

<REPORTING BURMA>
|
FRONTLINE DEBATE
|
MEDIA FAILURE OR MISSION IMPOSSIBLE?
|
LONDON UK- TUESDAY 22nd NOVEMBER 2005

Guest speakers; Nita May (BBC) Alex Spillius (SEA correspondent Daily Telegraph)
Aung Saw (Editor Irrawaddy) Richard Jones (Premier Oil UK)

Moderated by;
Donna Guest (Int. secretary for Amnesty International)

Among invited guests were; NLD (UK) DVB (Oslo)
Other guests included; Allies to the Burma cause-distinguished authors and historians
on Burma. Former Ambassadors.
Correspondents from the world media.
Human rights activists.

**UKorg
Comment:**

23 November 2005

Considering this debate could have opened up new channels of thought among those present, it must be admitted with great sadness, that it was a debate without foundation or reason.

A representative from UKorg was invited as a guest, to observe, but found the result to be of no consequence when it came to advancing Burma's dilemma.

Our observer was asked not to participate in question and answers as this may have moved the debate into a provocative and hostile environment, even though it would have open new avenues that many consider to be appropriate, but stay silent.

The debate was supposed to have discussed the media contribution and to debate whether or not more could be done. The second subject was to debate whether Burma is a mission impossible or not?

Our comment on these issues is thus:

As a point of debate at this moment in time, the media is quite irrelevant when it comes to strengthening Burma's will to defeat the SPDC. As events stand today its not what the media can add to its present and past disclosures which are important, unless

of course it is brave enough to report what it knows to be the true situation as it stands today and is reported below!

a/ Media failure?

b/ Mission impossible?

BURMA; Media coverage:

1/ Is it; enough-lacking in clout--is it without depth-futile & with no serious interest, OR IS IT SIMPLY NOT IN LINE WITH FOREIGN POLICY and the media prefer not to inflame their relationship?

2/WHAT ARE THE AIMS OF THE MEDIA?

Are they simply to inform as a matter of fact, combined with all the other news items, or is it to raise awareness so that some kind of action can be implemented to remedy it?

2a/ Is it designed as a rousing call, in which case, who is it targeted at who may otherwise be in a position to help, or is it simply a ploy?

2b/ Perhaps its not the lack of reporting, but its portrayal?

Western news speaks only of ASSK, accrediting her with all the honours bestowed on her as part of the public image build up, and for what purpose. Were they making the most of what they had? Does giving her an honour make her a better politician, or unite a people who are not exactly impressed by the pedestal the west has placed her on, because they are still suffering. Does the west not understand the cultural thinking, and deep concerns that Suu Kyi is seen not as Burmese but English, leading to the question; is their an ulterior motive?

The people need and are crying out for someone they can relate to,

The image building may have brought the publics attention to Burma, but failed in its main task, instead it created a trend milked dry by those exiles who use the stage of the NLD or more precise, Suu Kyi's, to boost their own ego's & bank balance when it should have been used to advance democracy! Now its running out of steam, because those who should have took advantage of the world stage, failed miserably. Now the NCGUB has again used this public image by attempting to fleece the Canadian people by ignominiously stating it must be said, that their country is not doing enough to support Burma's democracy movement, & should offer funds!
If the media want to help Burma, ask the NCGUB to show accounts of the millions they have received over the years.

3/ who can help Burma?

Is it the masses of the west, or the few who hold power & influence?

3a/ is it the people of Burma, with the help of the west?

3b/ or is it, that only the people of Burma can help themselves?

4/ **WESTERN HELP?**

Have we failed to impress or encourage the people of Burma, and, to influence its ruling regime?

Yes to both! Derived from lack of interest or design?

4a/ **ARE THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE WEST REALLY CONCERNED?**

4b/**Are those who consider themselves as being both prominent and influential** out of focus with reality, therefore follow the wrong path, which is an unfortunate but realistic divide created by the very nature of our society, or at the very least, unable to pursue a proper course of action because their hands too are tied with political restraints?

4c/**FOREIGN POLICY INTERVENTION?**

Is Burma a casualty of policy?

4d/**SYMPHETIC INDIVIDUALS:**

We have met with numerous business individuals over the years, all have shown a great awareness and compassion for the people of Burma, but all without exception, were influenced in one way or another by the foreign policy of their governments respectively. It is clear, that the only support on offer, financially, and its money which replaces tyranny, just as advertising costs money in order to sell products, is from government authorised intuitions, and then only after strict assessment.

