

**UK-org.**

**Member Comment:**

**27 January 2008**

**SPECTATORS or PARTICIPANTS?**

Perhaps Burma's dilemma has dragged on because the people of Burma, for too long, have been mere spectators of their own demise, not really understanding the script or where it was leading, completely oblivious to the plot!

The people of Burma must become the players and stage their own destiny. They must write the script, produce and direct if they are to have any future as a free people!

There have been many contradictions in terms, as to the part played by U Nu in the coup of 1962. We now know, that many 'untruths', were directed at him, which he did and does not deserve. It could be, that his strong desire to make Burma a strong independent united country, free from an outside influences, was his downfall?

**U Nu's downfall?**

As a democrat, he would have to seek a further mandate from the people and Parliament to have sanctioned an alliance with the West, who; since the mid 50's was undertaking operations in SEA, which became more involved after the French were humiliated at Dien Bien 1954 therefore; he was, or his democratically elected government was; a hindrance to their foreign policy?

During U Nu's imprisonment and after, there was only one group among the Burmans that offered any kind of retaliation against Ne Win, and if; U Nu had been aware of the West's 'intentions' at the time, in SEA, notably the US, before the coup, or, had become aware later, of the 'hypothetical' events outlined in this comment, would show reason why he persevered to motivate a people into rebellion, even though he was under great stress, brought about by negative outside influences, due to, the now raging war in Vietnam,

**Political ambition and its sacrificial lambs:**

Even though armed resistance against the regime has been ongoing since 1962 continuing through U Nu's incarceration, the funding for this action has always been a problem. It had been certain ethnic groups who managed to continue armed resistance if only for selfish reasons and not objectively aimed at a unified Burma, but for them too, the situation in recent years has become non-viable.

**Was;** the ethnic story in Burma, coupled with disagreements by some, with U Nu's government, *(to which; growth in just about every spectrum of society can be contributed, and cannot be disputed)* used as the ticket to exercise unrest, and an excuse to use this scenario as Burma's reason for a military coup, and to prolong the status quo for as long as it was necessary?

There are many questions to be answered, but sadly today, many who held the answers are gone. But, as with historians and archaeologists alike, with information available, and a clear picture of today's world, resulting from the past, scenarios can be set, allowing us to hypothesise events?

As mentioned already, during the years from 1962 to the present day, there have been Burman resistance, but for many years, they operated from ethnic strongholds, often operating alongside ethnic troops. All resistance fighters have had to suffer great hardships, always with the hope that funding would appear allowing for them to become a severe threat to the regime, forcing them to a negotiating table which would not be one sided.

### **Coincidental?**

After the coup in 1962, Prime Minister U Nu, was imprisoned because Ne Win was only too aware of his popularity and it would have been only a matter of time before he raised an army of volunteers to reinstate democracy, which could very well have destabilised the US's intentions in Vietnam, he therefore; kept him in prison until he had strengthened his own position on Burma's society. The whole thing could have been orchestrated by the US or one of its puppets?

At this time the ethnics felt powerless to confront General Ne Win, little did they know, had they retaliated immediately, with help perhaps from other ethnics, and the Burman resistance, they could have dealt a heavy blow to him and his infrastructure, weakening his position before he had time to establish his hold, possibly even, preventing the war in Vietnam and surrounding countries, but not knowing just how much Ne Win had promised the US, would mean not knowing to what lengths they would assist to repel the ethnic and Burman resistance? If those countries who today, preach sympathy toward the Karen for example, never assisted them in a way which would have allowed them to at least retain their lands under strength of arms, least of all the British, who owed a debt of gratitude to them for their contribution during WW2, would not have the finger of blame, pointing at them today?

It would appear, then and now, that all threats aimed at removing Ne Win, had to be either, neutralised or weakened?

When U Nu was released from prison in 1967, although the regime was now firmly established he immediately drew up feasibility plans for a counter coup. He travelled the world trying to gain support but, the very countries he considered allies turned their backs on him, they had undertaken other plans for; South East Asia, such as the fight against communism, to which secret CIA and Mossad, operations had already been active during the latter part of his premiership, and during the years he was in prison.

'Coincidentally' some have said, that Ne Win was planning his coup around the same time or just after, US troops started to take casualties in Vietnam in late 1961? Prime Minister U Nu spent most of the period of US intervention in Vietnam, in prison. It would seem, that Ne Win was more useful to the US cause, whereas; dealing with U Nu, under the banner of a democratic country, encounters too many questions, debate and most valuable; time, as we witness when ever the UN has to sanction operations, whereas; a dictatorship requires no mandate from the people!

If one is to study the stages leading up to the Vietnam war, and for those who are familiar with the ways of the world, will quickly relate events from, as an example; 50's Korea, the French defeat in Dinh Binh in 54, Malaya, the 60's Borneo, all areas which were not directly influenced by Burma's geographical location except Dinh Binh?

