

UK.org.

Member Comment:

21 November 2006

A SHARED, COMMON GOAL, WITHOUT WHICH, LEADS TO NOWHERE.

Federalism - Socialism- Communism - Republicanism- militarism, etc.

Burma today needs trails blazers, not concept theorists who have no idea as to the realities on the ground. Forget all the 'isms' for now, because; the cake has to be baked, before it can be eaten, and if the ingredients aren't there to begin with, then the cake will never be baked!

There are many interpretations of life and its social infrastructures. People put names to anything and everything; consequently, we have words to describe all things known and, the hypothetical. Then, along come the interpretations, or rather, the problem road, interpretations to suit policy or will. Of course, we need names and titles, otherwise how are we going to identify with life and the actions of humankind, but one man's interpretation is not necessarily the same as someone else's understanding of it. So, is compromise the key?

Misinterpretation is a deliberate act to manipulate the less educated, and does, lead to conflict, whenever there is a loser among those interpreters, who will deny compromise if it means losing individual power.

Descriptive names are very often confusing when different cultures first meet with them. If a person, were to be introduced to me, by my knick name, they will attempt to interpret its origin, which, more often than not, is way off course, as will their first impression of my culture and character. Whereas; had this person shadowed my path through life, he/she would have a much better understanding of me, and would know exactly how to approach me in all subjects. When judging the origin of a name or title, a person, will, interpret as they see it. Moreover; their findings will be influenced by their own experience of life, whether it comes from academia interpretations, which is the view of others before you, as the persistent quotations often remind us, or, living experience, by integrating with all or many aspects of cultured societies. Many academics together with the, intelligentsia, rarely set foot outside of their own mind and are oblivious to real life; (*stems from my duties as a close protection officer to government scientists and the like*) let alone live the life they are constantly trying to influence. This lack of understanding and the interpretation as they see it is what causes the problem. If I intend to travel abroad, I will seek advice on the country. Much of the guidance I used to study proved embarrassingly, and at times dangerously wrong on my arrival. I now prefer to mix with those from a particular country in order that I may learn something about their culture. One particular professor, I had the privilege to accompany, although a kindly man, had spent his entire life, up to then, in the surroundings of a well know university, where he became a renowned physicist. We used to sit together in his rooms, where he sat with pricked ears, as I told of my life and the experiences of the world. He was like a child being read to, from a fantasy tale; his questions became more and more bizarre, questions, which can only come from a mind that of which has never seen beyond its imagination. The results of his work, or the people it may

ultimately affect, appeared beyond his understanding, but at the same time, he would never intentionally tread on spiders or ants, he regarded them as the planets true intellects.

He died without even visiting the coastline of his own country, whereas; his work will affect the way we live for many generations to come, or, until someone decides his work was flawed. On the other hand, I have accompanied others, whose work was considered irrelevant, at the time, but found to be very relevant later, unfortunately, when its effectiveness was minimal. (I do hope the point strikes home!)

The nearest a person can get to becoming factual about life, therefore eligible to understand it, is to be part of it, not as a visitor, but as a living segment of it. Many of those who preach about life, or strive to change it, are not! A journalist, through the media, will report events, but rarely understand its deep-rooted origins, which in turn, will portray only an outlined picture, once archived, to be studied in the future, where, it will be completely misinterpreted, making future solutions for similar events, worthless, if not inflammatory.

What worked elsewhere will not work in Burma . Burma is a wilderness of uncertainties, and only those who know the game, the ground, and who dare, can play. The rules, as in any war become nothing more than guidelines, as situations are unpredictable. As in, any battle, new rules are made up as progress improves or diminishes, and new infrastructures are built along the way. It must be understood that Burma is at war with itself; therefore, adversaries decide upon rules of engagement on the ground, not the naïve onlooker. War is not a game where road signs attempt to guide us; thinking, is done on the ground, at the time of engagement. The only rule is to stay alive and to win. As you move forward, those administrators following will set up new infrastructures, to govern and secure, what you have succeeded in winning. Modern day societies are constantly making new laws as others become outdated and no longer suit requirements, such is the method as conflict progresses forward.

Fighting a war from a desk and thousands of miles away while the enemy grows stronger, and more suffering is inflicted on the innocents, is not the way forward. Speak to the UK and USA about the Middle East , to verify these words. Either fight or die. Those who do not fight should shut up, because there is no other way forward!

If the Burman population have to go it alone under the right leadership, then that is what should happen. The ethnics can decide what part is best for them, but what is needed, is a democratic government in Rangoon , before any advancement on their own front can be made.

CAUSE FOR CONFLICT:

Different schools and different cultures, will teach different interpretations on the world and its history, thus creating, instant conflicts of interest. If the ethnics wish to unite with others, then it is their duty to educate their people accordingly, as too, the Burman.

A COMMON BOND:

Who better, to fight Burma 's war against tyranny, then those who lived the struggle on the ground? Who better, than those who know and understand the needs of the diverse cultures, of which, are blamed for blocking the way forward?

