

21 June 2009

“Rubbing their noses in the dirt” is not the way forward!

Those around world who are sympathetic toward Suu Kyi and Burma, had both in their thoughts over the period of her birthday and call for her release, we also have her in our thoughts but as a human being among many others. Without prejudice, we place her in the same category as the many other political prisoners in Burma, each and everyone of whom voluntarily place themselves in harms way in the struggle for freedom without a second thought for their own safety but do not receive the same moderate treatment as Suu Kyi no matter how cruel it is portrayed in the west, in fact, on each occasion that Suu Kyi is placed on the frontpages, or given some kind of honour, the regime become stricken with rage and vent that rage upon other prisoners, or the innocent population of some village, many not surviving, or worse, have to live out their lives as cripples after severe beatings and torture! Suu Kyi is made aware of this, so the pain of being responsible is inflicted upon her, which cannot be an easy burden to bear, however, the moral of this story must be; what does she expect to come from it. Her willingness to allow herself to be restricted in her movements, may very well be in vain, as what will happen, could very well, have come about anyway?

Beneficiaries; who are they?

Despot controlled nations, nations without a government, countries where anarchy is ripe, etc. etc. These are places major powers enjoy total freedom to do precisely what they want without the world knowing they are on the ground playing their dominant games. If they want to extract a particular mineral from the ground, or perform military experiments, they simple create a local rebel group with the help of professional mercenaries, which acts as bodyguard, and even get their own home government to condemn their acts of inhumane treatment of the local population, who in turn, say; that they cannot interfere in the internal problem of a foreign country, where have we heard that before?

Many if not all, celebrities, industrialists, and the like, are supplied with information regarding, in this case; Suu Kyi and Burma, from government institutions, or those financed by them, be they diplomats, desk officers, ambassadors, politicians, but never from those on the ground, quite simply, because they would never dream of getting their shoes dirty, let alone place themselves at risk, so their contribution, that they believe is going in the right direction, is actually camouflaging the true situation, unfortunately, most do not even care, so long as they are seen to be the good guys and as a result improves their own image and feeds their ego!

Attacks on Suu Kyi by the SPDC, is without doubt, undeserving and cruel, the same must be said about the thousands of other political prisoners. With Suu Kyi's case however, blame could be directed in part, toward the; 'free world', for encouraging the escalation of antagonism inflicted toward her by the SPDC with its continued promotion of her as some god like figure, she is after all only human, but putting her on par with today's celebrity craze of gormless mentalities, created purely as a profit making enterprise for both those who are willing to allow themselves to be ridiculed and those whom promote the gullible and/or the defenceless makes a mockery not only of Suu Kyi's intelligence, her political standing, and a deep insult to her integrity, but more so of the thousands locked up and who never see daylight of a decent meal. It

is no compromise simply to mention; *'other prisoners'*, when placing Suu Kyi above the clouds, because she will never be in a position to help them in the same way that those who have died for Burma. Those who survive in prison chained, in dirty unhygienic conditions and who are suffering more than perhaps they would, if their torment was not made worse by the regimes hatred of Suu Kyi?

As the saying goes; *"rubbing their nose in the dirt"*, may have been the objective of the worlds 'free press' but humiliation stands more chance of inciting an angry response, than it does of forcing them; the SPDC, into an embarrassing submission?

Had Suu Kyi, been promoted more accurately, as a prominent, as in; *'Aung Sans' daughter'*, political figure, with foreign sympathisers, together with *'other'* Burmese political platforms, it would have been a pointless tactic for the SPDC to have placed the emphasis on her alone, because it would have forced them to fight opposition on a number of political fronts instead of being offered, on a plaque no less; the advantage position of just one, where they, the SPDC, control the whole battlefield because they have removed the only opposition that they consider the bigger threat, from the game!

The whole Suu Kyi experience comes about from; inexperienced politics, right from the start. The NLD never expected to win the 1990 election, more importantly; it had no fall back options when the results were rejected by the regime. As a political entity, they were completely out of their depth. Accompanied by school-boy diplomatic skills combined with egotistic ambitions, all fed from greed, leading the NLD, and the NCGUB, though notably the latter, in the direction of failing the people of Burma, because their selfish appetites took them away from the bigger picture preferring instead to ignore what was obvious, and to ostracise themselves, refusing even, to acknowledge, let alone invite other parties into the circle they saw as their domain. This action has placed Burma and Suu Kyi where both are today!

What the SPDC will not tolerate, is intimidation just like the proverbial spoiled child, even though it's a weapon they use frequently themselves, but then, it is they that have the upper hand, but when it's directed at them they react to it like cold water thrown onto a hot stove, and what does the world do; throw even more cold water when in fact, it should be removing the coal from the fire!

