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By
Dr. Chao Tzang Yawngewe*

The First (Inaugural) conference of the UNLD (United Nationalities League for Democracy) outside Burma was held recently on the Thai-Burma border, the result of which is its revival as the UNLD (LA) [United Nationalities League for Democracy (Liberated Area)].

The United Nationalities League for Democracy is a coalition of political parties formed by the Ethnic Nationalities of what is now known as Burma. These parties participated in the 1990 elections and together with its ally, the SNLD (Shan Nationalities League for Democracy), formed a parliamentary bloc of 67 elected representatives of the people.

Like the NLD (National League for Democracy) of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the UNLD's legitimacy rests on its participation in the 1990 election and it, like the NLD, represents therefore the aspiration and will of the people, in particular the Ethnic Nationalities.

The main goal of the UNLD is the establishment of a democratic, Federal Union of Burma, and it fully supports UN resolutions calling for a Tripartite Dialogue to resolve the serious Constitutional, Political and Humanitarian crisis in Burma.

UNLD leaders can be described as "principled moderates", and although many of the ethnic nationalities political parties have been unlawfully disbanded by the military regime, the UNLD is looked up by the Ethnic Nationalities peoples as a leadership body that is legitimate and represents their aspirations.

With the recent opening of the dialogue process in Rangoon, the UNLD is prepared to work together with all democratic forces and Ethnic nationalities organizations and leaders to mark the dialogue process an open and inclusive one. There is need in Burma to hear all voices and to accommodate all interests and aspirations.

Both Democracy and Federalism are based on pluralism, the recognition of, and respect for pluralism and diversity in all spheres of life-particularly in the sphere of governance and politics.

The UNLD as a front that stands for Democracy and Federalism will therefore be guided in all its actions by the recognition of, and respect for pluralism and diversity.

Dr. Chao Tzang Yawngwe
Member of Consultative Honorary Committee
U.N.L.D. (L.A)

---

* Chao Tzang Yawngwe is at present with the NRP/National Reconciliation Program, and advise the leadership of Burma's democracy movement on strategic and policy matters. He also coordinates with Ethnic Nationalities organizations and leaders. He holds a B.A (Hons) degree from Rangoon University, and a Master & Ph.D from the University of British Columbia, Canada. Chao Tzang Yawngwe was with the SSA/Shan State Army, from 1963 to 1977 and also served as the General Secretary of the SSPP/Shan State Progress Party (1973-1977). He is the son of Sao Shwe Thaikhe, the Yawngwe Prince, and First Union President (1948-1952).
မြန်မာစာပေဖျင် သို့မဟုတ် အချက်အလက် ဖော်ပြသည်。

(၁)
Announcement 1/98
12 February, 1998

1. The United Nationalities League for Democracy (UNLD) has, since its inception, existed as a league composed of nineteen, political parties representing ethnic nationalities and two independent ethnic elected MPs.

2. But the chauvinistic and fascist military clique which is totally against equality for the ethnic nationalities, has, not only refused to recognize their right to equality, it has, has 1992, purposefully and unilaterally declared the political parties representing the ethnic nationalities dissolved. Of the many works undertaken in preparation for its sham national convention, the dissolution of the UNLD and its seven member-parties from the states and other parties representing the ethnic nationalities, was evidently one of them.

3. The ethnic nationalities parties that had been dissolved came into existence through the desire of the ethnic nationalities themselves. Hence, although they had been declared, the parties are very much alive and in operation, and doing everything possible to continue the struggle for democracy and equality.

4. Currently, there are ethnic nationality leaders representing ten UNLD member-parties and one independent ethnic MP in the liberated area.

5. With a view to demonstrating the spirit and materializing the objectives of the Panglong Agreement which was signed and solemnized by General Aung San and leaders of the ethnic nationalities in 1947, the ethnic nationalities leaders in the liberated area, hereby, on this day of February 12, 1998 – the 51st anniversary of the Panglong Agreement – declared the formation of the UNLD (LA).

6. The UNLD (LA) will abide by and adhere to the policy and political principles originally adopted by the UNLD, and, exerting every effort, will co-operate with other political parties in the struggle to topple the military dictatorship, and so simultaneously achieve democracy and equality for all nationalities.

United Nationalities League for Democracy
(Liberated Areas)

Date: February 12, 1998
UNLD (LA)
United Nationalities League for Democracy
(Liberated Area)

ဗုဒ္ဓဝိသေသနတိုင်းသမိုင်း များ (၃၀/၃၀)

UNLD (LA) အကြားသို့ တီးဆိုပါသည်။ အချိန်များ ဖြစ်ပါသည်။ UNLD (LA) က ဗုဒ္ဓဝိသေသနတိုင်းသမိုင်း များ (၃၀/၃၀) ၁၉၇၆ ခုနှစ်စာရင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။ UNLD (LA) အကြားသို့ တီးဆိုပါသည်။ UNLD (LA) က ဗုဒ္ဓဝိသေသနတိုင်းသမိုင်း များ (၃၀/၃၀) ၁၉၇၆ ခုနှစ်စာရင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။ UNLD (LA) အကြားသို့ တီးဆိုပါသည်။
II UNLD and Others –

The petitioner argues that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is unconstitutional and in violation of the right to freedom of speech and expression, and the right to freedom of association. The petitioner submits that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is arbitrary and discriminatory, and violates the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association, and the right to peaceful assembly.

II NRPP – CFGs

The petitioner argues that the prohibition of NRPP (Ordinance) 2017 is unconstitutional and in violation of the right to freedom of speech and expression, and the right to freedom of association. The petitioner submits that the prohibition of NRPP (Ordinance) 2017 is arbitrary and discriminatory, and violates the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association, and the right to peaceful assembly.

II NDF

The petitioner argues that the prohibition of NDF (Ordinance) 2017 is unconstitutional and in violation of the right to freedom of speech and expression, and the right to freedom of association. The petitioner submits that the prohibition of NDF (Ordinance) 2017 is arbitrary and discriminatory, and violates the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association, and the right to peaceful assembly.

III UNLD

The petitioner argues that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is unconstitutional and in violation of the right to freedom of speech and expression, and the right to freedom of association. The petitioner submits that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is arbitrary and discriminatory, and violates the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association, and the right to peaceful assembly.

IV

The petitioner argues that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is unconstitutional and in violation of the right to freedom of speech and expression, and the right to freedom of association. The petitioner submits that the prohibition of UNLD (Ordinance) 2017 is arbitrary and discriminatory, and violates the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association, and the right to peaceful assembly.
“ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။” ဖော်ပြမည်။ “ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။”

UNLD မှာ ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။ ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။

ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။

UNLD (LA) နှင့် NRPP ကို အနေဖြင့် စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။

UNLD (LA) သည် အနေဖြင့် စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များကို ကျော်ကြားခြင်း ဖော်ပြမည်။

အမှတ်တစ်ချက်များ

- ဗိုလ်ချုပ်သမားများ (MP)
- စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များ (UNLD)
- စိုက်ပျိုးရေးရာသော အချက်အလက်များ (UNLD)
(5) တရားဝင်၏ UNLD/UNLD (LA) ၏ သိပ္ပါးများ အားကြီးရင်း အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။ NDF / UNLD (LA) အားကြီးရင်း အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

(6) အမူရိုင်းများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများအနေဖြင့် NRP ကိုရှေ့ထိုး၍ အုပ်စုကိုများစွာ စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

(7) အမူရိုင်းများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ၏ စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုများကို တင်းထောင်သူများ၏ ဝါညွှန်းများကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

(8) အမူရိုင်းများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများကို UNLD/UNLD (LA) အားကြီးရင်း အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

UNLD (LA) စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှု—

UNLD (LA) အားကြီး ၏ UNLD ၏ သိပ္ပါးများ “သိပ္ပါးများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်” ဟူ၍ သိပ္ပါးများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

