Burmese logs helping to pay for the dry season offensive

The Burmese military have launched their dry season offensive against the Karen State. They are massing their forces to launch an attack against the Karen headquarters of Mannerplaw which also serves as headquarters for many other opposition groups. This year the Burmese military is better equipped than ever. Foreign investments, such as those in logging and oil, are helping pay for this more modern army. The dry season offensive will be a bitter one. Foreign investments and assistance from NGOs including UNDP, are increasing.
The civil war in Burma seems far from ending as the Slorc speeds up its dry season offensive against Mannerplaw. The outcome of this offensive might seriously change the future of Burma’s struggle.

The area of Mannerplaw serves as the headquarters of the armed resistance of the Karen National Union (KNU) and also the headquarters of the Democratic Alliance of Burma (DAB), which is an umbrella organization of the other ethnic resistant groups and political dissidents.

For 40 years, up until the 1988 nationwide uprising, Mannerplaw was the headquarters of the National Democratic Front (NDF), a combined body of ethnic armed resistance groups fighting for the common goal of autonomy. However, following the uprising of 1988 which resulted in about 6000-8000 unarmed demonstrators being shot down in the urban sectors of Burma, thousands of dissidents fled to the jungles in the ethnic areas. Subsequently, the DAB was formed on 14 December 1988, and became the umbrella organization of the NDF and all other political dissidents including hundreds of student who participated in the 1988 struggle. Later, thirteen of the legally elected representatives of the people who won seats in the May 27, 1990 election also came to Mannerplaw to avoid the persecution of Slorc and formed the parallel National Coalition Government of the Union of Burma (NCGUB) on 18 December 1990. Mannerplaw has thus become a serious sore spot in the Burmese military regime’s attempt to totally eradicate opposition in the country.

Since December of 1991, Slorc has poured about 20,000 troops from three divisions out of a total of nine divisions through out the country, into their Karen State campaign aimed at occupying Mannerplaw.

Following the 4th of January (Burma Independence Day from the British), Slorc abruptly sped up its offensive against Mannerplaw. About 5,000 combined forces of KNU and other armed resistance forces, as well as armed students from the ABSDF, are defending Mannerplaw.

As a result of the Slorc offensive against the Mannerplaw area, heavy causalities are being experienced on both sides and ethnic Karen refugees have been increasing in the camps near the Thai-Burma border. At the same time, hundreds of civilians are being forced to serve as porters to Slorc soldiers in the combat zones. Even women are forced to be porters in areas filled with booby trap mines.

During January, a total of 200 Burmese soldiers were killed and more than 600 wounded while guerrillas of the KNU suffered 11 killed and 72 wounded. About 52 porters also died in the exchange of gunfire.

Since the middle of December, 8,190 new refugees have fled to Thailand. At the present, the total number ethnic refugees reported include 38,908 Karen, 12,008 Mon and 3,524 Kareni. About 2465 students have also taken refuge in Thailand. The total number of refugees at the present time in Thailand is at least 65,095. An additional 70,000 Muslim refugees have also arrived in camps near the Burma-Bangladesh border.

All of these tragic problems in Burma are closely related to shipments of arms which come mainly from China, Pakistan and the joint venture between Slorc and Germany’s privately own arms company, Fritz Werner Ltd. which manufactures assault rifles and ammunition in Burma. These problems are also closely tied to all the foreign investments which provide the money Slorc needs to pay for its forty-threeyear civil war against the people of Burma.
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UN Involvement in Burma

Following the uprising in 1988, the European Community and the United States began imposing economic sanctions on Burma identifying the high incidents of human rights abuses as the reason. At the same time, the UNDP has been accelerating its assistance to the Slorc, and began providing aid to Slorc for two 1991 projects - Re-forestation and Border Area Development Project. An amount of US$15.9 million has been earmarked for the Re-forestation project, and another US$17.5 for the Border Area Development project.

Despite the dire human rights situation in Burma, other UN agencies are also not slowing down, and their assistance is still pouring into Burma. Many of these UN agencies are involved in highly sensitive and complex fields in Burma. All assistance relating to these sensitive or complex fields should be ceased temporarily until Burma can reach a settlement to its long civil war and become more stable.

Border Development Project

On July 11, 1991, the resident representative of UNDP, Mr. Gerd Merrem and Ohn Gyaw, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slorc signed a contract for UNDP assistance amounting to US$1.3 million for the Slorc initiated “Border Area Development Project.”