You see, a democratic Burma would be seen as a problem, as with Thailand, both relevant in the coming events in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Burma, it would appear, was on its own, and would be until its usefulness run out, Thailand however, although not a despot in real terms compared to Ne Win's tyrannical rule, was not a democracy at this time, and so fell into bed with America, again because of 'its' geographical location, and again because Thailand's leaders did not have to respond to the people, and in return, received high reward for its cooperation. Today, Thailand is a prosperous country, and some resemblance of democracy is visible. But for Burma, isolation is still the name of the game, why?

In 1990, the regime was temporarily stunned at the election result. During the period directly after the elections until it was obvious that the NLD was not going to form a government, many soldiers both rank and file, would have deserted if called upon to do so, but once again, the opportunity was missed, why? Similarly, another opportunity was missed only months ago in September, October of 07, why?

The people of Burma are quick to blame each other, but are the real culprits yet to be unearthed?

The old saying; *'with friends like you, who needs enemies'*. I leave the guessing game to others, but have certain Burma politician's inadvertently or otherwise, climbed into bed with the devil that started the fire and continues to pour on petrol?

Many ask why the West, is only now beginning to give the impression it cares when in fact Burma has been their political tool for decades. The regime's biggest economic supporters over the years have been none other than the West!

The appearance of change comes about from the passing of time, not sympathy. Time is the reason for change. Prime Minister U Nu has gone, General Ne Win, General Bo Mya, along with too many other prominent people of the time to name.

The PDP, formed by U Nu, in 1970, struggled to stay a force to be reckoned with, but without adequate support, it was becoming almost impossible to confront the regime on anything near equal terms. The support from supposed allies never came because Burma was strategically important to their operations in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, especially if flight paths into Laos and North Vietnam were necessary?

It's ironic, that the very people who were evicted or escaped from the regime in Burma, became mercenaries in Thailand in order to be allowed to stay, and was employed to fight communist insurgents, in the South along the borders of Laos and Cambodia, all financed by the American CIA, the very people who kept the Regime in Burma, in power?

This theory is now history, buried deep in the archives probably never to be revealed, at least not before two or three generations have gone after us?

Now those involved are very old or have passed away, and the political lines of SEA have been drawn up. Those countries that configured the map of events, feel it is time to show concern but, without admitting it was their doing in the first place.

Britain opted out to send troops to Vietnam ; they consider that they done their bit in Malaya and Borneo , it could have been guilt but who knows, those Brits who did serve in Vietnam , done so in Australian uniforms, or American?

Due to events right through from the early to mid 60's, the 70's, 80's & 90's, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, although perhaps not as planned, are no longer seen as potential threats to the West. Western values, be they questionable, are established in many ways, if not set in concrete in some still practising communist countries in the region, people are aware of good living, and will not want to give them up easily, thus preventing, or at least, holding back any rapid return into once again, becoming a place where the West feels the need to impose its will?

### **Summary:**

For the West to accept U Nu, and today's PDP, would mean facing up to their own involvement in his downfall, and the total black out of the PDP today. They chose instead to create their own new face of Burma , where history will not be questioned and challenged. That new image of democracy, has, and is still ongoing, massive amounts of hyped up PR poured into it. It has completely overplayed its self, in that it has burned itself out. Over kill, is the term I would use? All it has achieved; is to create yet another regime of over enthusiastic followers of a particular mentality (*Its sole intention*) who can only see what is front of them, taking away all sense of choice and debate. So today, Burma has a single minded military dictatorship on one side, and a one way thinking young generation, on the other. Where is the progress in that?

It appears that someone wants to eradicate Burma 's history from 1947 onwards, and to install a puppet one party system, with a cloak of democracy, but only after those who participated and who could stand witness, in the making of today, have passed away, or, like Kun Nyunt, locked away?

Why would they want to do that?

Why does the BBC, which boasts of free speech, blah blah, all the other media outlets, refuse to give the PDP a platform. What is it that frightens them? Are they concerned that archives in their possession may be embarrassing in today's world? The fact that prominent journalists world wide, are snubbed if they want to expand Burma's political playing field, and are not given the window to do it means that governments are playing a major role in influencing even the biggest media outlets. This has actually made some journalists nervous about mentioning the PDP?

**This is serious stuff, when governments go to such great lengths in order to eradicate a political party, which was the heart of Burma, and the envy of SEA?**

They obviously believed that the PDP, was, for a better word; defunct, more so after U Nu passed away. Perhaps it was, it was forced to lay dormant for some years as a

political platform, although its members were still engaging in armed conflict against the regime. But once the message got through to a few dedicated men, that the 1990 election was a fiasco, followed by a further decade of non-conformity from the NLD, NCGUB believing they were a power unto themselves, or to the US, which ever hat fits, the PDP became a new light under its current Chairman, Bo Aung Din!