(9) အမူရိုင်းများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများကို UNLD/UNLD (LA) အားကြီးရင်း အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

NCUB, DAB, NDF, Overseas Orgs အားလုံးကို UNLD/UNLD (LA) အားမှားယူစေရန် အရာရှိများကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်။

NDF အား “သိပ္ပါးများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်” ဟူ၍ သိပ္ပါးများကို ထောက်ပံ့သူများ စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုများကို တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါပါသည်။

UNLD (LA) အားကြီး “သိပ္ပါးများကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါသည်” ဟူ၍ သိပ္ပါးများကို ထောက်ပံ့သူများ စီမံခန့်ခွဲနေသူများ စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုများကို တင်းထောင်သူများ အားလုံးကို စီစဉ်ပါပါသည်။
UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက်

ဗိသုကာ ရွေး မွှေးတပ်ကြီး (၆၇၀) ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) မှာ စာရင်းစာရင်းအင်္ဂါရာကို စာရင်းစာရင်းပြုစုစွဲနေသည်။ ဗိသုကာ ရွေး မွှေးတပ်ကြီး စာရင်းစာရင်းအင်္ဂါရာ စာရင်းစာရင်းအင်္ဂါရာကို စာရင်းစာရင်းပြုစုစွဲနေသည်။ ဗိသုကာ ရွေး မွှေးတပ်ကြီး စာရင်းစာရင်းအင်္ဂါရာ စာရင်းစာရင်းအင်္ဂါရာကို စာရင်းစာရင်းပြုစုစွဲနေသည်။ UNLD (LA) လုပ်ငန်းမှာ နောက်တစ်စီး လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် (၂၀၀၀/၃၀)

Inaugural Congress of UNLD (LA) သည် အလိုအား အသုံးပြုရန် အောက်ပါကျောင်းသားများ ဖော်ပြထားသည် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက်

UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် —

(၁) မိမိတို့ အကြံပေးချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက်

UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် —

(၁) မိမိတို့ အကြံပေးချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက်

NRP, NCUB, NCGUB, DAB, NDF, NLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် —

(၁) မိမိတို့ အကြံပေးချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက် (၂) သော ကြိုက်တွင် UNLD (LA) လိုင်စင်စာရင်းကိုင်းချက်

UNLD (LA)
UNLD (LA)
United Nationalities League for Democracy
(Liberated Areas)

 Announcement
For
Holding of UNLD (LA) Inaugural Congress

 24 April, 2000

UNLD (LA) is now preparing to hold it’s inaugural meeting “THE FIRST CONGRESS OF UNLD (LA)” on coming July/ September, in a liberated area. Its advisors, presidium, secretariat and executive committee members will participate to further consolidate their existing agreement and to address current issues of nationalities in the political mainstream of Burma.

Non-Burmans Nationalities, the Funding of UNLD and its Role:

Non-Burmans (Ethnic Nationalities of Union of Burma/Myanmar) have played major roles in the Wars against colonialism, the struggle for independence and the preservation of the Union.

Before the Union and democracy were fully mature, the country fell under Civil War and military dictatorships. Those had ignited the struggle of the ethnic peoples for freedom, equality and democracy. Since 1988, when mass uprisings were ruthlessly suppressed by the junta, they have, in conjunction with Burman democratic forces, been continuing the struggle.

The UNLD was formed by 21 non-Burman ethnic parties in 1989. It was a united front based on the ethnic peoples residing in 7 non-Burman states as well as those in Burma Proper. Representatives from these parties shared duties in the Board of Chairpersons, Board of Secretaries and various work committees.

The League’s stand was to establish a genuine union based on Equality and the Full Right to Self-determination should be integrated with the struggle for democracy. In other words, the unity for the struggle for democracy must be based on equality among the ethnic peoples including Burmans.

Subsequently, the UNLD has, in cooperation with all ethnic forces, struggled for democracy and, in cooperation with all union forces, struggled for the right to self-determination. The result was the formation of the ‘Election Victory to the States Committee’ during the 1990 General Elections. Altogether 67 seats were won by the 19 ethnic parties, making the UNLD the second largest winning grouping in the whole union.

However, the UNLD together with 7 other ethnic parties that were UNLD members were unilaterally dissolved by the junta in 1992.
Since then, many ethnic politicians and MP elects have been forced to flee abroad. At home, the UNLD continues to be active in convenient forms for the aims stated above it. It also forms the backbone of the CRPP founded in 1998 based on mutual respect and recognition.

The Establishment of UNLD (LA) and its Purposes and Programs:

The UNLD (LA) was establishment on 12 February 1998 by 11 exiled UNLD-affiliated parties, 15 former members of Board of Chairpersons, Board of Secretaries and Work Committees, and 8 ethnic MPs. [Ref: Statement 1/98]

UNLD (LA) Advisors:

1. Dr. Chao Tzang Yawnghwe Shan (Canada)
2. Dr. Maran La Raw Kachin (USA)
3. Dr. Aye Kyaw Arakan (USA)
4. Dr. Vum Son Suantak Chin (USA)

UNLD (LA) Presidium Members:

1. Daniel Aung (MP) LNDP
2. Marn Nyunt Maung UKL
3. Nai Tun Wau MNDF
4. Lian Uk (MP) Independent
5. U Tha Noe (MP) ALD
6. Dr. Za Hlei Thang (MP) CNLD
7. Thang Lian Pau (MP) ZNC
8. Nang Zin La KNC
9. Sao Ood Kesi SSNLD
10. Khun Mar Ko Ban (MP) KNSLD
11. Sha Reh KNLD

UNLD (LA) Secretaries Members:

1. U Aye Maung Lahu
2. Lian Hmung Sakhong Chin
3. Nai Phe Thein Zar Mon
4. Wong Zar Karp Zomi
5. Saw Htun Htun Lynn Karen
6. Khun Po Kayarn
7. U Htun Aung Arakan
8. U Myat Ko Karenni
9. Sai Win Pe (MP) Shan
10. Maran Naw Kachin
11. Nai Thaung Shein (MP) Mon
Purpose of UNLD (LA):

1. To implement the UNLD’s original objectives and programs;
2. To support UNLD activities at home;
3. To engage in activities denied to those at home;
4. To work in concert with democratic forces, both at home and aboard, both Burman and non-Burman.

Objectives Programs of UNLD (LA):

1. Together with other forces, to struggle for democracy and equality simultaneously;
2. To struggle for the realization of Tripartite Dialogue;
3. To assist others in exerting political pressure on the SPDC;
4. To assist in the enhancement of groups pressing for the realization of Tripartite Dialogue;
5. To coordinate with the UNLD, other ethnic parties, cease-fire groups at home and the NDF and other ethnic groups aboard;
6. To support the NRP activities;
7. To assist in the drafting of state constitutions;
8. To expose the truth about the so-called National Convention and the people’s genuine desires;
9. To highlight the UNLD’s struggle for the peaceful resolution of the ethnic question.

The States of UNLD (LA):

It is the original UNLD in another form, as necessitated by being outlawed by the SPDC. It is to fill the vacuum in the non-Burman camp in the efforts to make the Tripartite Dialogue a reality. The difference with the NLD is that the latter is recognized both within and outside Burma.

Nevertheless, it cannot be overlooked that members of the UNLD (LA) are active in the CRPP and other political and armed groups within Burma, and also in the NRP, NCUB, NCGUB, NDF and various overseas groups outside Burma.

With regards to the NDF, the united front of the ethnic armed resistance movements, we shall be able to complement each other in diverse actions for common aim and objective.