The regime knows exactly how to turn ethnic against ethnic for example. So why can't the ethnics understand and accept, that together, they can break the regimes hold over them. They must find a common bond. If that bond is nothing more than democracy, then use it as a strategic goal, physically go for it, and not simply leave it to others who only seek self-gain. Every soldier knows, once a strategic target is confirmed, plans must then be put into play. The objectives of military tactics are no different to political. It requires moves, taking ground as one moves forward. Sometimes, ground will be lost, and new tactics considered. This can only be achieved through shared intelligence between all those concerned. If a working partnership cannot be, then the plan is worthless. If this is the case, Burma 's internal war will go on forever, and everyone is wasting everyone's time.

Someone has to make a decision for Burma 's future. It has to restart somewhere. Moreover, unfortunately, it will not come peacefully! It takes brave people to acknowledge risk and repercussions of conflict, but history is full of it, and without these people we would still be living in the dark ages of tyranny. It takes an even braver person, to place him/her self in the front line to show his conviction is as good as his/her word.

The **PDP**, have made the first move to push Burma 's people into realising the reality of the situation. If others fail to acknowledge it, Burma 's downfall is on their heads, and the history books will reveal that!

Terry;
UK.org. Member.

UK.org. Collective Comment:

21 November 2006:

BAD PLANNING LEADS TO DISASTER.

This comment is in response to the many email messages we receive on Burma , from, individuals of Burma . They feel they cannot confront the NLD, or the NCGUB, because of the single-minded attitudes of both groups. They instead, join a growing number of nationals from Burma , who contact us, so that we may express their frustrations, and it seems anger. They reveal, that those who worry do so, not so much, of their countries past and present, which they consider, raises too many irrelevant arguments and in fighting, because very few people are qualified to debate it. It's their future, which concerns them. The continued tunnel vision approach to political thinking, stemming more from personal egos and ambitions, than solving Burma's dilemma, ignited by the lack of foresight and strategy back in 1990, commanded by the criterion of he NLD, leading to, today's quagmire.

Many of a younger Burma generation, have made it their ambition to study modern politics, and judging by their emails, do it very well. Their findings are what everyone

else has concluded, which is the complete lack of sincere effort, to unify policy, under a **multi-party opposition** under one roof. However; the NLD, NCGUB, refuse to acknowledge this, and do not want to accept it, and consider themselves, to be the only solution to Burma 's problems. Is this not a clear sign that the NLD and NCGUB are more concerned about their personal existence, than the freedom of Burma?

If there were more eligible political parties, who hold the support of a registered fixed number of people, both ethnic and Burman, combined also, with a political infrastructure, qualifying them as competent to operate as a government, it would allow for a better, although perhaps, not accurate, census of the voting public, and not simply a chosen few. This would allow for a wider debate with more solutions on offer.

The various bodies, the NLD, NCGUB, NCUB and DAB, cannot, proof of which, is now history, speak for all; the continued splits throughout, and the vast membership of the PDP is clear proof of that.

Because, few understand the intricacies of politics linked to a military doctrine, which as well as the regime, all ethnics are, they are not aware, of the traps, linked to a tri-partite set up for example, if brokered, under an NLD criterion, as opposed to a multi-party platform criteria. In a country like Burma , where there are a number of ethnic nations, it would become unworkable, by having just one voice for them as a group, under the umbrella of the NLD, one voice for the Burmans; the NLD, and one for the regime. Debate, would forever, be locked in stalemate, as it has been for decades.

The NCUB, which describes itself as, quote; '**the broadest organisation of pro-democracy Burman and non-Burman ethnic**', unquote.

Its members; of which the PDP is not, one only has to study the list, in order to become mystified. It is an assortment of interwoven, groups, many of which are individual members of the NCUB and, members also, of the DAB, who of course are members too, of the NCUB. Which is, intrinsically linked, to the NCGUB, which is supposedly, under the umbrella of the NLD? The NLD representing passive non-violent struggle receives accolades and funding for a passive stance, even though many of those intertwined are involved in armed struggle, which is conveniently, condemned by those who issue funds. Which means to the innocent onlooker, if he NCGUB and the NCUB receive funding under the guise of non-violent struggle, they are by all intent and purpose, deceiving those who donate money? We see no problem with this if it were helping Burma , but find it hypocritical of those who dictate funding policy, mainly western governments, when other pro-democracy groups seek help, but are informed in no uncertain terms, that help is not offered to armed wings.

However, were the ethnics already, operating within a Confederation of ethnics, with an already stable, centralised, political system, yes, one body representing them in a wider debate, would work, because individual ethnic constituents would have their relevant representation. However, under the disillusioned and corrupt auspice of the NLD, would have to consider policy in favour of the massive Burman, majority population, making any representation for segregated ethnics, either minimal, or totally, irrelevant? .

Had the NLD, been handed power in 1990, all those sub-NLD associates, under its wing, would soon have faced the reality that their memberships of the NLD clan, hold no power of influence in major government policy when it came down to satisfying ethnic policy requirements. The Burman majority population would have overwhelmingly influenced decision-making. It would have been politically unworkable to operate as a government and to meet everyone's wishes in such a vast complex of cultural differences. The next move, would have been splits in the alliance, or rather a fragile acceptance, leading to another coup, as in 1962?

Back in 1990, when the NLD won an election, which everyone accepts, but most were not prepared for, there was no real line of opposition running against the regime, least of all, an equal balance of representatives among ethnic diversity within their own lands. Had the ethnics, for example, been operating within, an ethnic confederation, and were a political force in their own right, the need to be allied, to the NLD, simply in an attempt, to gain credibility in the world, would not be necessary. Today, because the NLD has failed in its mission, it has taken down all those who allied themselves to it!

