

UK.org

Member Comment:

14 September 2006

∟€ HELP CAN ONLY BE GIVEN TO THOSE WHO HELP  
THEMSELVES!∟€

THOSE WHO ARE ABLE BUT STILL HOLD OUT THEIR HAND IN ANTICIPATION, AND TO  
SEEK REWARD, WITHOUT THEMSELVES CONTRIBUTING, ARE MALINGERERS WHOES  
JUST DESERVE IS THE REVELATION OF THEIR INEPTNESS IN THE EYES OF THOSE  
WHO THEY BOAST OF REPRESENTING!

History is full of inept leaders who take their country down the path of continuous  
doom and refuse to accept truth because they do not have the courage to face the  
consequences, and have the audacity to accuse those who do see it, and act on it, of  
unnecessary provocation of a given situation. In a democracy however; the opposite is  
also apparent when a leader does follow the signs of danger, and takes his/her country  
into a conflict, the burden of opposition, and the accusations of war monger, to  
mention just one, are callously thrust upon government. These are the thorns of  
democracy; one either accepts them or continues to live under the boot of tyranny?

Much has been said about Burma , of pre-1990 and how the regime expected things to  
go after the elections. No one but no one will never really know the inner most  
thoughts of those at the top of the table or of their subordinates. Being at the top can  
be a fragile position if you are not 100% sure of the minds of those you need, to keep  
you at the top. Again, much debate has taken place as to the reasoning leading up to  
the 1990 election, taking in both, as to; why it was allowed, and why the results were  
not acted upon.

For one man to enforce his doctrine, he must have an army of ambitious rouges, who  
will do anything to have his share of power and the booty it brings. Most tyrannical  
rulers through history had concentrated these monsters into a force that would  
terrorise the masses into submission. Any member, who may come to reconsider his  
motives and allegiances, would be quickly dispatched without fanfare. The regime in  
Burma is no different.

Pre-1990 events inadvertently, led to Burma ∟€ s quagmire to date: In the run up to  
the 1990 elections both sides, *the regime v democracy*, believed they would win. The  
regime already held the reigns of power and they did not intend to hand them over to  
anyone, unless they still had a major holding. However, the winds of discontent,  
together with fear of reprisals were whistling through the corridors of power. Caution  
had to be observed because no one was about to reveal their allegiance until all  
probability of reprisals from either side, were eradicated, after all, were some of the  
leadership cronies to submit to democracy once the results were known, it could have

been disastrous for the regime. The following declaration convinced any doubters in its ranks: *The NLD, who was to win an overall majority, would have to have learned the art of government, along with all the intricacies of each department. They had no previous experience in the running of a country; and would probably have been ejected from office at the first hurdle, but not before they plunged Burma into an even deeper abyss due to arrogance and ineptness.*

We cannot by contrast, underestimate the intellect of the regime leaders, quite the contrary. We must assume, they were naturally concerned not only; by the result of the election and the possibility of a sudden change of allegiance by many of their subordinates, but also a secondary fear; of Burma being run by amateur would be politicians, with interference from foreign countries. The regime therefore, portrayed the image, of; *either the collapse of infrastructure, albeit corrupt, or an influx of foreign influence, causing, disgruntled neighbours to remind them of their topography, and the dark days of Vietnam*. This would undoubtedly, have led the regime to execute yet another coup. To prevent this action, they simply chose to end the saga, there and then, by refusing to acknowledge the election results. Perhaps they did genuinely want to prepare for democracy, but realised the NLD's ulterior motives together with their lack of governmental knowledge would have led to another coup? This planned, scenario, led the regime onto a path of reinforcing their power, now that most of their enemies had come out into the open?

The stances taken by the NLD after the election knock back, and encouraged by some foreign nations, gave the regime time to reinforce their position. Had an uprising taken place, directly after, sanctioned by the NLD with ASSK at its helm, many believe the regime would have collapsed, because many senior figures in the regime would have come over?

The world suffered extreme suffering from two major world wars, which still bears the scars today. All the signs were clear before both events, as was the regimes weakness, after Burma's 1990 election, but still they went un-opposed or challenged, until it was too late. Right up to the present day, it is still the same old story, and battle scars are evident around the globe. The 9/11 probability was ignored even though a pattern of events over a set period could easily have been recognised. This failing is democracy in all its glory, where leaders and/or their subordinates, do not want to stand accused of taking his/her country to war. Nevertheless; no matter what route a leader decides to take, he/she will have both allies and opposition. Whereas; a non-democratic country where leaders are not elected, do not have this problem, because the people have no say in how their leaders act, even though it is they who suffer the consequences of their leaders actions. In countries like present day Burma, the villain always wins, because he has no morals, whereas; they govern the oppressed!