Plan for Holding of UNLD (LA) Inaugural Congress:

On 17 November 1999, an ad hoc meeting was held to discuss the questions of the establishment of an office and the holding of an inaugural congress. [Statement 11/99]

The inaugural congress is aimed to be the meeting of the Board of Advisers, Board of Chairpersons, Board of Secretaries and various work committees.
Purpose of the Conference:
1. To review the political situation, the UNLD’s principles and programs;
2. To draft short/long term programs and re-distribute duties among members;
3. To discuss ways to promote the political struggle of the ethnic people;
4. To discuss tactics to resolve political programs politically;
5. To prepare a strong basis for a future democratic union;
6. To discuss further with NRP, NCUB, NDF, NLD (LA)

Plan (Agenda) of the Conference:
- The UNLD (LA) plans to hold a 3-day meeting between July and September 2000.
- It shall be attended by the following participants both from abroad and the border.
- 4 Advisors, 11 members of Board of Chairpersons, 11 members of Board of Secretaries, 4 members of work committees, 6 assistants. (office work, communications & transportation)
- The meeting with the NRP, NCUB, NCGUB, DAB, NDF, NLD (LA) is planned to be held right after.

Conference Preparatory Work Committees Members:
(1) Khun Man Ko Ban  (2) Sao Ood Kese  
(3) Daniel Aung  (4) Lian H. Sakhong  
(5) Sai Win Pe  (6) Nai Thaung Shein  
(7) Sai Doue

On behalf of UNLD (LA), we, the work committee earnestly request to our UNLD (LA) concerned members, to take all necessary steps towards our common goal and to ensure that can function successfully.

Secretariat office
UNLD (LA)

Date: 24 April, 2000
DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT TOWARDS FEDERAL UNION:
THE ROLE OF UNLD IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY AND
FEDERALISM IN BURMA

By

Dr. Lian H. Sakhong

Secretary General of Chin National League for Democracy (CNLD),
Secretary and founding member of the United Nationalities League for Democracy (UNLD)

Introduction:

The United Nationalities League for Democracy (UNLD), an umbrella political organization of
non-Burman or non-Myanmar nationalities in Burma,1 was formed in 1988 following the
nationwide democracy movement against three decades of General Ne Win's dictatorship. From
the very beginning, the UNLD adopted a policy aimed at the establishment of a genuine federal
union based on democratic rights for all nationalities and the rights of self-determination for all
member states of the Union. It openly declared that democracy without federalism would not
solve the political crisis in Burma, including the civil war, which had already been fought, for
four decades. Thus for the UNLD, the ultimate goal of the democratic movement in present
Burma is not only to restore democratic government but to establish a genuine federal union. In
other words, the UNLD views the root of political crisis in Burma today as a constitutional
problem rather than a purely ideological confrontation between democracy and dictatorship.

1. Ever since the first Myanmar Kingdom of the Pagan dynasty was founded by King Annawrattha in 1044, the term
"Myanmar" has been used to denote the ethnicity of the majority ethnic group, which is in turn inseparably
intertwined with, as the saying goes: Buddabata Myanmar Lu-ryo (dreadly, the implication is that to be
"Myanmar" is to be Buddhist). The term Myanmar-Buddhist does not include the Chin and other ethnic groups
who joined together in a union, the Union of Burma, in 1947 on the principle of equality. Thus, although the
present military junta has changed the country name from Burma to Myanmar after the unlawful military coup in
1989, almost all the ethnic groups and as well Burmese democratic forces (led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi) do not
recognize the name, since it was changed by an illegitimate de facto government. I shall therefore use the term
Burma to denote the country, and the term Myanmar will be used to denote the ethnic group of Myanmar,
interchangeably with the word Burman. It might in parenthesis be noted that there is controversy over the use of
the terms Myanmar, Burma, Burman, and Burmese, revolving around the question about whether the terms are
inclusive (referring to all citizens of the Union) or exclusive (referring only to the Burmese-speakers).
In this paper, I shall explore the role of the UNLD in the on-going struggle for democracy and federalism in Burma. In doing this, attention will be given to the basic principles of federalism and democratic decentralization, which of course is the goal of the movement and the aim of the UNLD. However, instead of presenting a theoretical paper on the basic principles of federalism, I shall focus my attention to the quest for federalism within the historical framework of "religious and ethnic conflict", so-called, in modern Burma. In this way, I shall argue that the democracy movement in Burma since the military coup d'etat in 1962 is the continuation of the "federal movement" during the parliamentary democratic period in the 1950s and early 1960s. The central argument in this paper therefore will run through the military coup in 1962 as "the culmination of political process" stemming from the political crisis during the parliamentary democratic period.²

I shall then try to point out how we can view the role of UNLD in present struggle as the continuation of the Supreme Council of the United Hills People (SCOUHP), which played a leading role in federal movement during the late 1850s and early 1960s. Another way of putting it is to say that what the UNLD is trying to achieve at present is what the SCOUHP attempted even before the military coup in 1962. But because the federal movement led by the SCOUHP was abruptly interrupted by the military coup in 1962, the struggle for democracy and federalism needs to be continued today.

**Background History:**

The Union of Burma is a nation-state of diverse ethnic nations (ethnic nationalities or nationalities), founded in 1947 at Panglong Conference by pre-colonial independent ethnic nationalities such as the Chin, Kachin, Karen, Karenni, Mon, Rakhine (Arakan), Myanmar (Burman), and Shan, based on the principle of equality. As it was founded by formerly independent peoples in 1947 through an agreement, the boundaries of the Union of Burma today are not historical. Rather, Panglong Agreement signed in 1947.

In order understand the complex background of religious and ethnic diversity in Burma, one might firstly note that there is an age-old identification of Burman/Myanmar ethnicity and Buddhism, which has been the dominant ideological and political force in what is today called the Union of Burma or Myanmar. Secondly, there are other ethnic nations or nationalities such as the Mon, Rakhine (Arakan), and Shan, who are Buddhists, but feel dominated by the Burman/Myanmar majority. Thirdly, there are ethnic nationalities who are predominantly Christians within a Baptist tradition. The most prominent Christian groups are the Chin, Kachin and Karen. They -- like the Mon and the Shan-- form ethnic communities which transcend the boundaries of the modern nation-states of Burma, Bangladesh, India, China, and Thailand. The present state of relations between majority Burman/Myanmar Buddhists and minority Christian ethnic groups must be understood against the background of colonial history.

The British annexed "Burma Proper", i.e., the Burman or Myanmar Kingdom, in three Anglo-Burmese wars fought in 1824-1852 and 1885. As a result, the British took over Burma Proper in three stages: the Rakhine (Arakan) and Tenasserim coastal provinces in 1826, Lower Burma (previously Mon Kingdom) including Rangoon -- the present capital of Burma -- in 1852, and

---

Upper Burma including Mandalay, the last capital of the Burman Kingdom in 1885. When the last King of Burma, Thibaw, was deposed and exiled to India, the possessions of the Burman Kingdom -- including semi-independent tributaries of the Burman King, such as the Arakan and Mon -- were transferred to the British. However, this arrangement did not include the Chin, Kachin, Shan and Karenni, who were completely independent peoples, and had never been conquered by the Burman King. Thus, the British separately conquered or "pacified" them during a different period of time. The Chin people, for instance, were "pacified" only ten years after the fall of Mandalay, and their land Chinram, or Chinland, was not declared a part of British India until 1896.

During the colonial period, the British applied two different administrative systems: "direct rule" and "indirect rule". The first was applied to the peoples and areas they conquered together with the Burman Kingdom, i.e., "Burma Proper". "Indirect rule", on the other hand, was applied to the peoples who were "pacified" or added by treaty (the Shan principalities, for example) to the British empire after the annexation of the Burman Kingdom. Under the British policy of "indirect rule", the traditional princess and local chiefs of the Chin, Kachin and the Shan were allowed to retain a certain level of administrative and judiciary powers within their respective territories.