For too long Burma has been puppet to the West, which is still trying to impose its will, because still today does not want to give Burma back to the people? The PDP opened a new path, which many have followed. Outside influences however, who at first brushed aside the PDP as irrelevant, are now beginning to view it as a probable opposition to their own creation; ASSK and the NLD. It's only since the PDP started to show its potential, that the West upgraded their efforts to iconize ASSK, the latest edition being; that Spain is to make an award available to her. Now it is revealed; that a film of her life since 1988, is to be made.

Making ASSK into a prominent figure does not improve the chances of the regime stepping down, as the West know, that's why they chose ASSK as their toy, it does however; feed the hungry minds of the young with contemptuous demands, which place them in conflict with their elders, it turns Burmese against Burmese, adding delay to the never ending story. When and only when, the regimes paymasters and protectors decide the time is right will democracy find a home in Burma, and even then, by their rules, at least that may have been the plan, the PDP on the other hand, may have changed the rules, along with their time table, the whole game board in fact, and the pieces?

This may have upset the foreign policy plans of some?

#### **Participation of Monks:**

Perhaps if the monks are loyal to their doctrine, they will not be influenced by the bread basket of the West, However; if they decide to question the profile of Suu Kyi, they too, will become isolated, that there is no doubt.

If they continue on the Suu Kyi path without referring to other options, it means they too have been influenced by the psychological war set by the West?

My thoughts on the matter.

**Daren**, a UK-org member

**UK-org.**

**Member Comment:**

20 January 2008

Ref: Film Portrayal of ASSK:

Many of us read with interest, the comment made by our internet editor Steven Thomas. It's quite obvious that the subject would raise questions. A number of Burmese I know in the West, all refer to ASSK as more British than Burmese, and it is often said to me, "she must have been coerced into becoming involved, because she was too close to her family and life in England to have undertaken such a risky task, unless, she naively believed that it would not lead to where it has"? The last part of the sentence sounds about right. She sincerely believed it would all be over in a short time as did the many, none of whom, never actually contemplated the firm determination of the military regime to stay in power at all cost, because; ambition combined with naivety, blinded all concerned, and still does to this day, as witnessed by the antics of the younger generation, who have no idea what is it they are standing against. They see the monster and the carnage it crates, but they have no comprehension of the machine that fuels it, which is vital, if you want to take it on in a head to head fight. For a person of 20 or so, to take on a machine that has had decades to structure itself, is not only foolhardy, it jeopardises all the years of effort undertaken by some, to infiltrate into that machinery, whilst the NLD and Suu Kyi, sat on a pedestal waiting for outside help to solve the problem.

Many books have been written about Suu Kyi, none as helped to advance democracy, all they achieved, is to make money for those who see her as a meal ticket.

The Japanese producer of this film says that he has considered making it for some years. What he really means is this; He never had enough drama to captivate an audience, meaning, to warrant investment. In order to elevate an individual, one needs drama, loads of it, allowing him to place this individual right in the middle of it as the saving light. The September demonstrations gave it too him. This episode, like others before it, one can almost guarantee, will be hyped 10 fold, especially the unfortunate shooting of the Japanese journalist, which probably clinched the investment, because now Japan can claim fame by being on the spot in the struggle to free a people. I will leave it at that.

Is this the image to be portrayed, or will it glamorise what is fact?

The moral of this story; one of which, I hope will bring to their senses, the people who think they are the new founders of democracy. **They are not**, what they are actually doing is; jeopardising the years of undercover work, laying the foundations for the move into democracy with the least possible upheaval. Every time they antagonise the regime, the tighter it pulls in its reigns, making it more difficult for operatives to move about within the system.

There is nothing more hazardous for Burma, than a film portraying Suu Kyi as a leading light in Burma's struggle, it will antagonise the regime to a degree where I believe along with many others, into a wild frenzy, a rage so bad, the people of Burma will come to believe, that what they have already experienced, was in comparison, of what may come, as gentle! **It may even place ASSK in severe jeopardy. And what exactly, would the world do, invade Burma, I don't think so!**  
**This film should not be made until democracy has won, and Burma has something to celebrate!**

The flak from this film, will also jeopardise, all the hard work and sacrifices, made by those who have been selfishly fighting for freedom since 1962.

Let me give one hypothetical, example in this area; a middle of the road rank, let us say a Major, is in charge of a prison or, a unit in the field, or any other role within the machine, this Major is a democracy loyalist and infiltrator. It has taken 30 years for this person to reach a rank which allows him access to important information, he is suddenly confronted with a situation, where he has to punish, or even kill his own people, be it a pro-democracy activist, or an innocent child on the street, what is this person to do if he is to assist the struggle on the larger scale of things, he will of course, have to perform the duties expected of him by the regime! He would much prefer if a situation did not present itself in the first place, because eventually, the mental strain of killing your allies, even though cloaked, could be too much to bear, and we do know, that a number of military personnel, have committed suicide, or disappeared from view, probably after their identities were revealed because they refused to hurt or kill innocent people.