Any individual or institution not affiliated to government, but who wants to contribute in some way, has the difficult task in deciding whether or not it may affect their business if seen to contribute to something where foreign governments would prefer the **status quo in Burma's case**, so that they are in control of events, and not the other way around?

5/SUMMERY:

THE MEDIA:

The media is an excellent tool for bringing a subject to the eyes & ears of those in a position to help, but it rarely guides the reader or listener, to a recipient of aid, other than those chosen by government, consequently aid only goes where policy dictates, and not necessarily where it can genuinely be of help!

This is not failure on the part of the media, but rather the dubious shadow of political influences!

6/MISSION IMPOSSIBLE?

6a/ **Only** to those without a cause and those who stand to capitalise on the suffering of others, including their own!

6b/ Was WW2 a mission impossible, of course not, because, it was our cause, happening on our very doorstep in Britain! Hope could very well have been lost, if it were not for the right leader to generate new hope to such a degree that the sacrifices soon to be made were part and parcel of giving our children a life of freedom. It does not matter if the leaders of the time are criticised today, that will always be the case. What matters is we came through, and those who sacrificed *“their today”* gave future generations a free tomorrow. The leaders of Burma's pro-democracy elements must be willing and courageous enough to make decisions which will benefit their people in the future. By uniting against a common enemy, their individual powers and influence will actually grow. They will have powers with much wider repercussions in the political arena, forcing those who ignored before, to prick up their ears and listen! They will become respected by a wider audience because their voices will represent more people, therefore as a body, will put them at the head of the table instead of the bottom!

6c/ At the time of peril, the weak have to listen to the strong if they want to survive, no matter how crude or misplaced their solutions may be. Those who were fearful to face the truth, or to be more precise, lacked the courage of conviction, were fearful of failure, and the disgrace it may bring. In the case of Britain, they were soon replaced once the seriousness of conflict came upon us.

6d/ Just as it was in British politics in the run up to WW2, is now materialising within the pro-democracy community of Burma. The weak have been condemned, now it *“is the turn of the strong”*!

6e/ No, it is not a mission impossible, simple a little behind schedule!

7/HOW CAN BURMA WIN ITS WAR AT HOME?

7a/ Burma *“is the turn of the strong”* democracy movement must find its own solution from within. It will have to find ways to win allies within its own boundaries, although logic should make this easy because the enemy too, is within, and is common to all those under its boot. It is not a threat to outside its borders, and should therefore; not involve any foreign intervention, although certain observers will hold strong interests in any outcome!

7b/ This conflict can only be won by the people.

Whether it *“is the turn of the strong”* morally supported by the West or unacceptable to the East is irrelevant.

It is this hypocritical moral stance, of allowing power to one side and to tie the hands of the other, together with the greed and power ambitions of some exiles which has stapled the people to the ground, making them easy targets for the regime to manipulate at will. This is the cost imposed upon the people of Burma.

CLOSE THE DIVIDE & RULE

By informing & educating the population about their present dilemma will convince them that they can win over their own internal problems by applying a better understanding among groups and state exactly that the regime is everyone's enemy, and not just to a select group!

The state of mind necessary to take up the fight:

Every soldier who has ever been in a fire fight, and who has good training, will act instinctively, He cannot run or hide; there is no chance of outside support but he knows that encouragement and the will to stand and fight comes from within the immediate group, and all influence beyond what is no longer relevant falls away. You are standing together as one, with only two outcomes; to live or to die. Nothing else exists during the contact. This is Burma's standing today. They must look to those who are next to them now, and not those who are safe in far away lands!

To tie the hands of one side is like muzzling a dog, then putting it against a pack of wolves, leading to a certain death.

The people of Burma have had their hands tied for too long by those who cry no armed struggle, whose only reason for not calling for such action, is two fold; 1st, it's the only way groups can obtain funding. 2; it gives foreign governments the strings!

Certain voices say that the regime is too strong and powerful, and the pro-democracy elements have already lost the battle and further conflict is futile! We say to those voices, and we use the most insolent tone we dare, as a bunch of academics, you are by nature, sceptical about anything you cannot physically explain, and shy away from blame when your advice allows tyranny to tighten its stranglehold. The regime in Burma has never been taken on in battle. Skirmishes in ethnic border areas are not battles. To say it's impossible to go head to head militarily with the regime is a statement of complete ignorance of military matters, and its best that way because then there is no fear of you blabbing to the SPDC! When it comes to bare knuckle contact about real life, especially military matters, you are all in a fright, ignoramuses; Burma needs people with diplomas earned on the ground amidst the clouds of battle, and within earshot of the screams of men women and children.