In 1937, when the Burma Act of 1935 was officially implemented, Burma Proper was separated from British India and given a Governor of its own. The 1936 Act also created a government structure for Burma Proper, with a Prime Minister and cabinet. The Legislative Council for Burma Proper was also created, although essential power remained firmly in the hands of the British Governor and Westminster. From that time on, Burma Proper was commonly known as "Ministerial Burma". In contrast to this, the term "Excluded Areas" was used to donate the Chin, Kachin and Shan States (Federated Shan States), which were not only subject to "indirect rule", but also excluded from the Legislative Council of Ministerial Burma. The term "Excluded Areas", however, was superseded by the term "Frontier Areas" when the British government created a "Frontier Area Administration" soon after the Second World War.

The Second World War and the Japanese invasion of Burma brought British rule to an abrupt end. Accompanied and helped by the Burma Independence Army (BIA) led by General Aung San (later, U Aung San, upon leaving the armed services), the Japanese easily eliminated the British and captured Rangoon. In May 1942, the Governor of Burma fled to Simla, India, and established the British Burma government in exile there. Having successfully driven the British into India, the Japanese occupied Burma Proper and set up a military administration along their lines of advance.

When the BIA were allowed by the Japanese to be stationed in the Irrawaddy delta where the majority of the population were Karen, who were loyal to the British, communal violence erupted between the Karen and the Burman. The Japanese ended the bloodbath but only after more than 1,000 Karen civilians lost their lives. Because of that event, a full-scale war broke out between the Karen and the newly independent Burmese government in 1949. This ethnic conflict was the

---

3. Here I use Chinland and Chinram interchangeably. At the "Chin Seminar", held in Ottawa, Canada, on 29th April to 2nd May 1998, Dr. Za Hlei Thang, one of the most outstanding politicians and scholars among the Chin, proposed the word *ram* in Chin should be used in stead of the English word *land*, as *Chinram* instead of *Chinland*. It was widely accepted by those who attended the seminar.
beginning of civil war in modern Burma, in which hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost over more than five decades and which is still in progress. As will be explained, only in the case of the Karen, can the term "ethnic conflict" be applied, but not, for example, the Chin, Kachin, Shan, etc...

After expelling the Japanese, the British returned to Burma in the spring of 1945. They outlined their long-term plan for the future of Burma in the form of a White paper. This plan provided for a three-year period of direct rule under the British Governor, during which economic rehabilitation from the ravages of war was to be undertaken. Next, the Legislative Council of Ministerial Burma would be restored in accordance with the 1935 Burma Act. Only after the elections had been held under this Act would the legislature be invited to frame a new constitution "which would eventually provide the basic on which Burma would be granted dominion status."  

For the Frontier Areas, the White Paper provided a means of maintaining the pre-war status quo. The Karenni (Kayah) State was still bound by the pre-colonial treaty as an independent nation. Since the Chinram, the Kachin State and the Federal Shan States were excluded from the administration of Burma Proper, they would according to the White Paper, have "a special regime under the Governor". When Stevenson became the Director of the Frontier Union "for the Chin, Kachin, Karen, Shan and other non-Burman nationalities. However, the plans did not come to fruition as the British Conservative Party of Prime Minister Winston Churchill, lost the general election in 1945.

In the early stage of the post-war period, the British strongly highlighted the rights and interests of the Chin, Kachin, Karen and other non-Burman nationalities from the Frontier Areas who had loyally defended the British Empire during the war. But when the Labour Government came to power, Britain reversed its policy, and Burma's political agenda became largely a matter of bilateral negotiation between the British Labour Government and U Aung San's AFPEL (Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League). Thus, in December 1946, the Labor government invited only U Aung San, the undisputed leader of the Burmese nationalist movement. The delegation, which did not include a single representative from the Frontier Areas, went to London to discuss "the steps that would be necessary to constitute Burma a sovereign independent nation." Since Attlee's Labour Government had already prepared to grant Burma's independence either within or without the Commonwealth, the London talks were largely a formality, at most putting into more concrete from the principles to which they had already agreed. It might be said -- as Churchill stated in parliament -- the people of the Frontier Area were abandoned by the British and left to salvage what they could of their former independent status with U Aung San and the AFPEL.

---

The Question of Non-Burman Nationalities:

At the London Talks in December 1946, the Burman delegates demanded that "the amalgamation of the Frontier Areas and Ministerial Burma should take place at once, and that the Governor's responsibility for the Frontier Areas should end".\(^9\) As noted already, the London Talks was bilateral negotiation between the British Labor government and Aung San's AFPFL without a single representative from non-Burman nationalities. Although there were at least three Karen members in the constituent Assembly of the Interim Burmese government, none of them were included in the London Talks. Instead, Aung San included several councilors, civil servants and politicians in the delegation. He even included his main rival politicians such as U Saw and Ba Sein.

On the demand of amalgamation of Frontier Areas with Ministerial Burma, the British countered the AFPFL's demand with the following position:

> The HMG for their part are bound by solemn undertakings to the people of those Areas to regard their wishes in this matter, and they have deep obligations to those peoples for the help that they gave during the war. According to the information available to HMG the Frontier Areas are not ready or willing to amalgamate with Burma Proper.\(^10\)

During the talk, Attlee received a cable from the Shan Sawbwa (princes), through the Frontier Areas Administration and the Governor, stating that Aung San and his delegation did not represent the Shan and the Frontier Areas.\(^11\) Stevenson, Director of Frontier Areas Administration, also cabled to London, saying that,

> We understand that the Hon'ble U Aung San and the Burman Mission visiting London will seek the control of F.A. If this is the case of we wish to state emphatically that neither the Hon'ble Aung San nor his colleagues has any mandate to speak on behalf of FA.\(^12\)

In short, Aung San and his delegation had no right to discuss the further of the Frontier Areas.

Indeed, it might rightly be said that Aung San and his delegation neither represented nor had the right to discuss the further of the people of the Frontier Areas, especially the Chin, Kachin, and Shan because they were independent peoples before the colonial period and were conquered separately by the British, and they were not part of Ministerial Burma (Burma Proper). Aung San could therefore legitimately represent only Burma Proper, or the Ministerial Burma, which belonged to an old Burman or Myanmar Kingdom before colonial period. In the pre-colonial period, no Burman or Myanmar King had ever conquered, for instance, the Chin people and their land, Chinram. That was the reason the British had applied two different administrative systems.

\(^10\) Ibid., quoted also in Maung Maung (1989), p.257.  
\(^12\) Original document is reprinted in Tinker 1984 and quoted in Maung Maung (1989).
Thus, when Burma and India were to be given independence by the British, the Chinram was not to be handed over to their India or Burma since it was bot annexed by the British as a part of either country. They had the full right to be a sovereign independent state by themselves when the British withdrew its imperial administration from British India and Burma. In a nutshell, Aung San did not and could not represent the Chin and/or other nationalities from the Frontier Areas without any mandate from the peoples themselves.

During this critical period, U Aung San showed not only his honesty but also his ability for great leadership, which eventually won the trust of the non-Burman nationalities. He acknowledged the fact that the non-Burman nationalities from the Frontier Areas had the right to regain their freedom, independence, and sovereign status because they were not the subjects of the pre-colonial Burman or Myanmar Kingdom. Thus, they had the very right of self-determination: to decide on their own whether they would like to gain independence directly from Great Britain, and to found their own sovereign nation-states, or to jointly obtain independence with Burma, or even to remain as Provinces of the Commonwealth of Great Britain. Aung San reassessed his position and bravely and wisely put his signature to the historic agreement, the Aung San-Attlee Agreement, signed on January 27, 1947. This historic agreement spelled out the position of the Frontier Areas vis-a-vis independence that was to be granted Ministerial Burma, as below:

8. Frontier Areas:

(b) The leaders and the representatives of the peoples of the Frontier Areas shall be asked, either at the Panglong Conference to be held at the beginning of next month or at a special conference to be convened for the purpose of expressing their views upon the form of association with the government of Burma which they consider acceptable during the transition period ....