**A film glamorising the role of Suu Kyi**, will almost certainly impel activists to create more uncertainty, tempting the hand of the regime. September showed clearly, that the people do not have the stomach to rise up in their masses. Both, the countries urban and rural areas, are too isolated from each other, to produce any form of disciplined uprising!

What those young hot heads should do in Burma's case, is to leave the politics to the experts, who have years of practical experience, people who know how the regime thinks, people who have **decades** of intelligence at their disposal, government archive material built up during the term of office under Prime Minister U Nu. **No one else in Burma has this**, therefore; no one else possesses the political tactical capabilities of the PDP.

When the PDP, on behalf of Burma, not itself, offered its services to the NLD, NCGUB, it was snubbed as irrelevant. Even though the PDP had enough intelligence, dating back decades, which if revealed, would quickly destroy the characters of many, it chose not to, for the sake of Burma. It put the country first instead of political ambition, NLD, and NCGUB on the other hand, chose the latter. They feared, that by inviting the PDP into its midst, it would eventually come to depend on it, and in doing so, become less prominent through the eyes of the people, or more importantly, to be seen as less than capable themselves!

The PDP, at a later date, and after years of difficult and utterly professional diplomacy, negotiating abroad, laid a solution on the table.

After the years of stagnation, brought about by total incompetence and corruption, of the NLD and NCGUB, since the election of 1990, with no real pro-democracy representation, within Burma itself, considering that most democratic countries do not recognise any self promoting authority, when operating from foreign lands. Most countries, with opposing politics, have a divide line within its own boundaries, each controlling a segment of the country. And many, as with some in Africa , finally come together with the help of foreign diplomacy.

The proposition conceived by the PDP, would have put a; 'Burma' united power base within its own stable, and instead of referring to areas as 'ethnic' therefore, not referred to as a 'Burmese' political opposition but rather as being; ethnic nationalistically motivated, as thought of today, and ignored, would have become a united Burma front, where all pro-democracy elements, Burman and ethnic, would be identified as one. There would be no need to operate from other parts of the world; all the elected members of the 1990 election would have had a safe haven away from prosecution, where government could be set up.

With the joint efforts of the ethnic and Burman political and defence forces supported by their economies, boosted even more once government was recognised by the world, which of course, it would have, the regime would have no choice but to recognise it as such, and to use military force against this new development, where foreign support, certainly from Africa, would be forthcoming, even to the point of supplying requirements to survive and fight, would be a strategic mistake.

Also, the people of Burma would know it had a free unified territory, where they could move away from oppression, and contribute by increasing the economy of what would have still been Burma , but with a line passing through it, instead of flooding Thailand 's borders. We know it would have worked some of the best military and political minds in the world, concluded, after many months of study, using all the intelligence available, that; with recognition of government and support from Africa , the regime would quickly destroy itself if it attempted to invade. The very fact that many if not most of, the regime troops would have deserted to join forces in the liberated area is enough to have deterred them.

THE NCGUB, NOTABLY 'SEIN WIN' FLATLY REJECTED THIS PROPOSAL, BECAUSE IT MEANT HE WOULD LOSE A POWER BASE HE GREW TO LOVE, AND THE BENEFITS IT BROUGHT HIM. Apart from that; the thought of living in the jungle petrified this man, his own country, where living among the wild environment made him wince. In the UK-org archives, it tells of a member, who, when travelling with him on the river Salween , for a meeting with the late; General Bo Mya, noted down in his report, how petrified Sein Win was. As the only person to carry a life jacket, and for the few hours or so it took to reach the Karen location, he clung to the sides of the boat until his fingers went white. No one had the heart to inform him, that a life jacket in this rapid flowing river is more of a hazard than a life saver, as it would snare the many rocks and undergrowth, holding him under the waters savagery.

So, for one selfish frightened man, Burma was left to continue its suffering under the regime. ASSK would not be where she is now, NLD MP's, and its activist members would not have suffered as they have done. The fact that the world saw Suu Kyi,

then, as a leading opposition figure, means it would have wholeheartedly have supported her, and all the elected members of 1990, in exile, within Burma's own boundaries, who in turn would have had the full political support the PDP, and combined political brains of the ethnics, but this time, it would be categorised as the free Union of Burma, or something like that.

**It leaves the question; was Sein Win taking his orders from foreign puppeteers?**

**Is this film to portray all these factual events?**

**Ian Dunton**

**A UK-org member.**