that its tenure does not extend beyond December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1994.**

Respected ladies and gentlemen, as we all know, a lot has happened in the checkered history of this country in the recent past. We are not yet out of the woods. The challenge for all patriots and lovers of Nigeria now is to raise clear and impassioned argument and to engage in the articulation of realistic propositions towards a successful conduct of the sovereign national conference. Let us therefore jointly determine the way forward. It is in this light, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I make this initial humble contribution. Thank you very much for your patience.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Chris

Mammah: Gentlemen of the press, if you want to ask a question, please signify.

Nigerian

Tribune: May I know from Mr. Yar'Adua whether you are making all these proposals as an elder statesman or as a politician whose aim is the political ambition of becoming the President of this country?

Yar'Adua: What is there about ambition? We are talking about a conference which is supposed to be held. And I am suggesting what type of conference it should be. I think at this point in time most Nigerians are interested in what existence the country would have. And I am making suggestions towards that. So whether I have ambition or not, for anybody who has any ambition, we need to have a country first before we have ambitions. Agreed?

Nigerian

Tribune: Let me ask the Chairman, does it make any difference, I mean, is it not academic now that you are banned?

Yar'Adua: Yes. I think the Head of State started by saying that there should be a constitutional conference. He reiterated that, I think on Monday night. That, I assume, is the view of the government as to what type of conference the government would want us to hold. I am making a submission, making a suggestion that in fact, we would be much better off as a country if we hold a sovereign national conference as opposed to what the government is proposing.

Question: Don't you think it is high time we address the issue of the corporate entity of the nation, the right of every Nigerian irrespective of tribe or religion to aspire to the highest office in the country. Apart from that, you laid the blame for the military to take over on the military class, not the civilian class. Don't you think the civilian class or rather the political class, has to share part of the

blame for the military take over, taking into consideration the attitude of the legislatures before the military take over?

Yar'Adua: There are two questions, so let me start with the first one which I believe is about the sovereign national conference agenda. I think there are --- you mentioned two things there – the corporate existence of this country and the right of every Nigerian to aspire to leadership. Well, I think you will agree with me, my dear, that if we have reached a point in our history when we are beginning to think that the corporate existence of this country needs to be discussed, I would have thought that that makes everything else slightly less important. Because there first has to be a country for anybody to aspire to a leadership within that country.

And as to whether the aspirations of individuals, people of any tribe or religion, I think in my speech I did make mention of two events in this country: the cancelled November primaries and the annulled June 12<sup>th</sup> election. In both cases – and that is why I made the reference to them, barriers were broken in this country. The people who stood election for the first time in the November primaries, you have that, for example. I won election in Yoruba land, Falae won election in Kaduna. That has never happened before. In the June 12 election, what was important to me about that election was that a Yoruba man, forget whoever it is, a Yoruba defeated a Northerner in the North. It wasn't with the support of the people who voted – the fact that it was stopped. So there was a clear evidence. I don't think you can legislate leadership. And the people involved in both cases demonstrated their will to rise above the former type of politics -- both in the first and second instances. That was why those two events were important in this nation.

What I am saying is that clearly the people of this country are ready for democracy. In those two cases the ordinary Nigerian has shown to Nigeria and the world that he was ready to vote on his convictions. And they did so vote on their conviction.

Question: But the blame for military take over – you alluded the reasons for the take over by the military itself, not...

Yar'Adua: **Well let me start off by saying to you that there has never, anywhere in the world, including Nigeria, been any justification for a military take over from a civilian government. An excuse, yes, but justification itself, no.** So this talk about the politicians have done this, the politicians have done that, I think it will be better for the press if you go back to history, the recent history of the politics of this country. At every turn, whenever the military has altered the rules in the middle of the game, the politicians have exercised enough patience to say what? We will follow the new rules in the politicians search for democracy. And we kept on and on and I think until we got to a time when really not only the politicians who were seeking office, even the electorate were fed up with coming out almost every other week to hold elections which will be cancelled. In spite of that, the politicians went on. Now, political bickering that people are alluding to -- that is normal. After all, what is democracy about? Democracy is about consensus. It is about solving problems. It is about coming together to agree to disagree. It is not about sitting on the table and being very nice but everywhere in the world, it is the same. After all, even people without this sort of politics, Britain. Think about a few years back, about three years, wasn't there a move against Mrs. Thatcher by and within her own party? Wasn't there a lot of katakata? Wasn't she removed as Prime Minister by her own party? Did the British army interfere? So why can't in Nigeria, politicians be allowed to do that and arrive at their consensus without interference?

Vanguard: When General Abacha took over power, I remember that you were one of the few Nigerians who met with him. Secondly, and later on we heard that he parted with you because you demanded for an agenda which they refused to

give. First, I want to know your relationship with the administration. Then secondly, you are calling for lifting of ban on politics. Are you saying that because you are ready to aspire more than others?