HARD TRUTHS THAT MUST BE CONFRONTED IN OPEN DEBATE:

Everyone is aware that action is not always easy, and circumstances often prove impractical, to reveal workable options. However, there are still, ethnic representatives, with the letters, NLD, at the end of their ethnic title. There is no other real representation for other mixed feelings among their own people in the wider debate; the splits within numerous ethnic groups are evidence to this. They were, and are still, military type leaderships; without any true democratic initiatives within their own society, so people's representation, is absent. What if; for example; they happen to disagree with NLD policy? Another 1962 episode?

These group leaders appear to want the democratic advantages within a national equilibrium, but not within their own societies.

In theory of course, some would think a federal system would suit their needs, because central government, supported by the world, could act as arbitrator between those ethnics, who perhaps, could not otherwise work together in other ways, such as a confederation. With this in mind, they imagine they could tread the world stage under one flag, but their own societies, or States, will remain the same, as will the sour relations between ethnics, USING THE EXCUSE THAT CHANGE TAKES TIME. This attitude would raise the risk of inter-State civil war; all it takes is a renegade leader, leading to yet another coup, and possibly total disengagement of Burman from ethnic. This would leave ethnic territories open for conflict far worse than experienced under the SPDC, because foreign powers would support their chosen ethnic group until the ethnics no longer exist as a nation of people, but will become satellites just as those countries under the former USSR Bloc, became!

If particular ethnic groups cannot stay loyal to themselves, because of; no internal representation, how do the NLD, or any other future government, expect loyalty to be honoured toward them and democracy?

An early federal union of Burma would hold great risks in the early days of democracy. Power struggles between both; individuals and states would cause mayhem.

Perhaps the ethnics should get their own house in order first, by establishing fully-fledged democracies, or as near as damn it. Start by Cooperating with other ethnics to form their own confederation, which would build confidence and experience. Allow the majority Burman population to establish their own democratic system, in its own right, with its borders ending where ethnic borders join. During the period it takes to nurture the new confederation, perhaps, the newly established ethnic nations can become protectorates of Burman central government, without, the controlled aspect to it, once it too, settles into democracy. Everyone could then enjoy the economic growth that democracy would bring. When the time is deemed right, and all solutions have been thought through and agreed upon, the next phase can be entered into. However, nothing can be achieved, until the regime has been removed, and the ethnic contribution toward this is paramount, but even so, will not work while unrest exists in their own communities and among Burman led groups.

UK.org.

UKorg.

Collective Comment.

THE TRUE, HEROES OF BURMA .

Many judge Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi, as the same. These people have no idea as to the real world, or, are attempting to camouflage it and by doing so, have given reason why genuine help is never given to those who need it.

This is not condemning either individual; they both stand for what they believe, though the motivation, means and anticipated rewards are very different. With Mandela, he expected and was willing, to die behind the gun, become a prisoner and hanged, or imprisoned for a long time. Suu Kyi on the other hand, thought she was impregnable with the west behind her, and in particular, Britain . She was extremely naïve both to the threat to her safety, and to the level of power the regime had. She depended on superstition and her fathers name to protect her. She was politically inept, to realise that keeping her alive actually benefits the regime. Attempts on her life, again through the eyes of naivety, were simply not attempts, as any agency will point out. Had the regime wanted her gone, they would not have failed such a simple task. Conspiracy theorists, say, that she is kept in confinement, at the request of Britain, just as Mandela was, to keep the spirit alive, but to tone down, or prevent, any serious upheaval that may threaten the power base of the regime until foreign policy status is acceptable.

This is no longer seen, as beneficial to the people of Burma , more so by those who have lived and fought in the jungle for decades without any support from the NLD, or its satellites, which leaves a sour taste in the mouths of those who have.

In Comparison Suu Kyi does not, as Andrew Marshall , describes, and I believes is misplaced, have the same qualities as her father, General Aung San. Yes, it's criminal to incarcerate her; it is also criminal in the eyes of the Burmese, to equal her political prowess and fighting spirit, with that of Aung San. For anyone to make such a statement, more so than a foreigner, is evidence of their lack of real knowledge in Burma history, culture and affairs. That is not the story however. The story is; all too often, history makes heroes out of those who join the game after the battle. In Suu Kyi's case, her commitment is more through guilt than devotion, because the Burmese people disinherited her after her defection to Britain in its time of need. Now the elders are speaking openly, the myth created by the western media is falling by the wayside. If supposed Burma experts knew their field, they would know that the NLD and Suu Kyi, are rarely discussed today, due to access of information via the internet, and by elders who lived it.

Very few people are privy to Burma's struggle before 1998, therefore few are authorised to debate it.

More importantly, rekindled action from participants and former members of General Aung Sans inner circle of the 30 comrades, who have a closer comparison to him, than Suu Kyi could ever have, have stepped in to revitalise the people. One of these moves was the revitalising of the Parliamentary Democracy Party, founded by Burma's first elected Prime minister, and close friend to Aung San, U Nu, to take up the fight against the regime, after he was ousted by General Ne Win.