(c) After the Panglong Conference, or the special conference, His Majesty's government and the government of Burma will agree upon the best method of advancing their common aims in accordance with the expressed views of the peoples of the Frontier Areas.  

However, on that particular issue of non-Burman nationalities, two members of the Burman delegation refused to sign the Aung San-Attlee Agreement. One was U Saw, the former Prime Ministerial, and the other was Thakin Ba Sein, who had shared with Thakin Tun Ok the leadership of the minority faction of Dobama Asi-Azone after it split earlier (in 1938). In their view, the clause concerning the Frontier Area in the Agreement carried an implicit threat of

---

14. In 1938, the Dobama Asi-Azone split into two faction was led by Aung San and Thakin Kodaw Hmaing, and the other by Tun Ok and Ba Sein. Although each claimed to maintain the Dobama Asi-Azone, they were in reality two separate parties. While Aung San and Kodaw Hmaing opted for the "non-racial, non-religious secular" approach of inclusive secularism, Tun Ok and Ba Sein centered their political conviction on "race" and religion, namely, Burman or Myanmar "race" and Buddhism. As they put it well, to be Myanmar is to be a Buddhist ("Buddha-bata Myanmar-lu-myo," their creed in Burmese). Moreover, while Aung San stood for democracy and federal Union, Tun Ok and Ba Sein were in favor of totalitarian form of national organization and restoration of monarchy, a country in which the Burman or Myanmar race would tightly control the entire political systems. See in Maung Maung (1989), and Khin Yi, The Dhobama Movement in Burma, 1930-1938, (Cornell University, 1988).
"dividing Burma into two parts". Thus, they not only ignored the history of non-Burman nationalities such as the Chin, Kachin and Shan, but also the will of the people from the Frontier Areas. Upon their return to Rangoon, U Saw and Thakin Ba Sein joined Ba Maw and Paw Tun, another former Prime Minister, formed the National Opposition Front, and accused Aung San of having sold out for sake of holding office.

U Aung San, however, was not unduly troubled by the accusations of his political opponents and plunged straight into negotiation with pre-colonial independent nationalities such as the Chin, Kachin and Shan. As mentioned above, the Aung San-Attlee Agreement had left the future of the Frontier Areas to the decision of its people.

**Jointly gaining Independence with Burma:**

After having successfully negotiated with the British, U Aung San turned his attention to the non-Burman nationalities and persuaded them to jointly obtain independence with Burma. He promised the frontier peoples separate status with full autonomy within the Burma Union, active participation at the center within a Senate-like body, protection of minority rights, and the right of secession. He also promised to make the agreed terms into law as guarantee of their right for the future, and told them they need have no fear of the Burma. The negotiations between Aung San, as the sole representative of the interim Burmese government, and the Chinm Kachin and Shan, were held at the Panglong Conference in February 1947.

U Aung San successfully persuaded the Chin, Kachin, and Shan to join Independent Burma as equal, co-independent partners, and the historic Panglong Agreement was thus signed on February 12, 1947. The essence of the Panglong Agreement - the Panglong Spirit -- was that the Chin, Kachin, and Shan did not surrender their rights of self-determination and sovereignty to the Burman. They signed the Panglong Agreement as a means to speed up their own search for freedom together with the Burman and other nationalities in what became the Union of Burma. Thus, the preamble of the Panglong Agreement declares:

Believing that freedom will be more speedily achieved by the Shans, the Kachins, and the Chins by their immediate co-operation with interim Burmese government.

---

18. Ibid. However, notwithstanding the British insistence that the Frontier Areas people be consulted on their wishes and aspirations, the commitment of the British Labor government to the FA peoples is doubtful. Would the Labor HMF have supported the FA people had they opted for independence -- against its treaty partner, Aung San and the AFPFL -- is an open question. Besides, the Labor HMG was at the time embroiled in the bloody partition of the Indian subcontinent into two new nation-states - India and Pakistan. As such, it might not be unfair to say that the Labor HMG was more than happy to let the FA peoples negotiate on their own their future with Aung San and the AFPFL.
The Panglong Agreement therefore represented a joint vision of the future of the pre-colonial independent peoples -- namely the Chin, Kachin, Shan and the interim Burmese government led by Chief Minister Aung San, who came into power in August 1946 according to the Burma Act 1935. The interim Burmese government was a government for the region formerly known as Burma proper or Ministerial Burma, which included such non-Burmese nationalities as the Mon, Rakhine (Arakan), and Karen. The Arakan and Mon were included because they were occupied by the British not as independent peoples but as the subjects of the kingdom of Burman or Myanmar. The Karens were included in the Legislative Council of Ministerial Burma according to the 1935 Burma Act because the majority of the Karens (more than two-third population) were living in delta areas side by side with the Burmans. Since these peoples were included in the Legislative Council of Ministerial Burma, U Aung San could represent them in Panglong as the head of their government. Thus, the Panglong Agreement should be viewed as an agreement to found a new sovereign, independent nation-state between peoples from pre-colonial independent nations, who in principle had the right to regain their independence directly from Great Britain, and to form their own respective nation-states. In other words, the Panglong Agreement was an agreement signed between the peoples of a post-colonial nation-state-to-be.

Ever Since the Union of Burma gained independence in 1948, the date the Panglong Agreement was signed has been celebrated as Union Day. The observance of February 12th as Union Day means the mutual recognition of the Chin, Kachin, Shan and other nationalities, including the Burmans, as "different people historically and traditionally due to their differences in their languages as well as their cultural life." It is also the recognition of the distinct national identity of the Chin, Kachin, Shan and other nationalities who had the right to gain their own independence separately and to found their own nation-state separately. In other words, it is the recognition of pre-colonial independent status of the Chin, Kachin, and Shan, and other nationalities as well as their post-colonial status of nation-state-to-be.

Condition Underpinning the Creation of the Union of Burma:

According to the Aung San-Attlee Agreement, the Frontier Areas Committee of Enquiry (FACE) was formed to inquire through an additional and specific consultation about the wishes of the frontier peoples. The British government appointed Col.D.R.Rees-William as Chairman of the FACE. Since the committee conducted its inquiry after the signing of the Panglong Agreement during March and April 1947, the evidence they heard was generally in favour of cooperation with Burma but under the condition of:

22. The Mon Kingdom was conquered by the Burman King Alaung-pay in 1755, and the Rakhine (Arakan) kingdom by King Bodaw-pay in 1784.
23. The Karen National Unity (KNU) rejected the terms of the 1935 Act in 1946 because they demanded independence for a separate homeland. They thus boycotted general elections of the 1947 Constituent Assembly, but the Karen Youth Organization (KYO) entered the general elections and took three seats in the Constituent Assembly and even the cabinet post in the Aung San's interim Government.
(i) Equal rights with Burma,
(ii) Full internal autonomy for Hill Areas [that is, ethnic national states], and
(iii) The right of secession from Burma at any time.26

The FACE finally concluded its report to the Government that the majority of witnesses who supported cooperation with Burma demanded the "right of secession by the States at any time".27

The FACE report, particularly the right of secession, was strongly criticized by such Burmese nationalists as U Saw and Thakin Ba Sein who had earlier refused to sign the Aung San-Attlee Agreement. They accused Aung San of having given up Burman territory and argued that the Frontier Areas were just the creation of the colonial policy of "divide and rule". U Aung San dismissed this criticism as historically unfounded and politically unwise. And he said, "The right of secession must be given, but it is our duty to work and show (our sincerity) so that they don't wish to leave."28 And in keeping with his promise to the Chin, Kachin and Shan leaders at the Panglong Conference to make agreed terms into law, the right of secession was provided for in the 1947 Union Constitution of Burma, Chapter X, Article 201, and 202:

Chapter (X): The Right of Secession:

201. Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Constitution or in any Act of Parliament made under section 199, every state shall have the right to secede from the Union in accordance with the condition hereinafter prescribed.