The only way to challenge a ruthless enemy is to adopt his tactics and become better at executing them!

The casualties around the world of today are sadly lost, and are created by those who want to suppress knowledge and the freedom to exploit it at will, from the people. This indoctrination to control the minds of individuals from an early age, by

the few belongs in the dark ages of the medieval period, along with superstition and myth, not in the 21<sup>st</sup> century where humans are travelling through space!

It is of course respected, that for many of the worlds population, it will take years to wean them away from myth, provided of course we do not all die first, because of a few fanatical power hungry individuals manipulating the many, to carry our their dirty deeds, and the free world simply become spectators brought about by its own twisted morals, until the final curtain falls?

This head in the sand attitude, has taken Burma into the pit of despair, and now the world follows because those who are supposed to protect us are so tangled up in deciphering rights and wrongs, that nothing has any firm meaning, and definitions are targeted whereas; they should be universal!

Stewart  
A UKorg member

UK.org.

Member Comment:

25 September 2006

### **AN ENGINE WITHOUT A VEHICLE IS SIMPLY LOTS OF REVS WITHOUT GOING ANYWHERE!**

Had history been written in the aftermath of being acted out by following Burma's pro-democracy policies, many nations today would still be under the control of tyrannical regimes?

It is un-mistakenly foolish, for anyone, to display premature joy from what ever the United Nations, or any other body for that matter, has to say, in relation to Burma . In the unlikely event of the regime standing down, under the laughable intentions of the UN, which is designed purely for cosmetic reasons, who will run Burma ? It would certainly not, be those who keep writing the woes and joys of Burma's sickness, in the hope of making a name for themselves whilst lounging around amid all the trappings of the free world, without having to raise a sweat, let alone staunch defiance. The same people who praise the worthless efforts of the NCGUB & Co? They sure as hell could not take on the task; there is not a worthy individual let alone a politician among them, and the people inside Burma are only to aware of this!

Unfortunately, it takes foreigners to make accurate assessments when in fact; it should be the Burmese community as they are the ones who will be forced to endure the most from incompetence. Already, a number of high profile academics have turned away from Burma because they have reached the end of their tether, because no one among the democracy activists, except the few, have learned a damned thing in the past few decades, other than, to profit from it all!

What with all the innuendo being spurted out from the UN, the **memo**, brigade, inside UN corridors is passing around the questions; **Who is there to take on the task of government, because the NLD is not a functioning party, the NCGUB & Co, would bring about a bloody civil war because no one trusts its members** . **Since 1990, other groups proclaiming self-allegiance have popped up, which on their own, would create obstacles blocking the way for any 1990 mandate from being recognised** . **All these groups would expect to be part of any interim government, allowing time for them to mature into competent politicians, but even then, they would have to be taught, as self-learning would take another two decades or more, and even then may not bear fruit** . **Therefore, what is the point of pressuring the regime, albeit superficial, if there isn't an able bodied unit, to function as a centrepiece, accepted by Burman and ethnic alike? Where others could focus and learn ?** **More importantly; who is politically knowledgeable and stable enough, to coordinates a transfer of power from the regime to civil** . **It has to be someone who is trusted and respected by the regime and at the same time, someone who holds a seasoned respect and understanding for the regimes**

**command and control of societies infrastructure albeit corrupt and inter woven, but without, would create havoc and mayhem.**

Also circulating the corridors, is the echo of an answer, and is the sole reason why the US & UN, have proclaimed their intentions. What we need, is for them to tell the world what the wheels of the UN already know.

There are very few, seasoned politicians with a history and the knowledge, of active defiance in the school of hard knocks, stemming from the days since 1962. These people grew up in the centre of events, among men of stature. They did not flee to a more peacable existence, but stayed among the people whoes respect they now have.

They lived and worked among leaders who had nothing to work with other than pure loyalty and the guts to persevere when others fled. Today, the siblings of this living history are the foundations of the PDP today. I would defy anyone to counter these words once they become aware of the facts.

Visit the PDP webpage and study the "Brief history" . [www.pdpburma.net](http://www.pdpburma.net)  
Anyone who studies this history, and absorbs it, will have no right to criticise or dictate the pro-democracy history of events unless they personally participated in it, in which case, their names will be emblazoned on the pages in memory of their contribution. If a persons name is not mentioned, it's because he/she was not there at the deep end of activities!