Burma's pro-democracy groups have the resources to generate funds if they worked together. They could finance their own fight. Unfortunately, those who can generate money prefer to keep it for themselves. That needs changing.

THE Parliamentary Democracy Party (PDP) & its Chairman; Bo Aung Din. He is an academic of great standing, but he chose not to play voice, or to live a comfortable life, but instead, to combine his academic qualities with his life's learning as a fighter, and for someone who has had more than his share of pain, and is still willing to share the pain of others, uses this combined knowledge to further Burma's hopes!

He has brought the people into the fold, something everyone else has ignored.

www.pdpburma.net

Note:

The establishment of an infrastructure outlined below, is of course not an over night procedure, neither is it expected to be an easy task. If something similar was considered after the regime rejected the election results of 1990, Burma could very well be the head of SEA by now. The Democratic Alliance of Burma (DAB) was supposed to have worked in a similar fashion as below, but lacked the ingenuity and imagination or thought, when it was founded. The same applies to NCUB. They cancelled each other out as far as impact on Burma's political scene was concerned!

The important issue at this point in time, is to assess past mistakes, and accept them with no loss of honour.

To re-establish confidence among the people, and to promote solid, self-determination and effort.

To achieve that goal the whole infrastructure of the opposition must be re-evaluated and categorised.

The election mandate of 1990 is dead in the water as is the election mandate of ousted Premier U Nu's government.

In order to make such a deep incision and to then dissect what has become an institutionalised movement among many from Burma, and a western media creation of an icon, will of course take enormous amounts of selfless courage and conviction, notably from the NLD itself.

This action could easily have been piloted during this debate, by a few simple statements together with questions, put by our representative who was in attendance.

The questions must be answered if Burma is to move forward!

a/ Is it time to restructure the NLD as a party, together with its leadership

b/ Followed by a complete change in direction as to its tactical policy?

c/ Is it time for all the ethnic nations and their break away groups to rethink their grievances and inhibitions about past relationships with their own people, and also with the Burman population by focusing on the one common enemy of the people? The SPDC has proven to be deceitful in its dealings with groups who have signed peace deals with it.

*d/ If this can be done, to then establish, one united **think tank** comprising of representatives of all groups. This must be constructed with **all** pro-democracy elements that display both political and military prowess, and preferably, are already acknowledged by a people following, and have proven records of working*

with the people in an effort to ease their suffering and familiarise them with the political environment within their country?

(As stated during the debate, by Aung Saw, editor of Irrawaddy; The people trapped inside Burma, and most of those who live as refugees, are not truly familiar with who or what is the main cause for their dilemma. Also as pointed out in the Irrawaddy edition of; the 5th May 2005, where the editor wrote a comprehensive objective analytical review of the NLD.

The editorial was highly critical of the failure of Suu Kyi and other leaders of the party to deliver, and have brought instead, disillusion and despair to both the people and the NLD)

He preferred not reiterate on that point. An example of why the Burma cause is going no where. It's pointless to write about a subject, only to then fail in enhancing its importance to the cause. Perhaps he believes that this a concern for the people of Burma only, and not to be voiced in western debates?

e/ With the establishment of the , to then elect a coalition committee But the chamber must be populated with equal numbers of representatives from every political denomination who already hold political portfolios.

f/ Once the is established, and political unification is acceptable to all, the integration of those under arms must take place. This will enable a secure system to be put into place whereas preventing the military from ever becoming a threat to the people in a future democracy. This will give clout to the new interim confederation of those seeking democracy, and will complete a major step forward toward total democracy!

g/ by establishing all of the above, which is of course only an example to kick start proceedings; a shared economy can be developed.

h/ All of the above will then enable this new entity to stand proud, giving it the clout required to deal with the outside world, and totally shatter the divide and rule tactics used to hold them back for so long without a voice!

ON REACHING A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION, THIS IMMENSE TASK WOULD HAVE JOINED THE PEOPLE, WHO WOULD BY THEN BE LIVING AND WORKING TOGETHER, AND A FULLY INTERGRATED DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM TO SUIT EVERYONE WILL BE WELL ON COURSE.