202. The right of secession shall not be exercised within ten years from the date on which this Constitution comes into operation. Although the "right of secession" was put into law in the Union Constitution, Burma did not become a genuine federal union.

The End of Aung San's Policies of Pluralism and Federalism:

At the Panglong Conference in 1947, the Chin, Kachin, Shan and other non-Burman nationalities were promised, as Silverstein observes, the right to exercise political authority of [administrative, judiciary, and legislative powers in their own autonomous national states] and to preserve and protect their language, culture, and religion in exchange for voluntarily joining the Burman in forming a political union and giving their loyalty to a new state.29

Unfortunately, U Aung San, who persuaded the Chin, Kachin, Shan and other non-Burman nationalities to join Independent Burma as equal partners, was assassinated by U Saw on July 19, 1947. He was succeeded by U Nu as leader of the AFPFL. When U Nu became the leader of the AFPFL, Burmese politics shifted in a retro-historical direction, backward toward the Old Kingdom of Myanmar or Burman. The new backward-looking policies did nothing to

26. See the resolutions of Chin, Kachin and Shan leaders at SCOUHP's meeting on March 23, 1947 and the memorandum they presented to the FACE (FACE's report 1947).
27. Ibid.
accommodate non-Myanmar/Burman nationalities who had agreed to join Independent Burma only for the sake of "speeding up freedom".

As a leader of the AFPFL, the first thing U Nu did was to give an order to U Chan Htun to re-draft U Aung San's version of the Union Constitution, which had already been approved by the AFPFL Convention in May 1947. Thus, the fate of the country and the people, especially the fate of the non-Burman/Myanmar nationalities, changed dramatically between July and September 1947. As a consequence, Burma did not become a genuine federal union, as U Chan Htun himself admitted to historian Hugh Tinker. He said, "Our country, through in theory federal, is in practice unitary."\(^{30}\)

On the policy of region, U Nu also reversed U Aung San's policy after the letter was assassinated. Although Aung San, the hero of independence and the founder of the Union of Burma, had opted for a "secular state" with a strong emphasis on "pluralism" and the "policy of unity in diversity" in which all different religious and racial groups in the Union could live together peacefully and harmoniously, U Nu opted for a more confessional and exclusive policy on proved to be end of his policy for a secular state and pluralism in Burma, which eventually led to the promulgation of Buddhism as the state religion of the Union of Burma in 1961.

For the Chin and other non-Burman nationalities, the promulgation of Buddhism as the "state religion of the Union of Burma" in 1961 was the greatest violation of the Panglong Agreement in which U Aung San and the leaders of the non-Burman nationalities agreed to form a Union based on the principle of equality. They therefore viewed the passage of the state religion bill not only as a religious issue, but also as a constitutional problem, in that this had been allowed to happen. In other words, they now viewed the Union Constitution as an instrument for imposing "a tyranny of majority", not as their protector. Thus, the promulgation of Buddhism as the state religion of Burma became not a pious deed, but a symbol of the tyranny of the majority under the semi-unitary system of the Union Constitution.

There were two different kinds of relations to the state religion reform from different non-Burman nationalities. The first reaction came from more radical groups who opted for an armed rebellion against the central government in order to gain their political autonomy and self-determination. The most serious armed rebellion as a direct result of the adoption of Buddhism as state religion was that of the Kachin Independent Army, which emerged soon after the state religion was that of Buddhism was promulgated in 1961. The "Christian Kachin," as Graver observes, "saw the proposal for Buddhism to be the state religion as further evidence of the Burmanization [Myanmarization] of the country,"\(^{32}\) which they had to prevent by any means, including an armed rebellion. The Chin rebellion, led by Hrang Nawl, was also related to the promulgation of Buddhism as the state religion, but the uprising was delayed until 1964 owing to tactical problems. Thus, the Chin rebellion was mostly seen as the result of the 1962 military coup, rather than the result of the promulgation of Buddhism as the state religion in 1961.

---

\(^{30}\) Hugh Tinker, Union of Burma (London, 1957); quoted also in Tun Myint (1957, p.13; see also my article in Chin Journal (March, 1997) No. 5.pp.84-94.

\(^{32}\) Mikael Graver, Nationalism as Political Paranoia in Burma (Copenhagen: NIAS, 1993), p.56 (Emphasis added!)
The Second reaction came from more moderate groups, who opted for constitutional means of solving their problems, rather than an armed rebellion. The most outstanding leader among these moderate groups was Sao Shwe Thaik of Yawngwe, a prominent Shan Sawbwa who was elected as the first President of the Union of Burma. Although a devout Buddhist, he strongly opposed the state religion bill because he saw it as a violation of the Panglong Agreement. As a president of the Supreme Council of United Hills People (SCOUHP), formed during the panglong Conference, he invited leaders of not only the Chin, Kachin and Shan, the original members of the SCOUHP, but also other non-Burman nationalities -- the Karen, Kayah, Mon, and Rakhine (Arakan) -- to Taunggyi, the capital of Shan State, to discuss constitutional problems.

Unfortunately, these problems still remain unsolved. The conference was attended by 226 delegates and came to be known as the 1961 Taunggyi Conference, and the movement itself was known later as the Federal Movement.

The Federal Movement in 1961-62:

At the Taunggyi Conference, all delegates, expect three who belonged to U Nu's party, agreed to amend the Union Constitution based on Aung San's draft, which the AFPFL convention had approved in May 1947, as noted already. At the AFPFL convention, U Aung San asked, "Now when we build our new Burma shall we build it as a Union or Unitary State?....."In my opinion", he answered, "it will not be feasible to set up a Unitary State. We must set up a Union with properly regulated provisions to safeguard the right of the national minorities." According to U Aung San's version of the constitution, the Union would be composed of National States, or what he called "Union State" such as the Chin, Kachin, Shan and Burman States and other National States such as Karen, Karenni (Kayah), Mon and Rakhine (Arakan) States. "The original idea", as Dr. Maung Maung observers, "was that the Union states should have their own separate constitutions, their own organs of states, viz.Parliament, Government and Judiciary."

U Chan Htun had reversed all these principles of the Federal Union after Aung San was assassinated. According to U Chan Htun's version of the Union Constitution, the Burma Proper or the ethnic Burman/Myanmar did not from their own separate National States; instead they combined the power of Burma/Myanmar National States with the whole sovereign authority of the Union of Burma. Thus while one ethnic group, the Burman/Myanmar, controlled the sovereign power of the Union, that is, legislative, judiciary, and administrative powers of the Union of Burma; the rest of the ethnic nationalities who formed their own respective National States became almost like the "vassal states" of the ethnic Burman or Myanmar. This constitutional arrangement was totally unacceptable to the Chin, Kachin, Shan who signed the Panglong Agreement on the principle of equality, and also for other nationalities.

---

33. Those three delegates who did not agree to the idea of a federal Union were Za Hre Lian (Chin), Aye Soe Myint (Karen), and Sama Duwas Sinwasung (Kachin).
They therefore demanded at the 1961 Taunggyi Conference the amendment of the Union Constitution and the formation of a genuine Federal Union composed of National States, with the full rights of political autonomy, i.e., legislative, judiciary and administrative powers within own National States, and self-determination including the right of secession. They also demanded separation between the political power to the Burman/Myanmar National States and the sovereign power of the Union, i.e., the creation of a Burman or Myanmar National State within the Union.36

The Second point they wanted to amend on the Union Constitution was the structure of Chamber of Nationalities. The original idea of the creation of the Chamber of Nationalities was that it was not only to safeguard the rights of non-Burmese nationalities but also for the symbolic and real equality, envisaged at the Panglong Conference. Thus, what they wanted was that each National State should have the right to send equal representatives to the Chamber of Nationalities, no matter how big or small their National State might be. In other words, they wanted a kind of Upper House like the American Senate.