In 1962, General Ne Win ousted the elected Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, from office. There have been a catalogue of verbal reasons why, but a coup is a coup, and is purely for power. However; It is important to know what happened next, this important piece of missing history has therefore, been briefly recorded by those who lived it. If America were to forget its civil war history, its arrival to the present day would have a big question mark. Cromwell's part in English history, if removed, would have the same affect. The brief history I have attached is as important to international scholars as well as, those from Burma . This inside story is as much a mystery to them as it is the world, outside of politics, because naturally, western politics directed Burma 's path before and since, right up to the present day.

The Internet as allowed stories to be told, that otherwise would not have. The western media still choreographs Burma 's pro-democracy status, but again because of the internet and the continuing growth of the PDP, this hold has begun to crumble, as more Burmese learn the truths and the lies.

Moreover, whatever results in the future, any serious debate on Burma cannot go ahead without the Parliamentary democracy Party (PDP), and new parties, established since 1990.

If the world wishes to help Burma , it must change course according to the wind.

UKorg.

UKorg.

Collective Comment:

09/11/06

BLINKERED FOLLOWING

The attached file is part of Burma's unknown history, and until this has become known, Burma's fight is being miss-directed by outside influences, and misunderstood by Burma's younger generation....

This comment is not in anyway intimidating, simply standing for what is best for Burma as a whole. It is wrong to believe, as many do, that Burma is not ready for democracy. It is a great pity, that truth, is often disfigured for political points, or influenced by foreign policy, of other countries and the many media outlets that preach human rights and freedom of speech, that ultimately, follow their lead.

Firstly, to those who insinuate that we, UKorg, appear to make personal attacks on the NLD, and its members? We, who are lucky enough, to live in a democracy, albeit, far from perfect, are constantly criticising our different political parties, and direct our verbal attacks on those who lead, it does not mean we attack a persons individual character, only what they represent!

You, on the other hand, who as radicals, fanatically defend something you do not really understand, and in doing so, show the world that you in particular, are not ready for democracy, and are actually undermining its principles. You, are following '*a nobody's*' existence of trying to belong to something, but only as fodder, instead of learning, what it is you think, you support, and comparing it with other options, and then to become part of it, instead of; only its baggage! Anyone, who considers that radicalisation of its members, advances their cause, is in fact, their own, worst enemy. Any party, who after 16 years of failed actions would have at least had the sense to notice something was wrong, and enough compassion, for helping their own suffering people, to make change?

If you do cannot grasp the message below, or more importantly, feel its bite, then you are not worthy to represent those before you. Wild uncontrolled anger does not solve problems against a violent aggressor, but determined controlled anger can!

The Soldier:

“When one has touched bottom, become lowest of the low and willingly plumbed the depths of human misery, there comes from it a silent understanding and appreciation of what solidarity, friendship and human kindness to others can mean. Something that is difficult to explain to those unfortunates, who are on the outside of our club, who have never experienced what it means to be dirt and yet to be privileged to be surrounded by life long comradeship”.

By;

Ronald Searle, who was a prisoner of war under the Japanese.

We have always stood up for democracy; perhaps even more so than our civilian counterparts simply because we have been among the blood and guts of futile slaughter of innocent people, who are preyed upon by ruthless dictators. Our compassion, sealed, with passion, for peace and harmony, comes from living in hells back yard, while the pacifists, only because they lack the courage and compassion, to

make great sacrifices, preaches peace. They do so, from the safety and comfort of their guilt-edged platforms, and seek only to seal their own personal power craving, by allowing the weak to suffer and die on their behalf.

The cobra strikes in defence because it knows of no other way; therefore, it must be contained or killed so the defenceless can live and move around in safety. Radicals are the cobras of tyrannical regimes, whose leaders care not, whether they live or die, so long as there are enough of them, to do their dirty deeds. If a King Cobra, shared Sein Wins or Suu Kyi's home, would they try to pacify it. Would they sleep soundly at night? The people of Burma have to live with the cobra, and fear its strike, which could happen without warning or compassion!

Long before the Sein Wins, and the Suu Kyi's, just to name two prominent figures we can all relate too, there were those, who from day one, fought to free the people and country they loved. They confronted the cobra head on. Even though fear drenched their bodies, they braved its venom so others may sleep peacefully.

During and after, WW2, the few gave their all, to first, create, then to stabilise Burma's fragile, new democracy. Even then, there were those lower ranked individuals, who craved power. General Aung San's assassination was not over policy or wrong doings; it was purely for power, no matter what repercussions it bought to Burma. The same applied to Prime Minister U Nu's overthrow, in 1962, and again when members of his own party betrayed him in nothing more than a power struggle. Because of these power hungry individuals, Burma, was dragged, into the pit of despair, instead of becoming a peaceful democracy that would have led the whole of SEA into a new era, and the wars in that region may never have occurred? With the actual history of events in mind, is that really a legacy to be proud?