Suu Kyi is not a threat to the SPDC politically, apart from the fact that she is untested in politics, unlike Nelson Mandela, (*mentioned* because many, though wrong as they are, appear to place both individuals in the same basket) who was active until his capture, and of course encouraged aggressive action, whereas; ASSK preaches non-violence! This aspect of her character places Suu Kyi more in the role of *'patron'* to the NLD, supported by the fact that she is not an *'elected'* member of any political party due to her not being allowed to participate as a candidate in the 1990 election.

Any such selection can now only be served by new elections where candidates from other parties would be in contention!

The new image of Suu Kyi today; is identified by the new young generation of activists, as many are now proclaiming, she is seen more in the role of; *'patron to democracy'*, irrelevant as

to whom wins it, or how it comes about. They also acknowledge, that the NLD, once seen as the key to the door of democracy has now realised that the locks have been changed and a new key needs to be found?

Without any proven track record, acknowledgement of a persons abilities is left to the media of the free world to create the image best suited to the cause, in Burma's case; it's more to do with; who or what is best for foreign governments, and not necessarily what is good for Burma? Foreign governments want to dictate what it is they want from Burma , instead of Burma making offers that benefit them!

To continue the iconic promotion of Suu Kyi, is to hold back democracy, whilst provoking yet more antagonistic behaviour from the regime leaders, more so from its boss, Than Shwa, whom cannot bear, even to hear Suu Kyi's name, that in itself, is placing Suu Kyi into imminent danger, a consequence that no free world government or media would be willing to accept liability for?

The media of the '*free world*'; does of course suggest credibility to its promotions by boasting a free press, but all that simply means of course, is that, the media magnets, depending on what side of the political fence they sit, instead of being threatened into acting as a government voice, it works voluntarily with it, and between themselves, can make or break anyone they choose too without risk of arrest, whether deserving or not, it all depends solely upon what gains can be made from it and by whom, irrespective of any risk that it may draw toward a person/s chosen to be the principle. Typically, it would be considered; as a price worth paying for!

The present means of promoting democracy in Burma from the outside is grossly counter-productive, simply because it is all talk and no commitment, inviting nothing but continuous antagonism directed at the people who have to bear the brunt, when instead it should be seeking forms of compromise through direct threats to the regime power base, no matter how futile to begin with, but either way, can only be achieved from a position of strength and not through continuous rhetoric because there is too much individual ambition forcing division and preventing the right person with the leadership qualities to take things forward?

The present means of promoting Burma's struggle also incites internal bias toward other democracy fighters that have and continue to make immense sacrifices on behalf of their country.

The present divide and manipulate tactic, to serve the preferred foreign policy of outside governments, cannot be allowed to continue and must be countered by the people of Burma themselves if they are ever to become their own masters in a free society, to choose what is best for them and their children!

Equalise the balance of opposition and it will make the population resolute in standing shoulder to shoulder, not in competition, but in unification. Only the people of Burma can bring this about with a '*parallel-election*', in direct competition with the regimes election call in 2010, but it can only come to fruition under one chair, until such time as fair and equal government elections can take place. ASSK is unable to occupy this chair for obvious reasons, Sein Win although would dearly love to occupy it, but has proven to be pseudo in his efforts and is

therefore; far from acceptable, leaving only one other; Bo Aung Din, Chairman; Parliamentary Democracy Party (PDP Burma) But of course the people would have to determine the result by studying each manifesto put forward accompanied with the individuals and their parties portfolio.

Political opposition to the SPDC, need to stand together, to join forces on equal standing, differences must be put aside in the mean time allowing for a multi-party debate to seek out the best solution to oust the SPDC.

(Individual political parties will have the opportunity to run their campaign once a door into the early stages of a democracy can be opened)

If the opposition was seen to accommodate a section of leader quality individuals representing all aspect of Burma 's diverse population, identified by each being intellectually capable of accepting their own individual qualifications and accepting posts accordingly, then taking the fight to the regimes front door could be made possible. It is very easy for those whom know what to look for, to quickly realise the awesome, collective power that could be harnessed against the regime?

Within such a scenario, it would be a pointless exercise for the SPDC to hold Suu Kyi to ransom, because it would not stop the ball rolling forward, whereas; today, it does! If the SPDC continued to hold Suu Kyi, even after a broad front line opposition was prominent, then the regimes motive for holding her would prove to be more than just political, and it would have far reaching consequences for the regime on a level not yet experienced by them!

Note: If as some reports mention; that underground bunkers and tunnel systems have been built so the regime can take refuge in times of panic, let us hope that they have to put it to the test soon, the tunnels could then be sealed entombing the tunnel rats in their lair. We can only hope?

Sandy D.
A UKorg member