Slorc actually started the project on May 25, 1989 by forming the Central Committee of Border Area Development and National Races with Deputy Chief of Staff, Gen Than Shew acting as chairman. Subsequently, Slorc also designated an “Executive Implementation Committee” which was formally set up on May 31, 1991. Chief of Military Intelligence, Maj-Gen Khin Nyunt, was named as chairman of this committee.

The development project emphasizes transportation such as road construction from village to village and telecommunications, especially in the areas of Kengtung, Kokang and Wa in the Shan State (East and Northeast Burma). This area use to be the site of very heavy clashes between the Communist Party of Burma (CPB) and Burmese troops. The areas are still opium producing areas and are situated near to the Golden Triangle where the borders of Burma, Laos and Thailand meet.

Following the collapse of the CPB caused by a mutiny of its militant members, the Kokang and Wa in March 1989, the Slorc wooed the mutineers to a cease fire in order to try to neutralized several other ethnic guerrilla forces still active in the areas.

There is no doubt that the roads and telecommunications systems being funded by the UNDP assistance will be used primarily by the Slorc military to send its No. 906 Military Engineering Company and some military wireless units into the areas.

Up to now, Slorc has already built numerous roads throughout the areas as well as one wireless relay station and three telecommunications relay stations. These facilities are being used by the Burmese army of the Southern Military Command and Northeast Military Command. Even the monthly salaries of the volunteer public staff in these areas is offered at double the amount of their ordinary salaries. Lo Hsing Min, the younger brother of drug king-pin, Lo Hsing Han, gained construction contract worth Kyats 1,652,000 (US$270,819 at the official exchange rate) from the Shan State Law and Order Restoration Council, and the contract was signed on 4 December 1989.

According to some analysts, Slorc is building the motor roads for the purpose of the rapid transportation of its troops around the area so that fewer troops are needed to control the area. The military can then use more of these troops to carry out suppression campaigns in other key ethnic resistance areas. Subsequently, Slorc has transferred several of its divisions from the Shan State to ethnic resistance areas of the Kachin State (north-eastern Burma) and the Karen State (Southeastern Burma) for the offensives being carried out this dry season. This has resulted in the current intensified clashes in the Karen State, which in turn are creating hundreds of new refugees who have fled to neighboring countries.

Environmental Project

On July 11, 1991, on the same day as the signing of the Border Development Project, Mr. Gerd Merrem and Ohn Gyaw signed a contract for UNDP assistance worth US$680,000 to the National Commission for Environmental Affairs (NCEA) which was created by Slorc in February 1990. Ohn Gyaw is also the chairman of NCEA. While the UNDP is providing funds for reforestation in Burma, Slorc is selling its forests to over 40 foreign companies in order to get hard currency to pay for its 43-year-old civil war.

UNICEF Assistance

On July 16, 1991, Burma ratified the UN convention on the Rights of the Child, and also signed the World Deceleration for the Survival, Protection and Development of Children. Maj-Gen Khin Nyunt, Chief of Military Intelligence, signed the agreement. Under the plan, Col. Pe Thein and Rolf Carriere, local UNICEF chief, jointly signed the contract that UNICEF will spend up to US$40 million on health, nutrition, water, sanitation, education, and communication projects.

Ironically, at the same time that UNICEF is agreeing to provide Slorc with US$40 million to help the children of Burma, the children in the Slorc-created concentration camps near Tavoy in Tenassarin Division are dying from malnutrition, malaria and cholera without any assistance or concern from Slorc or the UNICEF. (See B.U.R.M.A. Vol. 1 Number 11 for details of these concentration camps)
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**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Re-education**

On January 27 of this year, the military junta in Burma sent thousands of university teachers to a re-education camp 40 kilometers north of Rangoon. According to an official radio report, the teachers will be kept there for four weeks.

The reason for this forced "vacation" is the junta's complaint that the December 10 and 11 demonstrations on university campuses around Burma were the fault of the teachers who could not, or did not, control the students.

The site of the re-education camp was previously used as a training camp under the name of "The Institution of Civil Service" where hundreds of civil servants were sent for training after Ne Win took over the country in 1963. About three hundred civil servants were sent each time to receive intensive training on physical science, basic military, code of conduct of civil servants and, most important of all, political science. Most of the time was used to teach the philosophy of the Burmese Way to Socialism.