Many judge Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi, as the same. These comparisons are massively out of focus with the real world, and prevent help from arriving to those who could use it best to further Burma's future democracy. This is not condemning either individual; they both stand for what they believe, though the motivation, means and anticipated rewards are very different. With Mandela, he expected and was willing, to die behind the gun, or, become a prisoner and hanged, or imprisoned for a long time. Suu Kyi on the other hand, thought she was impregnable with the west behind her, and in particular, Britain. She was extremely naïve both to the threat to her safety, and to the level of power the regime had. She depended on superstition and her fathers name to protect her. She was politically inept, if she believed, that her death may hinder the SPDC, or, she was wise enough, or aware of; that keeping her alive actually benefits the regime?

Attempts on her life, again through the eyes of naivety, were simply not attempts, as any agency will point out. Had the regime wanted her gone, they would not have failed such a simple task. Conspiracy theorists, say, that she is kept in confinement, at the request of Britain, just as Mandela was, to keep the spirit alive, but to tone down, or prevent, any serious upheaval that may threaten the power base of the regime until foreign policy status is acceptable. If Suu Kyi's policy was armed struggle, she would have set up in the jungle, or left Burma, and set up abroad, because then her life would have been in serious danger, and the regime would have more reason to expect uprising. However, if that were the case, she would never have risen to where she is,

because western help would never have materialised! That, in itself, should reveal a great deal?

All the above, is no longer seen, as beneficial to the people of Burma, more so by those who have lived and fought in the jungle for decades without any support from the NLD, or its satellites, which leaves a sour taste in the mouths of those who have.

Misconceptions lead to disillusionment..

In Comparison Suu Kyi does not, as Andrew Marshall, describes in Time magazine, and we believe is misplaced, have the same qualities as her father, General Aung San. Yes, it is criminal to incarcerate her; it is also criminal in the eyes of the Burmese, to equal her political prowess and fighting spirit, with that of Aung San. For anyone to make such a statement, more so a foreigner is evidence of their lack of real knowledge into Burma history, culture and affairs.

However, that is not the story. The story is; all too often, history makes heroes out of those who join the game after the battle. In Suu Kyi's case, her commitment is more through guilt than devotion, because the Burmese people disinherited her after her defection in Burma's time of need, to Britain. Now the elders are speaking openly, and the myth created by the western media is falling by the wayside. If supposed Burma experts knew their field, they would know that the NLD and Suu Kyi are rarely, discussed today, due to access of information via the internet, and by elders who lived it. If these media know all, new all, it would register in their little brains, that the regime will never at any cost, allow Suu Kyi to hold any office, no matter how menial, any time in the foreseeable future.

Very few people are privy to Burma's struggle before 1988, therefore few are authorised to debate it.

More importantly, rekindled action from participants and former members of General Aung San's inner circle of the 30 comrades, who have a closer comparison to him, than Suu Kyi could ever have, have stepped in to revitalise the people. One of these moves was the revitalising of the Parliamentary Democracy Party, founded by Burma's first elected Prime minister, U Nu, a close friend and comrade in arms, to Aung San, to take up the fight against the regime, after he was ousted by General Ne Win.

In 1962, General Ne Win ousted the elected Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, from office. There have been a catalogue of verbal reasons why, but a coup is a coup, and is purely for power. However, it is important to know what happened next. This important piece of missing history has therefore, been briefly recorded by those who lived it. If America were to forget its civil war history, its arrival to the present day would have a big question mark. Cromwell's part in English history, if removed, would have the same affect. The brief history I have attached is as important to international scholars as well as, those from Burma. This inside story is as much a mystery to them as it is the world outside of politics, because the regime withheld history, and Western / Asian politics, directed Burma's path before and since, right up to the present day.

The Internet has allowed stories to be told, that otherwise would not have. The western media still choreographs Burma's pro-democracy status, but again because of

the internet and the continuing growth of the PDP, this hold has begun to crumble, as more Burmese learn the truths and the lies.

Moreover, whatever results in the future, any serious debate on Burma cannot go ahead without the Parliamentary democracy Party (PDP), and new parties, established since 1990.

If the world wishes to help Burma, it must change course according to the wind.

UKorg.

UK.org.

Member Comment:

06 November 2006

CLASH OF AMBIGUITIES FROM THE WEST AND AMBITIONS FROM THE EAST

Particularly the West has overly misinterpreted Burma 's pro-democracy activity up until 1988 to 1990, and the period leading up to the present day. As I see it, this is the main reason, why little or no help was ever generated toward the people who could really do something toward removing the regime. I also believe that the major benefactor to having a dictatorship in place, in Burma , is the UK . The whole attitude of British state bureaucracy has been, and is still, both intimidating and subversive. From first ignoring U Nu's plea of help, in the early days of him being deposed by Ne Win, right up to a visit to London, headed by General Bo Mya (Karen) of the '*Democratic Alliance of Burma*' (*DAB*) U Tin Maung Win, chairman, '*Committee of Restoration for Democracy in Burma*' (*CRDB*). Bo Aung Din (*present Chairman of the PDP*) joined the delegation at the time, as the *UK's*, *CRDB's* head administrator. This undermining and down right ignorant attitude, of British state bureaucracy, in failing to recognise these men as state representatives of the majority population in Burma , of both ethnic and Burman, continued during future meetings with *PDP Chairman*, Bo Aung Din. His unhappy and embarrassing experiences of being intimidated, and made to feel insignificant, just as General Bo Mya's delegation, were, and U Nu before them, was beaten by their superiority over the British, of their understanding of a peaceful mind, and was therefore, able to accommodate the arrogance aimed at them with ease. This is outstanding credit to those men, who have suffered decades, to stand proud, even though they may have felt disillusioned by their encounters with British state bureaucracy.