BY THIS STAGE THE SPDC WILL BE A MEANINGLESS BUNCH OF NOBODIES, BECAUSE THEIR ARMY WILL HAVE DESERTED THEM, TAKING ALL THEIR EQUIPMENT AND MILITARY HARDWARE WITH THEM. THEIR INFRASTRUCTURE WILL HAVE BEEN SABOTAGED FROM WITHIN. THEIR ALLIES WILL BECOME THEIR ENEMIES. THEIR NEW FORTRESS CAPITAL WILL BECOME THEIR PRISON!

AT THIS STAGE, ALL THOSE NOW UNITED WILL HAVE DEVELOPED TRUST AND RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER. PAST DISAGREEMENTS, CRITISISMS, ANIMOSIITY WOULD HAVE BEEN HEAVILY DEBATED UNTIL DIFFERENCES ARE FINALY RESOLVED.

ALL THE RESPECTIVE POLITICAL PARTIES WOULD HAVE GONE THROUGH A PROCESS OF LEARNING ESSENTIAL SKILLS TO FURTHER THEIR COUNTRY.

THE PEOPLE WOULD HAVE THEMSELVES BEEN EDUCATED, TO UNDERSTAND AND BE PART OF THE TRANSFORMATION. THEN AND ONLY THEN, WILL BURMA WILL BE READY TO ENTER A NEW ERA. ELECTIONS WILL THEN SET BURMA ON ITS NEW COURSE INTO THE WORLD.

ONCE AGAIN BURMA WILL BECOME THE PROUD NATION IT REACHLY DESRVES! AS BURMA TRAVELS THE PATH OF DEMOCRACY IT CAN THEN MAKE THE FINAL DECISION OF WHICH SYSTEM OF DEMOCRACY IS BEST FOR THEM?

LESSONS WILL BE LEARNED FROM BURMA ALL AROUND THE WORLD THAT OPPRESSION CAN BE DEFEATED ONCE THE RIGHT LEADER STANDS FOEWARD! WINSTON CHURCHILL ROSE UP TO HELP BRITAIN WHEN WE WERE ON OUR OWN. HE WAS WILLING TO MAKE TOUGH DECISIONS, AND STOOD PROUD IN FRONT OF THE PEOPLE IF THEY WENT WRONG. BUT THE PEOPLE KNEW THEY NEEDED A LEADER WHO COULD CONFRONT ISSUES HEAD ON, WHERE OTHERS WOULD HIDE. A LEADER WHO WILL CONFRONT THE PEOPLE FACE TO FACE AND TELL THEM EXACTLY WHAT IS REQUIRED; OTHERWISE THEY MUST LIVE UNDER TYRANNY FOR EVER!

The said task is the same that every new born democracy must complete. But this stage in any countries history can only be achieved by choosing a leader who is forthright, holds all the pains and scars of revolution, but is still composed and in control of his emotions. He faces reality that others are perhaps blind to, therefore can be trusted to take his followers across the treacherous barriers that were once deemed impossible! For this level of leadership the people only have to look toward the "Parliamentary Democracy Party" (PDP) For those with vision and hopes for the future, there can be only one present entity to take them there, the PDP, with Bo Aung Din at the helm with a crew of devout believers in democracy, whose loyalty and dedication has never yielded but who have stood on the bodies of their fallen comrades with tears in their eyes, and continued to fight on their behalf, and for the future of their children!

The day of reckoning is fast approaching. While groups of exiles, many who have never seen Burma, or have never returned since their fortunate escape, continue to form new groups, talk about nothing, and are allowed to continue abusing Burma "s suffering by demanding money from foreign donations only to steal it from the very people it is supposed to help,

Any person with instinct or common sense can easily assess what help all the money given so far to the NLD, NCGUB, as examples, could have done for Burma, because people only have to witness what the PDP has achieved from its own pocket. Bo Aung Din has denied himself basic luxuries in order to rebuild and sustain the hopes of the people. He has denied himself the right to live a life of comfort while his country suffers. His first and last penny always goes in the same direction, Burma! One can only imagine what he could do if he had the same funding that all those blood sucking parasites have stolen not only from the people of Burma, but from the very people who made those donations!

WHY ARE THEY BEING ALLOWED TO GET AWAY WITH IT?

For those who cry wolf, and admit defeat by saying it will never work because the ethnics will never unite let alone unite with Burmans, and/or, SPDC is too strong and cannot be broken, need not apply, these defeatists can find a brick and go crawl under it, but of course, they have already found one haven't they.

UKorg.