Yar'Adua: In fact, when I get the --- with your first question, I am still calling for an agenda and our relationship is fine.

Vanguard: What caused the early departure?

Yar'Adua: You answered your question before you asked it. Now, as to the issue of calling for the lifting of ban immediately -- to un-ban I mean. Ladies and gentlemen, here in this country, it doesn't matter what type of conference we end up with. I think everybody here is in no doubt that when people go into that conference, one of the subjects that will be discussed is the existence of this country. Has anybody any doubt that the corporate existence of this country will be discussed at whatever type of conference we hold?

The crowd: No.

Yar'Adua: Fine. Now, if we are going to discuss that, don't you think that it is ridiculous that people should go to that conference as individuals without any chance to legally discuss with other Nigerians and take positions legally, openly and debate these issues. Not just on the pages of newspapers where people just write. Don't you think that if you want to genuinely discuss the co-existence of this country, that before you get there, the people should be allowed free association, free expression and the people should be able to move freely across the country to in fact canvass for their positions? How do you do that if politics and free association is completely banned? How do I know what are your views on the existence of this country if I am not allowed to freely associate with you? So it is not an issue. And if a politician who will -- after all, I have been in politics only for about five years... But if a politician who has been in politics, who whatever number of years, can say that, "Ah, I am not ready to participate in politics; wait until next year". Do you really think that that politician has the confidence of whatever people he has been trying to lead? But in this case really, my main point is that people should be allowed free association so that this conference would be properly and seriously attended.

NTA: During --- back in 1950 at the Ibadan Constitutional Conference, we were told by the elders and from what we read about the conference -- sorry I was not born then, I was born just a few years after -- that there were certain outstanding issues which were not resolved, which then and now are still called 'the national question'. The issue of political domination, the issue of economic domination, the issue of who gets what, when and how. Whether the center should be stronger than the regional components or whether the components should be stronger than the regional components. The June 12th election brought to the fore, at least in the history of this country, 'the national question'. These are issues which people are saying must be discussed. There is still this dominant feeling, I don't know whether it is from the elite or not, that the North has dominated the political affairs of this country, because we're still talking about who gets what. There is something to acquire by being at the center.

The North on the other hand, is accusing the South, I don't know whether it is right or wrong, that they are controlling the economy of this country. The minorities are in-between, they don't know where they belong (laughter). Sorry, I didn't mean that. I am not implying that in any way they don't know what they want. The whole issue of Nigeria's federalism centers on these issues.

What I am saying is I would like the General to please be clear. How do we go about tackling this issue? One, does he believe that there is political dominance by the North. How genuine is that allegation? And secondly, how genuine is

the fear by those from the South against the North? And how genuine is the fear by the Northerners against the South, because the whole political gimmick and chicanery has to do with who gets what, when and how? Thank you.

Yar'Adua: Well you see the problem with issues of that nature – really, it is not even important whether they are true or they are alleged. What is important is the perception of people on these issues. There is nothing you can do about what people perceive. And that is why we are saying that this conference should be a sovereign national conference where for the first time, Nigerians under their own aegis, not under the British, not under anybody -- who by themselves should sit down and address themselves to these very questions which you are raising. The fight -- if I am Hausa-Fulani, no apologies. If somebody thinks I am dominating, fine. Let us get to the table. Let him tell me, “Look, you bloody Hausa-Fulani, you are dominating me. I don’t want to be dominated any more. And therefore, this is how I want to live. This is my proposal; this is how I want to live with you so that you don’t dominate me any more”.

Now, any form of restricted conference is not going to allow these same questions to be answered. It doesn’t matter, but what I know as a matter of fact is that the fear that this would lead to the break up of the country is absolute rubbish. So these questions you say from 1950 have been unsettled. So let us sit down and settle them. That is why we are going for this conference, why we are saying that the conference must be sovereign in the sense that it is free to discuss anything under the sun and it is free to come to any decision. So if somebody says “Me, I don’t want to live in Nigeria”. Fine, but let him tell us why he doesn’t want to live with us. We also hope we will be able to persuade him that he is probably better off with his problems. We are much better off living with each other and quarrelling as brothers and sisters. But let us discuss it and let us reach our own decision. Let us reach our own conclusion. And you will think that if people are going to discuss that, then people must have totally unfettered freedom to discuss it. And they must be elected, so that they have the mandate of the people that they are actually representing on such an important issue.