Under this new program for university teachers, 2,096 people have been gathered from around the country. Since the institute was built to accommodate not more than 400 people at a time, life in the camp can not be much different than prison.

Khin Nyunt, in a speech which he made as Chairman of the Education Committee of Burma, said, "Living conditions here might not be comfortable for you."

He went on to say, "After analyzing the events that happened last month (December 10 and 11), we found that:

1) Teachers do not clearly know what they should do to control students.

2) There is a lack of discipline among the students and an increase of delinquency as well.

3) There is lack of communications between the teachers and the students, and an incompetence of the teachers in persuading the students to follow the 'right path'.

4) There is an absence of cooperation of some teachers with the authorities."

Subjects to be taught to the university teachers include management, man-control, discipline, leadership, morals, history of the anti-imperialist struggle, history of the Burmese army, and the accomplishments of the Sllorc for the national economy.

**Opposition**

If there is any continued anti-junta voice coming from the universities, some of these professors will most certainly have to join the growing number of political prisoners now in the country's prisons. Although the total number of political prisoners cannot be known, Amnesty International reports that they have the names of at least 1,500 people imprisoned for being in opposition to the military rule.

Even legal political parties, set up to contest in the May 1990 elections, can not act as an opposition movement in the country. Of the 485 representatives elected by the people in that election, 71 have now been arrested and are in prison or under house arrest. Sixty nine of that number are members of the National League for Democracy which won over 80% of the seats. At the present time, 20% of all the elected representatives are either in prison, in exile at the border, or have died from mysterious causes.

**ASEAN and Sllorc**

ASEAN continues to lend its protection to the Burmese military regime, and defensively rejects any calls from other countries to help pressure Sllorc through economic and political boycotts to allow democracy to grow in Burma. They suggest that the Asian concept of human rights is not the same as that of the Western countries, and therefore Europe and the United States should not interfere. According to Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad, "Western nations believe that they can intervene in the domestic affairs of countries violating human rights, but it is a question of who makes the judgement whether a country is violating human rights."

Mahathir went on to say that those who suggested democracy as the only answer to countries like Burma are arrogant. "It is the height of arrogance to claim that only a particular system is right and just. It is equally arrogant to claim that there is only one system of government which is right and just."

Yet Mahathir, and the other ASEAN foreign ministers as well, have failed to say who in Burma has the right to suggest what human rights means to the people of Burma, or what kind of system the people of Burma want and need.

Why do the ASEAN nations seem so keen to prevent too much criticism of the brutality of the Burmese military? Part of the answer to that question might be found in Amnesty International's annual report on human rights. They list four of the six ASEAN states as places in Asia where torture, ill-treatment or poor detention conditions can be found. Those four are Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines.
SITUATION IN THE ARAKAN STATE

In past months, tension has been growing along the Burma-Bangladesh border. Thousands of refugees are trying to flee persecution under the Burmese military junta. The situation is extremely complex. Some observers feel that Slorc is trying to create a Buddhist-Muslim conflict on this border in order to divert attention away from their dry season offensive in the Karen State and to strengthen unity within their army. Following are the reflections on these issues by an Arakanese from the Arakan State in Burma which is the site most of these tensions.

Bangladesh is now being unlawfully attacked by the military junta of Burma. I condemn the Slorc for their aggression into the territory of a friendly neighbor and support the government and the people of Bangladesh in their struggle against the aggressors.

The Slorc of Burma is creating and intensifying the Rohingya problem with the hopes of creating internal confusion which will be beneficial to them in their control over the country. This follows the pattern set by Ne Win who successfully agitated the communal riots against the Chinese community in previous years in order to divert people's attention away from serious economic problems facing the country. Hundreds of Chinese were killed in these riots.

The intentions of Slorc's present performance on the western border are probably double edged:

(1) One intention is to allure the Arakanese (Rakhine) people to the Slorc's camp because they (the Slorc) are beginning to feel the aggravating indignation of the Arakan people against them. (Last year, in March, a company of Arakanese Buddhists led by a commander named Phyu Aung, infiltrated deep into the Arakan State and launched a number of surprise attacks in Kyauktaw and Mrouk Oo Townships against Slorc troops, inflicting heavy casualties. It was then that Slorc began to send thousands of soldiers to the Bangladesh border.)