But what had happened according to U Chan Htun's Union Constitution, was that while all the non-Burman nationalities had to send their tribal or local chiefs and princes to the Chamber of Nationalities; it allowed Burma Proper to elect representatives to the Chamber of Nationalities based on population. Thus, the Burman or Myanmar from Burma Proper, who composed majority in terms of population, were given domination in the Union Assembly.

In this way, the Union Assembly, according to U Chan Htun's version of the Union Constitution, was completely under the control of the Burman or Myanmar ethnic nationality. Not only did the powerful Chamber of Deputy have the power to thwart aspirations and interest of non-Burman nationalities, but the Burman also dominated even the Chamber of Nationalities. That was the reason the total cotes of non-Burman nationalities could not block the state religion bill even at the Chamber of Nationalities. Thus, all the non-Burma nationalities now viewed the Union Constitution itself as an instrument for imposing "a tyranny of majority", not as their protector. They therefore demanded a change of such constitutional injustice at the 1961 Taunggyi Conference.37 Thus, the Federal Movement and its Taunggyi Conference can be viewed, as noted by a Shan scholar Chao Tzang Yawngewe, as "a collective non-Burman effort to correct serious imbalances inherent in the constitution" of 1947.38

In response to the demand of the 1961 Taunggyi Conference, U Nu had no choice but to invite all the political leaders and legal experts from both Burman and non-Burman nationalities to what became known as the Federal Seminar at which "the issue of federalism and the problems of minorities would be discussed with a view to finding a peaceful solution."39 The meeting opened on 24 February, 1962 in Rangoon while the parliament was meeting also in regular session. But before the seminar was concluded and just before U Nu was scheduled to speak, the military led by General Ne Win seized state power in the name of the Revolutionary Council in the early

morning of 2 March, arresting all the non-Burman participants of the Federal Seminar and legally elected cabinet members, including U Nu himself, dissolving the parliament, suspending the constitution and ending all the debate on federal issues.

The Military Coup in March 1962:

Brigadier Aung Gyi, the most powerful but second only to General Ne Win in the Revolutionary Council, stated that the main reason of the military coup in 1962 was "the issues of federalism".40 The Burma Army, which staged the coup d'e'tat, was "the product of Burman nationalism," as a Shan leader an scholar Chao Tzang Yawnghwe pointed out, "a national sentiment revolving around racial pride and memories of the imperial glories of Burinnong, Alaungpaya and Hsinphyusin," and was very much enraged by the federal movement. They were desperate too, since a successful constitutional reform would underline the army's supremacy in the non-Burman areas.42 Moreover, if the constitutional reform was carried out successfully, the Burman would be on the same levels as non-Burman nationalities and this certainly was unthinkable for Burman national-chauvinists like Ne Win and Aung Gyi.43

Although the Burma Army was originally established by Aung San as the BIA (Burma Independence Army) during the Second World War, two factions from very different backgrounds made up the Thirty Comrades, the core of the BIA. "Twenty-two of the young comrades were followers of the old writer and national hero, Thakhin Kodaw Hmaing" and were later knowns as "Kodaw Hmaing-Aung San faction". But another eight, including Ne Win, came from the "Ba Sein-Tun Oke faction".44 As noted already, Ba Sein refused to sign the Aung San-Attlee Agreement, mainly because of non-Burman nationalities issues on which he could not agree with U Aung San. As a matter of the fact, while Aung San had officially recognized, by signing that agreement, the pre-colonial independent status of the Chin, Kachin, Shan and other non-Burman nationalities, and their right to regain independence directly from Great Britain and their right to form their own respective sovereign nation-states without any mutual attachment to Burma, Ba Sein and his fellow U Saw, who later killed Aung San, could not recognize historical truth and refused to sign that agreement in 1947. They also accused U Aung San of being a traitor of Burman traditional nationalism, and they went about saying that Burma had been sold down the river by Aung San.45 Hence, General Ne Win and Brigadier Aung Gyi, as the most faithful disciples of the Ba Sein-Tun Oke Burman national-chauvinist faction, reclaimed their vision of Burma ---- which in their view U Aung San betrayed. And they promulgated the Unitary State Constitution in 1974 by force.

Ever since the chauvinistic Burma Army launched a full range of "Myanmarization" measures under the leadership of General Ne Win, the Chin, Kachin, Karen, Karenni (Kayah), Rakhine

41. Those are the Burman or Myanmar Kings who conquered their neighboring countries such as Mon, Rakhine, Shan and Siam in their past history. But no Burman king ever conquered the Chinland.
42. Chao Tzang Yawnghwe, the Shan of Burma: Memories of a Shan Exile (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1987), p.120
43. Ibid.
(Arakan), Shan and other non-Burman nationalities have had no choice but to struggle for their survival by any means, including the use of arms. Today almost all non-Burman nationalities are fighting against the central government in order to gain full political autonomy and self-determination within the Union of Burma. Thus, the civil war in Burma which began at the time of independence intensified under General Ne Win's military dictatorship and his successor, the present military junta, which came into power in 1988, in order to suppress the nation-wide popular uprising for a democratic change.

**Struggle for the Second Independence:**

As Daw Aung San Suu Kyi correctly points out, the struggle for democracy, equality and self-determination in present Burma is the struggle for the second independence of Burma because what Burma's leader tried hard to achieve in the first independence movement had all been coercively negated by General Ne Win in the 1962 military coup. Moreover, the 1962 military coup abruptly interrupted the federal movement, which indeed was a struggle for reformation of genuine federal union in accordance with the Panglong Agreement and Spirit. Thus, the nation-wide democratic movement in 1988 can be seen as the struggle for the second independence, especially as the revival of the spirit of Panglong. Likewise, the formation of the UNLD can be viewed as the continuation of federal movements in 1950s and 1960s, then led by the SCOUHP.

In order to achieve the goal of the struggle for the second independence, the UNLD therefore adopted the following policies as its objectives:

1. To establish a genuine federal union.
2. To guarantee democratic rights, political equality, and self-determination for all nationalities Union.
3. To build a firm unity of all nationalities in the Union based on the principles of equality and justice.
4. To promote the development of all member states of the Union.
5. To abolish all types totalitarianism in Burma.
6. To establish internal peace and tranquility through dialogue.

The UNLD believes that for building a genuine federal union, the Union constitution must be based on a democratic administrative system, because as noted by a Shan analyst, "... democracy is an essential pre-condition for federalism. Federalism will not work in a polity where there is no democracy because federalism is, at the bottom, about decentralization of power and limits placed on power. In federalism the above is achieved via a set of arrangement that limits and divides or disperses power, so that parts of the whole are empowered and are further enabled to check central power and prevent the concentration of power."\(^{46}\)

\(\text{In short, democracy and federalism are inseparable, as head and tail of a coin, in a pluralistic and multi-ethnic country like Burma.}\)

The Basic principles of Federal Union:

On the formation of a genuine Federal Union, the UNLD has adopted seven principles of federalism for the future constitution of the Federal Union of Burma, as its conference held in Rangoon, on June 29-July 2, 1990. These seven principles are:

1. The constitution of the Federal Union of Burma shall be formed in accordance with the principles of federalism and democratic decentralization.

2. The Union Constitution shall guarantee the democratic rights of citizens of Burma including the principles contain in the United Nation's declaration of universal human rights.

3. The Union Constitution shall guarantee political equality among all ethnic national states of the Federal Union of Burma.