Academic circles have already requested copies, so they can accurately place Burma's post war history, which before, was otherwise unknown!

Allen T.  
A UK.org, member.

UK.org

Member Comment:

30 September 2006

## IN LEAGUE WITH FOREIGN INTERVENTION ON BURMA POLICY ????????????

As another month draws to a close, and a new year is but a short distance away, our concerns for the people of Burma continue to grow, though not only for their despair under a dictatorship, but for the failures of those who are supposed to be fighting on their behalf to release them from the clutches of the regime. Repeatedly, there are people who expect others do their dirty work, and it has allowed the continued suffering of millions. The world is well aware that the foreign policy of many countries has influenced the slow pace of progress toward democracy in Burma, but to consider the possibility that groups like the NCGUB for example, as cooperating with them in this programme, is despicable to the point of treason. We are well aware of Britain's role in preventing democracy, a sample of which can be viewed on England's Channel 4 TV station, DISPATCHES 20,00hrs. On Thursday 5<sup>th</sup>. October 2006;

Assistance was given to Burma from the West, in its fight against communist insurgents, and many accept that as a valid reason for keeping the regime in place, except the Burmese of course. That is now history, however; it does not take nearly two decades after the recognised victory on one front to protect western interests, to come up with a strategy for ending interior conflict unless there are ulterior motives to benefit the West?

Its time Burma took control of its own destiny!

The people who constantly boast of their contribution to Burma, who, have money coming out of their ears, given to them either; by those, whose naivety on Burma affairs is questionable or, given as a bribe to cooperate with the foreign policies of those countries who prefer to see the regime in power? At least that could have been the case. Nevertheless; whatever the reason was, that particular mould was broken, when the PDP, finally, pushed its head above the surface.

How things have changed since then! The complete political framework toward Burma has changed. It has gone from complete disaster, with no firm leadership or direction, its repetitive dialogue from the same old circle of voices, all working for the same channel, to, unknown voices entering the game, voices that would never before criticise or condemn. The continued hype of AASK and her supposed mandate to rule, has disappeared completely from western media, Highly regarded intellectuals and academics have given up on Burma. Now it is simply Suu Kyi the prisoner. (*Of course, she should be released, as should the many others imprisoned*)

The UN has opened its mouth albeit hot air, and now, without surprise, the NLD wants to negotiate terms with the regime, well I never. Therefore, why did this new direction in Burma politics show itself when it did? I will tell you why; the PDP had not showed its hand before out of genuine respect for the election of 1990.

It was restructuring its party and its policies ready to take its place in opposition, and prepare for the next general election, which should have been on the democratic agenda had the NLD been allowed to take office.

However; the regimes rejection of the results and after a continuation of stagnation, dragging Burma deeper and deeper into the abyss, the PDP showed its hand, and those few who thought they ruled the roost, were very suddenly, knocked clean off their perch when they did!

THE CLOSER TO THE ENEMY YOU ARE THE MORE EFFECTIVE YOUR STRIKE.  
During the 1<sup>st</sup> Second World War and most, if not all conflicts thereafter, leading up to the present day, including the collapse of the USSR, total victory, did not result solely, from action on an open battlefield. A major factor in bringing victory in all these conflicts came from the brave men and women, who operated on the ground inside enemy territory. Those people were nearly always native to the country under occupation either, by invading forces, or, a homegrown dictatorship. Without the courage of these heroic people in all areas of covert / clandestine warfare; destabilising local command structures and moral, hindering transport and supplies, plus many other attributable factors, many of these conflicts would most certainly have been extended, perhaps even, leading to defeat.

1<sup>st</sup> This most valuable inside asset fell into decline inside Burma, once operations of U Nu's resistance fighters were drastically reduced. (*Not to be confused with ethnic defences of their own territories*) This failure was due solely, to lack of support from fellow Burmese around the world who failed miserably to assist in raising funds. The blame for Burma's dilemma today sits perhaps, squarely on their shoulders. We ask the question; was the support of those people, and perhaps still today, given to the regime, moreover, has helped to prolong their position by operating foreign business syndicates ever since?