(2) The other intention is part of their overall strategy which is to mend the worsening split among their own military leaders. The Slorc has adopted a dangerous strategy that could be counterproductive. But up to now I think the Arakanese Muslims are playing into the hands of Slorc. It is true that, in the past, a lot of differences existed between the Arakanese Buddhists and Muslims. But in such a difficult situation, these differences should be left aside for the time being. There are numerous problems among different ethnic groups. All these differences should be solved peacefully in a friendly manner only after we have established a popularly elected democratic government. Some of the slogans of some Muslim organizations such as 'Muslims constitute the majority of Arakan', or 'we are fighting for an Islamic Republic' seems to be alienating the Buddhists from their struggle. Historians used to categorize Arakanese Muslims into four different groups viz:

(1) those living in Arakan since the feudal period,
(2) those who migrated into Arakan during British colonial rule,
(3) those who illegally came during the AFPFL era and
(4) those who were smuggled in during Ne Win's military rule.

Since Muslims in Arakan have a tradition of living in a specific location which is completely separated from Buddhists, it is very difficult to determine who belongs to which group.

During the feudal period both Arakanese Buddhists and Muslims have been living peacefully under the same kings. Muslims used to call the Arakanese Buddhists as Maghs. Some kings even assumed both Buddhist and Muslim names, eg. King Nara-mit-hla (1430-1434 A.D.), the founder of Mrouk-Oo dynasty, assumed the Muslim name Solaiman Shah. King Razargri (1593-1612 A.D.) was also called Salim Shah. Mrouk-Oo was the last dynasty of Arakan. It was destroyed by the Burmese king Bo Daw Phaya (1781-1819) in 1784. It is not true that the Mrauk-Oo dynasty was overwhelmed with Muslims nor was it an Islamic dynasty. Some of the kings were said to be Muslim converts. But Buddhism flourished in Mrauk-Oo which can clearly be seen until now. Anyhow Muslims and Buddhists lived peacefully during the Mrauk-Oo dynasty sharing the same land and the same available resources.

Arakan was one of the territories conceded to British at the conclusion of the first Anglo-Burmese War. At first Arakan was simply amalgamated into British India which paved the way for a new wave of migration of the Bangalis and a number of other races from India (from Tamils in the east to the Pathans in the west).

Politicians under the AFPFL government smuggled in tens of thousands of Bangalis into Arakan to counter the anti-AFPFL attitude among the Arakanese population because AFPFL lost in most of the constituencies in Arakan in the first general elections of independent Burma held in 1952 while they won a landslide victory in other parts of Burma. One of the AFPFL leaders assigned the task of smuggling Bangalis into the Arakan State was familiar to me. Apart from helping those people in their migration into Arakan, he was also instructed to persuade the newcomers to promise to vote for the AFPFL in all future elections.

The migrations during the present Ne Win era were due to the corruption of the military and civil officials under Ne Win's 'Burma Socialist' Regime.

Whatever the causes of the influx may be, the responsibility of all these complications should not be put solely on the present Bangladeshi government or on the former East Pakistan government. Most of the responsibilities, if not all, rest upon the successive Burmese governments who created these problems in an attempt to solve their own immediate crisis or who ignored their officials' misconduct. Most of the
Muslims who are now suffering the onslaught of the Slorc are children or grand-children of the former illegal immigrants (some might be the descendants of ethnic Muslims). It is unfair that they are being punished for the crimes they have never committed themselves.

Here, I think I should describe a tragic scene I myself witnessed in the prisons during my detention period from 1963 to 1972. There were about fifty Arakanese Muslims (known as Mujahids) in Insein prison who had been arrested since independence in 1948. Initially the number was more than 100 and they were kept in the prison without any trial. The number declined as many older people died in the prison. I often noticed that some old people with whom I was familiar would not turn up the next day and learned from their fellow prisoners that they fell sick. Some of them never turned up again. Why have the sufferings of those Muslims been left unnoticed by the international community and the Islamic community as well?

Another tragic event happened in 1978 when several thousand Arakanese Muslims fled into Bangladesh which caused much alarm among the international Islamic community. The military junta, under Ne Win, agreed to receive back all the Muslims in accordance with the list provided by the Muslim leaders. However, the execution of that agreement by the military should not be forgotten. Neither the Muslims nor the Arakanese Buddhists were pleased with the way things turned out. We do not know exactly what happened to the millions of dollars of financial and material aid provided by the international community. We do, however, know that Col. Wan Tin, the regional commander, became extraordinarily rich at the end of the "Hintha Project", as it was called. Wan Tin was recalled to Rangoon and was appointed to be Managing Director of the State-owned Insurance Corporation. After further investigations, he was found guilty of misappropriation totalling five million kyats and was fired (only after his boss Brig. Gen. Tin Oo, the MI chief at that time, was ousted by Ne Win). About twenty high ranking of-

ficials, both military and civilian, were also found guilty and convicted. Several steps should be taken now to solve the present problem.