Guardian

Newspaper: I have three questions, Sir. I will take the last now and it is closely related to what he just said. You are suggesting that the lift of the ban on politics should be now and politicians should be allowed to crisscross the country and go round, to have the freedom of movement. Sir, don’t you think this is a latent agenda; I don’t want to use the word hidden. Don’t you think it is a latent agenda in your plan perhaps, to somehow influence the people that are likely to be elected into that conference; so that you as a known-skilled politician should be able to influence decisions that are likely to be taken in that conference. I am saying this because you have accepted that we have a forum; that the Constitutional Conference should provide us a forum for sitting down and discussing these things freely; any problem that has beset us all this while. Now why do you think, Sir, that it is necessary for instance, to go round the country or to have that freedom of movement to mobilize people to perhaps influence, I wouldn’t know the effect anyway. Why is this trip necessary to precede the conference?

Yar'Adua: Well let me answer because if you have up to three, I have to answer this one. Now, I am sure you know, for example, there have been arguments that there are about 250 ethnic groups in this country and that each ethnic group should be represented in this, the area which we are now discussing for the government. Let us take the Yoruba States. Well, if you don’t allow freedom of movement from southerners, and let us say here is Chief Yomi Edu coming from Lagos, sitting near Chief S.M. Afolabi coming from Osun. These are Yorubas. Now if Yomi is voted in from Epe to go to the conference, now let us say Epe people say to him --- “Look, if you go to that conference; what we want is to get out of Nigeria”. And he in Osun got elected there -- and let us

take the other extreme and Osun says to him “Look, go to that conference. What we want is a unitary form of government in Nigeria”. Both of them will go to that conference. Neither of them will have a right in any form or manner to alter that. No matter how small his constituency. Neither of them. And imagine, let us say each ethnic group is represented by, imagine about 300 people, each one with a separate mandate with no earlier discussion at all. When you have a conference, which is called to discuss the future existence of this country, that conference will never finish. And all the other conferences we are talking about --- the Constitutional Conference perhaps in the 50s, were under political parties with political representation.

And if I am in a position to influence the vote, isn't that what democracy is all about. Isn't it? Because the country has to make a choice, either between forcing them or influencing them. Let democracy be allowed to work. Who is afraid of me anyway?

Guardian

Newspaper: Okay Sir, the second question is that briefly on the time-span of this government, you said it should terminate at the end of this year. And you set an agenda so to say, a kind of time-table that between June and December it should facilitate all electoral processes. Now, talking realistically, do you think that the events or the circumstances we face here in Nigeria now, politically and economically... Do you think this country is economically ready to facilitate another electoral process this year, considering the state in which we are trying to get ourselves from?

And then --- perhaps, straight to the next question. You talked about the delegates to the conference; that they should be purely elected.

Yar'Adua: Yes.

Guardian

Newspapers: I should think that we, after the post-June 12<sup>th</sup> issues actually raised a lot of issues. The issue of the minority and other interest groups are there. Don't you think if there is pure election to the Constitutional Conference, that these other pressure groups so to say, would be under-mined and there would be no total consideration for their own feelings and their aspirations? Thank you.

Yar'Adua: Which groups because every State has...

Guardian

Newspaper: Well, more so, for instance, the minorities. The minorities, I am talking about the minority, talk about the women's affairs, talk about the NBA, talk about the NUJ. I think these ones should have contribution to the conference.

Yar'Adua: Now, you are talking about the economy -- and democracy. Well, right now, the very people who caused the economic mess anyway are running the damn country. That's to start with. Secondly, if it is a pure choice and I am surprised actually this is coming from a journalist because there is a choice between two types of government -- military or democracy, simple. And if your choice is democracy, then we should have it as soon as possible. Today, we have been under military rule continuously for ten years. I do not think our lot has been improving. Fine. Then why do you want a longer continuation of that government. And the democracy that you are talking about, these last attempts we have had in the last eight years, to have democracy -- the amount of money, the transition cost was not designed by civilians. Precisely, that is the most costly transition ever anywhere in the world. It wasn't designed by politicians. It was imposed. And that is the sort of thing which you cannot have in a democracy, for example.

Now, what was the second question? Now the interest groups, sufficient interest. I don't think you should start impugning things because on the issue

of minorities that you are talking about, a minority comes from somewhere, clearly. Here we are, I mean if you like, you can say Dr. Cole is a minority, he comes from Rivers State. And I am Hausa, a majority. I am not going to Rivers State to contest election to go to the Constitutional Assembly. He is not coming to Katsina to contest election. There he is going to be voted for, from where he is coming. And this conference is not going to --- the most important thing about this conference -- it is not going to be about what is the freedom of the press or what is the law of this country is going to be. The most important thing in that conference is for it to determine for example, here I am, from the majority; he is from the minority. It is to determine first, do we want to live together. If we want to live together, how?

Now, you ask me why should anybody come to that conference to determine how the Hausa-Fulanis live with Yorubas when he was not elected. He was not given a mandate directly by either the Yorubas or the Hausa-Fulanis. That his mandate is because he is a lawyer? How lawyers are going to deal with soldiers? Why should we bother?