Fortunately, the embers of freedom were locked in the hearts of those loyal patriots of U Nu's forces, who became spread everywhere across Burma. Many of the key individuals continued their struggle underground the best way they could, one tactic, was to keep the movement alive in the minds of all concerned. Further, Low-key tactics played out by senior figures from both, U Nu's political and military wing gradually began to sprout new flowers. However; the party decided to slow down its pace, and took instead a low-key back stage approach in the aftermath of 1988, and in the lead up to the 1990 elections. At this stage of the game, it wanted no one to stumble across the long-term strategy of the party. Besides, if the elections did lead to a parliamentary democracy, then the PDP could simply become part of the electoral system, and stand for election when it next came around. How fortunate for Burma, that the PDP continued its direction in a low key, as these proven tactics allowed it to grow in stature and political proficiency without drawing attention to itself. This is clear to anyone who fully understands the political mind of a natural 1<sup>st</sup> people's leader, as opposed to a self-indulgent profiteer who makes mistakes because he/she wants instance recognition.

Profiteering is best left to legal businesses that pay taxes to enrich the country. Politicians, elected or self-appointed, should not be allowed in a position to

make laws and then manipulate them for personal gain, while the people are kept in poverty and suffering!

What happened in Thailand recently, would happen in Burma, if the wrong people posing as democratic, took power. The observer only has to study the life styles of certain exiled representatives today, in order to get a clear picture as to how these people would operate were they ever to govern.

When the NLD won the 1990 election, and refused point-blank, to initiate a working partnership with the regime, to undertake the slow process of shifting government into a civil administration, it cut its own throat, and that of Burma's future. It also rejected assistance from all other political movements including the PDP. It is natural that no one liked the idea of allowing the regime to hold onto its grip of power, but the politically naïve and inexperienced NLD, alone, against the 30-year-old, well-established infrastructure of a military institution, was a lost battle even before it began, as people are now beginning to understand.

With the self-humiliating knock back of the election, the most obvious reason for the NLD to have chosen non-violence is two fold; as nobody could have been so naïve as to believe that passive resistance would force the regime into submission.

1/They doubted that fellow Burmese people would finance an underground movement. Moreover, they were right. 16 years of stagnation has proved that.  
2/Their stance was instigated by the west, allowing for certain major governments, to implement policies favourable to them?

Burma could have helped itself:

For any gambler, it is highly probable that there have been, and are still, those who would support insurgency operations against the regime, in side Burma, and will come forward when someone else takes the initiative, but for now, they are too scared to stand forward. This *evasive commitment*, under fire, in war, and make no mistake, Burma is at war with its self, is reminiscent of those in other wars who chose the easy way out at the expense of millions who could not. These people then sit idly by in comfort, waiting for others to fight their war, and when it is over and safe, they returned. They then used all the manipulative skills learned in the free world, to exploit the weak and vulnerable among their own people, for personal gain, without putting anything back into the country, but instead, take their profits and retreat, back to the luxury they have established elsewhere. Burma's internal strife has unfortunately produced such individuals, as do all conflicts. These same people seek to deceive the countries they now reside in, by boasting of their patriotism and praise figures like General Aung San. They use his name, and that of his daughter, to promote their own selfish ego's, in the hope that his name and his courageous exploits and determination, gives credit to them. However, in truth, Aung San would be insulted to the point of anger by this despicable act of self-indulgence, because they who stand under his image do not serve his epitaph but are a disgrace to it by cowering behind a curtain of passive surrender, and whether voluntary or involuntary, conspire to the regimes doctrine. These people are not honourable enough even to be mentioned in the same sentence as Aung San and U Nu, neither in the same breath where the long-suffering people are quoted.

General Aung San, gave the people of Burma a chance, those he entrusted into his circle, including U Nu, carried on the fight after his death only to be let down by the very people who could have helped. Still to this day, those same self-indulgent fraudsters, cower behind the same curtain allowing others to die on their behalf. A great deal of disrespect shown toward certain members of the Burmese community in exile has been swelling for a long time, both from foreigners and Burmese alike. This is evident by the growing apathy between the Burmese themselves, though mainly, aimed at those who profit from Burma's plight, and are quite happy to see it continue.

This attitude, has led to more and more activist groups rising out of the dust of discontent. The NCGUB, are cushioned temporarily, from its deserved ignominy because it bases itself in the US, where naivety among many Americans relating to Burma, including some of its politicians, is ripe, just as it was before war reached their doorstep. It is only a matter of time before they realise their error. When they do, and certain individuals within the Burma circle are seen, for what they really are, Burma may have a chance of redeeming its pride among its entire people.

Robert  
A UK.org, member.