- (a) The Muslim minority problem should be handled as part of the struggle for human rights in Burma, not as an Islamic Jihad.

- (b) The Muslims should try to achieve unity among themselves (RSO, ARIP, MLO and so on) at least to obtain coordination to adopt a common strategy.

- (c) The Muslims should drop the slogans which are too Islamic in appearance, and begin to communicate, and then cooperate, with the Arakanese Buddhists. In doing so flexibility from both sides would certainly be necessary.

- (d) The UNHRC and other international organizations should intervene by giving pressure to the Slorc before it is too late.

- (e) To achieve a long lasting solution, cooperation of the four different parties concerned, Arakanese Muslim Community, Arakanese Bud- dhist Community, Popular Government of Burma, and the Government of Bangladesh, is essential. As a pre-requisite, a friendly climate among the four parties is also necessary. Since the present regime in Rangoon is one of the most atrocious dictatorships in the world, it is impossible to accomplish a long lasting settlement as long as they stay in power. Hence it is apparent that the task of disposing the Slorc should be the first priority. I would like to appeal to the international Islamic community to extend their assistance, not only to the Muslims, but to the entire democratic movement in Burma, thereby setting a healthy climate for the future settlement.

- (f) It is no longer a secret that the Slorc and the army are beginning to split. All of us concerned should be very careful not to create a conflict among ourselves. All our efforts should be targeted against the Slorc and their handful of power usurpers.

A mosque in the Arakan State
Student demonstrations in Burma during December last year seem to have brought about more adverse reactions from the junta's leadership than anticipated by many. The junta was not hesitant to take action. They arrested about 1000 students within a few days and sent troops supported by armored carriers and tanks to every quarter of Rangoon and Mandalay, the two largest cities in Burma.

After interrogating the arrested students for two weeks, Slorc seemed to think that they had at last discovered the real cause of the student unrest. Maj-Gen Khin Nyunt, Secretary (1) of the Slorc and also chairman of the Burma Education Committee formed in September last year, met with the committee as many as four times in December and January. During all four meetings Khin Nyunt urged the university teachers to see Burma's history through the eyes of Slorc. He said the 1988 mass uprisings occurred because:

(1) The Burma Communist Party (BCP) was attempting to seize political power.
(2) The BBC, diplomats from Western nations and rightist politicians combined efforts to incite the masses.

The Slorc and its predecessor, the BSPP, have always presented the BCP to the people in two totally different pictures. Sometimes they say that the BCP is no longer in existence, while at other times, when they wish to put the blame on someone else for their own failures, they say that BCP has infiltrated everywhere and are plotting against the Slorc.

In an attempt to prove BCP involvement in the 1988 uprising, the Slorc leader invited the university reactors and lecturers to Mount Pleasant in Rangoon on November 16, 1989. They forced the teachers to watch a video showing the politics of the BCP discussing the 1988 uprising. But the show proved not only to be a failure but it caused an opposite effect among the highly educated teachers who left convinced that the BCP actually had nothing to do with the uprising.

To see the real cause of the student unrest, we should look back at the history of student movements in Burma. These movements can be divided into three parts according to three different periods of history:

1. During the sixty years of British rule (the three years under Japanese rule is excluded), three major student uprisings occurred.
   1.1 1920 Nov. - All Burma Students' boycott which ended peacefully.
   1.2 1936 - University boycott, when Ko Aung San, Ko Nu, Ko Kyaw Nyein, Ko Thein Pe etc. where leaders. It ended in compromise.
   1.3 1938 National uprising - The British govt. used force and Ko Aung Kyaw died of injuries inflicted by the attack of baton brandishing police and mounted police.

2. During the 12 years (two years under the interim government is excluded) under parliamentary rule, two major unrests occurred.
   2.1 In October 1953 when university students demanded a one month mid-term vacation for October.
   2.2 On March 22, 1956, when protesting students were shot by police. A seventh standard student, Harry Tang of the Methodist High School was killed and a half dozen others were injured. Prime Minister U Nu responded immediately by letting every 7th standard student pass the exam without further examination.