Why should anybody go to that conference who is not Ibo and who is not from you know, Akwa-Ibom for example, and tell the Ibos how to live with people from Akwa-Ibom, unless he was given a mandate by the Ibos to come and do so. Or given a mandate by the people of Akwa-Ibom to come and tell Nigeria whether the people of Akwa-Ibom want to stay in Nigeria and how they want to stay in Nigeria. This is not a matter of law, it is a matter of people. That is why we are saying people who want to discuss this must be given a mandate directly by the people to discuss on their behalf. Not because somebody is a lawyer or a soldier.

Why should a General go there and tell me how to live with people in Sokoto. He has no right to do so. Only my people and the Sokoto people have a right to determine how they should live together. And therefore, they must be given the right to select the people and give them the mandate they want for this country. After that, then the lawyers can go and write the constitution based on what was concluded. And the NUJ will be there to ensure there is press freedom.

Patrick

Iwuanyanwu: I will prefer to call the General by title because I am told that once a soldier always a soldier.

Yar'Adua: Thank you very much.

Patrick

Iwuanyanwu: My question is this: You must have heard the Head of State in his budget address saying that the decisions of the constitutional conference will be subject to ratification of the Provisional Ruling Council. And he said that the campaign for democracy already is still taking place. What is your attitude to this? And secondly Sir, you have not told this conference if you will offer yourself to be elected to participate in the debates in the conference; and how do you wish to mobilize people?

Yar'Adua: Well in the first place, I think the issue of that -- because the Head of State did say that whatever was decided will be taken to the PRC for ratification. And my press conference clearly addressed that --- I did say that we want to have a sovereign national conference; a conference which is free to determine its agenda, to discuss whatever it wants to discuss and whose decisions will be binding on both the governors and the governed. It is clear. That means if we are going to have this conference, if we are going to attempt the importance it deserves, then we should take our decisions and that's it.

And as to whether I will offer myself to this, in fact, it is because people like me want to offer themselves, and we are not going to go there if we are

nominated. Because if we are nominated then I am representing nobody. So if I am going to go there, I will only go on the condition that I am elected. Anyway don't worry. Where I come from, I don't have to go and campaign. I know I will win.

Punch: During your address, you said there is no justification for military take over anywhere in the world. Is there any justification for politicians to jump into a government formed by military government?

Yar'Adua: Well in the first place, I think you are asking it the wrong way because, you know, it would be a matter of personal opinion of the individual. And clearly, on that issue, you know my personal opinion. Those who are there, you must ask them. Otherwise, I would be there.

Radio

Nigeria: I thank the General for coming to address us. He wants a conference, a national conference that will be sovereign. On what platform? Do we want two parties? Because we tried two parties, we tried multi-parties. What kind of structure would you want?

Yar'Adua: All I am suggesting is that the ban should be lifted on political activities so that people in their various associations are free to intercourse. As to whether we will end up with two parties or ten parties, I think the conference should decide that.

Radio

Nigeria: The second question, Sir. You would want this government to disengage in December 1992. Are you sure that the political class, because the general belief is that at that conference the political class should not be there. So there is no point. We have politicians who are not organized. Now, do you think the politicians as at now have deviated from the factors that led the military to be nascent today.

Yar'Adua: No. Let us make these issues quite clear. The issue like the oneness of the non-military class is not just -- and we must accept that it is not just the work or the responsibility of the politicians alone. Because once the military is there now, it is not ruling just the politician. It is ruling everybody. It is a collective decision and the collective will of Nigerians whether they want military rule or otherwise. And as to the issue of whether the politicians are organized or they are not organized, in my view, in fact, the politicians are more organized, they are more resilient than the military. Because if all the vicissitudes that have been visited on the political class by the military has been visited by all the military by the political class, there will have been no military in Nigeria today. And even in the recent past -- because we must differentiate fact from propaganda.

In the recent past, and I ask all of you honestly, in the recent past, if these same politicians would in fact create the political impasse we are talking about? Didn't politicians -- didn't they go out and campaign? Didn't the elections take place? Was anybody killed over the election? Was there any riots? Any fight? Did the politicians come back and say they did not want the winner of this election to be declared? Even for the first time, even the opposition party or if you like since there is no opposition party to this effect; even the party so to say, who lost the election, the leadership still came out to clearly say let us have this. So how do those in politics now get blamed to that effect?

Did the --- was it the Military who ordered people all over the country to vote according to their party and not to bother about the unity of the country. Wasn't it the politicians who campaigned and got people to agree that those are not the main issues? That is the point. They go to them -- which normally happened ten years ago. Today, it was not possible. But simply because people write commentaries and so on, politicians this, politicians that. There is a difference. Look at the reality of what happened and then judge on that reality.

Master of Ceremony: Gentlemen of the Press, let me apologize that at this time in point we have to stop this Press Conference. On behalf of the convener and his associates, I want to thank you all for coming.