All these men displayed exemplary diplomacy and respect toward the British representatives, but it is clear today, that the British, was only interested, in collating information in regard to the strength of opposition against a regime, they, preferred to keep in place?

Those supporters of Burma should not come under the influence, of what appears to be, more attention applied to Burma , this is nothing more than a ploy.

Conspiracy theories can always be denied, but never disproved.

Both governments and those opposing government use these theories.

The theory that the NCGUB, is in collaboration with the west, to slow the process of democracy in Burma, would normally be ridiculed quite easily, but, for the length of time it has failed in all its supposed efforts to remove the regime, along with the west's employed, foreign policy in SEA, over the past twenty years?

One workable tactic to add to this buffer would be for ASSK (possibly not realised by her, as Mandela's incarceration was not understood by him, until perhaps now?) to be detained, in Burma , her image status to be boosted world wide, by the media. This would divert attention away from any other possible threat to the regime, by using ASSK's detention as a human rights subject. Up until now, it has worked. Those who operate in the field of subversive operations would be familiar with this type of tactic, which has been deployed to many parts of the world, for generations.

Diversion?

The western media have always portrayed the ethnic people's as the main sufferer under the regime, and that it is purely an ethnic problem, giving the impression that it is the whole Burman population that is persecuting them.

This is a complete fabrication of the truth; it lays instant judgment against all the Burman people. Again, this diverts any possible aid to other activists from the Burman perspective. This injustice, allowed the regime the freedom to expand its power base, because, naïve, ill informed or by design, foreigners, who could have helped, believed, that to help any Burman group, was to aid the regime. In truth, Burman opposition, the **PDP**, was the only opposition in the field of conflict, that the regime had on Burman territory, because the ethnics, as said many times before, only defended their own lands and its borders, they rarely ventured far into Burman ground.

Unfortunately, there was little opposition from the majority Burman population, after deposed Prime Minister U Nu's, party politics fell into disarray. Brought about, mainly from lack of financial support, due to the complete miss understanding of Burma politics by foreigners at the time, and of course influenced by the west's foreign policy, but also by the clash of personal ambition, of those who wanted to succeed U Nu. These people were more interested in their own power climb, then the freedom of Burma. By initiating a party split, they inadvertently, or perhaps by design, crippled any chance of a fighting chance against the military regime.

If a person was to pool, every incident, right up to the present day, they would be able to concoct a memorising catalogue of implications directed at numerous individuals, as to why Burma is still terrorised, by a military dictatorship, with no substantial assistance from those countries who preach freedom and democracy, to remove it!

As the regime started to occupy ground, once held by U Nu's forces, it became increasingly more difficult to oppose regime troops in open engagements, so guerrilla tactics were incorporated into their training. Because of lack of funds, it was not logistically viable to survive in Burman territory, therefore; they sought alliance with ethnic groups, allowing the **PDP** to base their HQ's inside their border perimeters. This continued for many years, where PDP fighters engaged with regime troops often in the ranks of ethnic soldiers.

Just like General Aung San, at the end of WW2, U Nu became to think like a soldier first, and politician 2nd. This had a profound influence on his way of thinking. A soldier will find gratification from doing his/her duty in defence of their countries freedom. Soldiers seek no reward, only the smiles of contentment on people's faces. For some however, that have no remorse or compassion, even for their own countrymen/women; reward, status and power, is the ultimate prize, irrespective of sacrifice or suffering.

It was U Nu's, devoted compassion for Burma, that led him to fall prey, to unscrupulous power seekers twice, firstly under Ne Win, then to certain members of his own party.

At this point in time, the NLD did not exist, and very few westerners took notice of Burma , other than those who fought there during WW2, against the Japanese.

In Brief, it all began when members of the PDP, notably men like U Tin Maung Win and Bo Aung Din (current Chairman of the PDP) arrived in the West, where they instantly began activities to make Burma's troubles known to the world. U Tin Maung Win went to the USA , Bo Aung Din to the UK . The Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Burma (CRDB) was formed, the first real pro-democracy element formed outside of Burma . Win was its Chairman, Bo Aung Din, head of UK department, where he organised the very first demonstration outside the Embassy of Burma, in London . This was ultimately, the beginning of Burma 's window opening up, to reveal its problems to a sleeping world. In an instant, these two brave men, along with others, after fighting and surviving in Burma , under immense pressures and stress, brought the world into their war.

Then along came ASSK, to tread the path cleared for her by the likes of U Nu, U Tin Maung and Bo Aung Din. Just to name a few. If it had not been for the activities of both these men, and their associates, events in Burma would have gone completely un-noticed by the world, which meant 8/8/88 might not have happened, or would have been ignored, which means the NLD would not have come to be, because it was western money which financed it.

A few good men, who emblazoned Burma 's plight in front of the world, set the whole stage. Moreover, today, others steal the glory because those who crawled through the blood of their families and comrades, are not power seekers, these men and women only want to bring peace and freedom to their countrymen/women.

Mick J
A UKorg member.

UK.org.

Member Comment:

03 November 2006

A SHARED, COMMON GOAL, WITHOUT WHICH, LEADS TO NOWHERE.