3. During 26 years under Ne Win, 11 major student unrests occurred. All were suppressed by force.
   3.1 July 7, 1962 - over 100 killed
   3.2 November 1963
   3.3 December 1969 - during the South East Asia Peninsula games
   3.4 November 1970 - Golden Jubilee of the 1920 National Student Boycott
   3.5 November to December 1974 - U Thant's funeral
   3.6 June 1975 - First Anniversary of the workers boycott
   3.7 March 23, 1976 - Centenary of Thakin Kodaw Hmaing's birthday
   3.8 September 5 to 6, 1987 - Protest against third demonetization
   3.9 March 11 to 18, 1988 - RIT with nearly 100 killed
   3.10 June 21, 1988 - Mye Nigon with nearly 80 killed
   3.11 August to September, 1988 - 8888 uprising with thousands killed

This chronology of student unrest in Burma would suggest that student uprisings are directly related to dictatorial rule and its violent suppression against any opposition voice, even the most peaceful one.

The military dictators of Burma see it differently however. Khin Nyunt, the most powerful man in Slorc, said in a recent speech to university professors on January 5, 1992, "The students' unrest in December broke out because: 1) the spread of fabricated news from within and abroad, 2) instigation by those involved in a cult of personality (a slur against Daw Aung San Suu Kyi), and 3) inefficiency of the university teachers.

Slorc leaders also attacked foreign governments who have tried to persuade Slorc to honor the human rights of their own people and to transfer power to the elected representatives. Khin Nyunt is quoted as saying, "We have our own heredity, traditions, customs and culture. We oppose Western culture. But even a person with no profound knowledge of the Burmese culture can clearly see that the army is one hundred percent westernized, organized in the most modern form and equipped with the most modern weapons. This is one of the many contradictions of Slorc's policies.

The international community's concern and action in the last three years, especially in 1991, brought some effective results. However, more drastic actions are needed. The international community should step up their efforts. Trade sanctions should be intensified and Slorc should be isolated from international organizations including UNDP and UNICEF. This kind of support is essential to help bring about the changes which the student uprisings have so often called for.
**NEWS IN BRIEF**

"Shell" in Burma

The joint venture between Shell of Netherlands and Slorc is yielding 14.78 million cubic-feet of natural gas per day from test well No.1 in Taikkyi Township of Rangoon Division. The drilling was launched on the 10th of July last year and the gas was discovered on January 3, 1992. (WPD-11 & 16/1/92.)

Singapore Delegation

Mr. Bernard Chen, Chairman of the Government parliamentary committee for Defence & Foreign Affairs of Singapore met with Lt-Gen Chit Shew, member of Slorc on 16th of January. Mr Chen and Chit Shwe discussed financial investments and trade between Singapore and Burma.

Through the first eight months of last year, Singapore imported about S$108 million worth of goods from Burma, up 70% over the same period of 1990 and Singapore sold nearly S$342 million worth of goods to Burma, also about 30% over the same time in 1990. (WPD-17/1/91.) & (ST-21/11/91.)

UNDP and World bank

The symposium on Energy Sector Investment and Policy Review Study sponsored by UNDP, World Bank and Slorc was held on the 20th of January. Vice-Admial Maung Maung Khin (Navy) responded on the World Bank’s review of the energy sector of Burma. Up to now, ten foreign companies are under contract of Slorc. (WPD-21/1/92.)

Those companies are BHP of Australia, Petro-Canada of Canada, Premier Petroleum and Croft Exploration of England, CIE of France, Idemitsu of Japan, Yukong of South Korea, Shell of Netherlands, Kirkland and PTTEP of Thailand.

Air Weapons Training

For one decade, the Burmese military regime has carried out its Air Weapon Course No. 1 in Meiktila (central Burma) following which the Burmese pilots have undergone training in China during 1990. Last year, Slorc imported advance jet fighters and other military hardware from China. (WPD-18/1/92.)

China’s Aircraft Corp.

Aero-Technology Im/Export Corp. of China discussed with Slorc about aircraft production, and extension of air service. (WPD-9/1/92)

Preparations for Colombo Plan

On the 17th of January, Slorc held a meeting to plan for preparations to host the Colombo Plan Consultative Meeting in Burma. The meeting will be held from 26 Nov. to 2 Dec. 1992 and representatives from membership countries will attend. (WPD-18/1/92.)

WPD = Working People’s Daily
ST = Shipping Times (Singapore)