Federalism - Socialism- Communism - Republicanism- etc. etc.

There are many interpretations of life and its social infrastructures. People put names to anything and everything; consequently, we have words to describe all things known and, the hypothetical. Then, along come the interpretations, or rather, the problem road, interpretations to suit policy or will. Of course, we need names and titles, otherwise how are we going to identify with life and the actions of humankind. Its the variations of interpretations that cause the misunderstandings and confusion.

Descriptive names are very often confusing when different cultures first meet with them. If a person, were to be introduced to me, by my nick name, they will attempt to interpret its origin, which, more often than not, is way off course, as will their first impression of my culture and character. Whereas; had this person shadowed my path through life, he/she would have a much better understanding of me, and would know exactly how to approach me in all subjects. When judging the origin of a culture, name or title, a person, will, interpret as they see it. Moreover; their findings will be influenced by their own experience of life, whether it comes from academia, which is the view of others before you, as the persistent quotations often remind us, though not always right, or, living experience, by integrating with all or many aspects of cultured societies. Many academics together with the, intelligentsia, rarely set foot outside of their own mind and are oblivious to real life; (*stems from my duties as a close protection officer to government scientists and the like*) let alone live the life they are constantly trying to influence. One particular professor, although a kindly man, had spent his entire life, up to then, in the surroundings of a well know university, where he became a renowned physicist. We used to sit together in his rooms, where he sat with pricked ears, as I told of my life and the experiences of the world. He was like a child being read to, from a fantasy tale; his questions became more and more bizarre, questions, which can only come from a mind that of which has never seen beyond its imagination. The results of his work, or the people it may ultimately affect, appeared beyond his understanding, but at the same time, he would never intentionally tread on spiders or ants, he regarded them as the planets true intellects. He died without even visiting the coastline of his own country, whereas; his work will affect the way we live for many generations to come, or, until someone decides his work was flawed. On the other hand, I have accompanied others, whose work was considered irrelevant, at the time, but found to be very relevant later, unfortunately, when its effectiveness was minimal. (I do hope the point strikes home!)

The nearest a person can get to becoming factual about life, therefore eligible to understand it, is to be part of it, not as a visitor, but as a living segment of it. Many of those who preach about life, or strive to change it, are not! A journalist, through the media, will report events, but rarely understand its deep-rooted origins, which in turn,

will portray only an outlined picture, once archived, to be studied in the future, where, it will be completely misinterpreted, making future solutions for similar events, worthless, if not inflammatory. Their time will come later to record history, but today, **Burma needs trails blazers, not concept theorists who have no idea as to the realities on the ground.** What worked elsewhere will not work in Burma . Burma is a wilderness of uncertainties, and only those who know the game, the ground, and who dare, can play. The rules, as in any war become nothing more than guidelines, as situations are unpredictable. As in, any battle, new rules are made up as progress improves conditions, and new infrastructures are built along the way. It must be understood that Burma is at war with itself; therefore, adversaries decide upon rules of engagement, not the naive onlooker. War is not a game where road signs attempt to guide us; thinking, is done on the ground, at the time of engagement. The only rule is to stay alive and to win. As you move forward, those administrators following will set up new infrastructures, to govern and secure what you have succeeded in winning. Modern day societies are constantly making new laws as others become outdated and no longer suit requirements, such is the method as conflict progresses forward.

Fighting a war from a desk and thousands of miles away while the enemy grows stronger, and more suffering is inflicted on the innocents, is not the way forward. Speak to the UK and USA about the Middle East, to verify these words. Either fight or die. Those who do not fight should shut up, because there is no other way forward!

If the Burman population have to go it alone under the right leadership, then that is what should happen. The ethnics can decide what part to play, is best for them, but what they do need, is a democratic government in Rangoon , before any advancement on their own front can be made.

CAUSE FOR CONFLICT:

Different schools and different cultures, will teach different interpretations on the world and its history, thus creating, instant conflicts of interest.

A COMMON BOND:

Who better, to fight Burma's war against tyranny, than those who lived the struggle on the ground? Who better, than those who know and understand the needs of the diverse cultures, which now are blocking the way forward?

The regime knows exactly how to turn ethnic against ethnic for example. So why can't, the ethnics understand that together, they can break the regimes hold over them. They must find a common bond. If that bond is democracy, then use it as a strategic goal, and physically go for it, and not simply cry out for it. As every soldier knows, once a strategic target is confirmed, plans must then be put into play. 1 by 1 tactical moves, taking ground as one moves forward. Sometimes, ground will be lost, and new tactics considered. This can only be achieved through shared intelligence between all those concerned. If a working partnership cannot be, then the plan is worthless. If this is the case, Burma's internal war will go on forever, and everyone is wasting everyone's time.

If we imagine, that the regime was to be removed from power, by whatever means, how do those who suggest it, really believe that a federal system would work with the present climate of political immaturity?

- a. Draw up borders around what is considered Burman
- b. Fight to remove the regime.
- c. Establish a democratic government.
- d. Call together the ethnics and discuss their options?
- e. Someone has to make a decision for Burma's future. It has to start somewhere. Moreover, unfortunately, it will not come peacefully!
- f. It takes brave people to acknowledge risk and repercussions of conflict, but history is full of it, and without these people we would still be living in the dark ages of tyranny. It takes an even braver person, to place him/her self in the front line to show his conviction is as good as his/her word.

The **PDP**, have made the first move to push Burma's people into realising the reality of the situation. If others fail to acknowledge it, Burma's downfall is on their heads, and the history books will reveal that!

Terry; a UK.org. Member.

UK.org.

Collective Comment:

02 November 2006:

CONFRONT YOUR DEMONS:

This comment is in response to the many email messages we receive on Burma , from, individuals of Burma . They feel they cannot confront the NLD, or the NCGUB, because of the single-minded attitudes of both groups. They instead, join a growing number of nationals from Burma , who contact us, so that we may express their frustrations, and it seems anger. They reveal, that those who worry do so, not so much, of their countries past and present, which they consider, raises too many irrelevant arguments and in fighting, because very few people are qualified to debate it. It's their future, which concerns them. Because of the constant tunnel vision approach to political thinking, this stems more from personal egos and ambitions, than solving Burma's dilemma, ignited by the lack of foresight and strategy back in 1990, leading to, today's quagmire.

Many of a younger Burma generation, have made it their ambition to study modern politics. Their findings are what everyone else has concluded, which is the complete lack, of sincere effort to unify a multi-party opposition under one roof. However; the NLD, NCGUB, refuse to acknowledge this, and do not want to accept it. Is this not a clear sign that the NLD and NCGUB are more concerned about their personal existence, than the freedom of Burma ?

If there were more eligible political parties, who hold the support of a registered fixed number of people, combined also, with an infrastructure, qualifying them as competent to operate as a government, it would allow for a better, although not accurate, census of the voting public, and not simply a chosen few?

These two bodies The NLD, and the NCGUB, cannot, proof of which is now history, speak for all; the vast membership of the PDP is proof of that. Representing every aspect of Burma 's mixed cultural societies takes more than one voice; it requires a multitude of voices, as displayed in any democracy, under a chosen system. Without this representation, any democratic ambition will simply cancel itself out.

Because, few understand the intricacies of politics, they are not aware, of the traps, linked to a tri-partite set up for example, as opposed to a multi-party platform. In a country like Burma , where there are a number of ethnic nations, it would not work by having just one voice for them as a group, one voice for the Burmans, and one for the regime. Debate, would forever, be locked in stalemate, as it has been for decades. Had the NLD, been handed power in 1990, all those sub-NLD associates, under its wing, would soon have faced the reality that their memberships of the NLD clan, hold no power of influence in major government policy when it came down to satisfying ethnic policy requirements. The Burman majority population would have overwhelmingly influenced decision-making. It would have been politically unworkable to operate as a government and to meet everyone's wishes in such a vast complex of cultural differences. The next move, would have been splits in the alliance, leading to another coup, as in 1962?

Back in 1990, when the NLD won an election, which everyone accepts, but most were not prepared for, there was no real line of opposition running against the regime, least of all, an equal balance of representatives among ethnic diversity within their own lands.

HARD TRUTHS THAT MUST BE CONFRONTED IN OPEN DEBATE:

There are still, ethnic representatives, with the letters, NLD, at the end of their ethnic title. There is no other real representation for other mixed feelings among their own people in the wider debate; the splits within numerous ethnic groups are evidence to this. They were, and are still, military type leaderships; because none of the ethnics themselves has any system of standard democracy within their own society, so people's representation, is absent. These groups appear to want the democratic advantages within a national equilibrium, but not within their own societies. Of course, a federal system would suit their needs. They can enter the world stage as one nation, but their own societies, or States, will retain the same, USING THE EXCUSE THAT CHANGE TAKES TIME? This attitude brings the risk of State civil war., leading to yet another coup.

If ethnic groups cannot stay loyal to themselves, how do the NLD, or any other future government, expect loyalty to be honoured toward them and democracy?

Perhaps the ethnics should first get their own house in order, by establishing fully-fledged democracies. Start by Cooperating with other ethnics to form their own confederation, allowing the majority Burman population, to establish their own democratic system, in its own right, with its borders ending where ethnic borders join. During the period it takes to nurture the new confederation, perhaps, the newly established ethnic nations can become protectorates of Burman central government, without, the controlled aspect to it. Everyone could then enjoy the economic growth that democracy would bring. When the time is right, and long thought out solutions has been agreed upon, all can live under one national flag if they choose?

BUT?

Some suggest that it is not viable to create a multi-party infrastructure within individual ethnic societies at this stage of their history, allowing for a simplistic version of democratic principles to operate. We have different ideas on that, as do those who write to us.

If a particular society, lets say an ethnic group, can organise an army, with its command infrastructure of rank and file, together with its different levels of unit capabilities and armaments, each commanded by its own commander and subordinates, and administers their own troop strengths and activities, then it should be able to create the same but in civilian mode. A military infrastructure is no different to a civilian network of administration; it's only the mentality and tasking that is different! Replace the military personnel with bureaucratic civilians, and you have the perfect local administrator. Some would have us believe, that the terrain and dispersed population, along with the diverse life styles, would not allow organised structuring of administration. Between 1990 and today, a great deal could have been achieved if the will to do something was there. No time like the present!

UK.org.