4. The Federal Union of Burma shall be composed of National States; and all National States of the Union shall be constituted in terms of ethnicity, rather than geographical areas. There must be at least eight National States, namely, Chin State, Kachin State, Karen State, Kaya State, Mon State, Myanmar or Burma State, Rakhine (Arakan State), and Shan State.

5. The Union Assembly shall be consisting of two legislative chambers: the Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) and the Chamber of Deputies (Lower House).
   (i) The Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) shall be composed of equal numbers of elected representatives from the respective National States; and
   (ii) The Chamber of Deputies (Lower House) shall be composed of elected representatives from the respective constituencies of the peoples.

   The Creation of Chamber of Nationalities based on equal representation of the member states of the Union is intended to safeguard the rights of National States and minorities in the Union government. It also intended as a symbol and instrument of the principle of equality among all nationalities of the Union.

6. In addition to the Union Assembly, all member states of the Union shall from their own separate Legislative Assemblies for their respective National States. In Federalism there must be a clear separation of Union Assembly, or Federal Parliament, from the Legislative Assemblies of the members states of the Union. Moreover, the residual powers, that is, all powers, expect those given by member states to the federal center, or the Union, must be vested in the Legislative Assembly of the National State. In this way, the Union Constitution automatically allocates political authority of legislative, judiciary, and administrative powers to the Legislative Assembly of the National States. Thus, all member states of the Union can be freely exercise the right of self-

---

47. I do not follow the original Burmese version of the UNLD text strictly here, but I am confident that this English translation will not miss the points we have described in Burmese, for I myself have drafted the original version in Burmese. See the UNLD documents in Lina H. Sakhong, peaceful Coexistence: Towards Federal Union of Burma (Chiangmai: NRP Program Printing, 1999), pp.94-95 (in Burmese)

48. As James Madison once explained regarding the role of the Senate in the USA, the role of the Chamber of Nationalities also will be "first to protect the people against their rules, and the secondly to protect against their rulers, and secondly to protect against the transient impressions onto which they themselves might be led."
determination through the right of self-government within their respective National States.

(7) The Sovereignty of the Union shall be vested in the people of the Union of Burma, and shall be exercised by the Union Assembly. Moreover, the central government of the Federal Union shall have authority to decide on action for: (i) monetary system, (ii) defense, (iii) foreign relation, and (iv) other authorities which temporarily vested in the central government of Federal Union by member states of the Union.

UNLD Policies concerning the Power Transition:

After the election held in May 1990, the UNLD adopted some policies to be applied during the power transition from an authoritarian military junta to a democratically elected government. Among them: (1) tripartite dialogue, (2) national reconciliation, and (3) national convention. In this paper I shall discuss briefly the need for national convention and tripartite dialogue, the policies adopted by the UNLD at the conference held in Rangoon from June 29- July 2, 1990. I shall, however, omit in this paper the policy of National Reconciliation, the program that in mainly conducted by the UNLD in exile together with other democratic forces, such as NCGUB, NCUB, NDF, and others.

(a) UNLD for Tripartite Dialogue:

From the very beginning, the UNLD has adopted for a non-violent political transition in Burma, from military dictatorship to a democratic open society. The UNLD believes that Democracy is the only form of sustainable governance which guarantees both individual citizens and national and cultural collectivities in Burma the rights of full participation in the development of social, economic, and cultural resources available to all citizens of the Union. Enduring democracy therefore requires the active participation of all the citizens -- as individual citizens and as members of an ethnic-cultural collectivity -- to build and renovate not only the democratic institutions but also the structure of the Union itself, which shall balance the different interests of nationalities for the common good of all member states of the Union.

As the UNLD believe in democratic principles and rights of full participation of all nationalities in the process of nation rebuilding, the UNLD demands dialogue as an integral part of the political transition, not only in the process of power transformation from military rule to a democratically elected body, but also in the entire process of democratization, which includes the restructuring of the Union into a federal system. Therefore, in the processes of both power transformation and democratization, dialogue must be the main instrument for bringing all individual citizens and collective members of nationalities of the Union together at all levels.

49. The UNLD and its umbrella parties contested in the election and won 69 seats, which is 16% of the parliamentary seats in the Union of Burma. A landslide victory went to NLD, a grand alliance of UNLD.
50. The UNLD was unilaterally dissolved by the SLORC in 1992. Thus, UNLD in exile has to be formed in a liberated area in order to carry out its mission until the victory comes. An official announcement on the formation of UNLD (exile) was made on Union Day of 1998.
After the general election in 1990, the UNLD believed that at least two levels of dialogue might be necessary to achieve the goal of the creation of democratic open society and the establishment of a genuine Federal Union. The first step of dialogue is for power transformation, and the second step, which is more important than the first level, will be for the entire process of democratization and the restructuring of the Union into a federal system.

The UNLD also believes that since the NLD had received the trust of the people in a landslide victory of the 1990 election, a dialogue for "transformation of power" should be a dialogue between the NLD led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and the military junta, the de facto government of present Burma. However, the nature of such dialogue at the first level must focus only on the transition of state powers into a democratically elected body. In other words, it will be a dialogue for administrative power but not for legislative power or constitutional matter. The core of dialogue at that level therefore is just for a "breakthrough" of political stagnation, which have created a number of political and social crises in today Burma.51

The UNLD strongly believes that political crisis in Burma today is not just a conflict between dictatorship and democracy. It involves an unmanaged and neglected conflict, including a civil war that has consumed many lives and resources of the country for five decades. The root of civil war in Burma is the conflict over power-sharing between the central government, which so far has been controlled by one ethnic groups called Myanmar or Burma, and all National States of the Union. In other words, the root of the problem is, as mentioned already, a constitutional problem or more specially, the rights of self-determination for non-Burman nationalities who joined the Union as equal partners in 1947. Indeed, most nationalities in Burma are now fighting for rightful self-determination and autonomous status of their respective National States within the Union. Since they were not able to resolve their problems through dialogue, they have no choice but to attempt to solve their disputes through violent means of civil war.

In order to avoid further bloodshed and violence during the political transition, the UNLD believes that the second level of dialogue must start almost simultaneously with the first level of dialogue. The aim of dialogue at the second level is to solve the entire political crisis in Burma and to end five long decades of civil war through the creation of a genuine Federal Union. The UNLD believes that without a genuine Federal Union there is no means of ending the civil war in Burma. Without ending the civil war, there is no means of establishing a democratic system either. Thus, the participation of all ethnic nationalities in the political transition is the most important element in the entire process of democratization and restructuring the Union into a federal system. They all have the right to participate in this important process of restructuring the Union. Thus, dialogue at the level must no longer be a two-way dialogue but a Tripartite dialogue, which shall include three forces, namely the forces composed of the non-Burman nationalities, the democratic forces led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and the military junta.

(b) The Need for a National Convention:

On June 29 to July 2, 1990, the UNLD held its conference at the YMCA Hall in Rangoon. At that conference, all the members of the UNLD unanimously adopted a policy on national convention.

51. See the protocols of the UNLD’s Second Conference, held at the YMCA Hall in Rangoon from June 29- July 2, 1990.
that states that in order to lay down the general guidelines of a federal constitution which will serve as foundation on which to build a new democratic society for the further Federal Union, a National Consultative Convention shall be convened, similar to the Panglong Conference.\textsuperscript{52}

The UNLD consulted issues of the National Consultative Convention with the NLD, the winner of the general election in 1990. On August 29, 1990, the UNLD and the NLD made a joint declaration knowns as Bo Aung Kyaw Street Declaration. Some of the points included in this declaration were:

(i) After the emergence of the Pyithu Hluttaw (Union Assembly or Federal Parliament), this Hluttaw shall form the elected government at the earliest time, then the Pyithu Hluttaw shall organize to convene a "National Consultative Convention" consisting of the representatives from all the nationalities, and other personages that are deemed necessary to take part in this convention. This convention shall lay down general guidelines for the Constitution of the Union. The Pyithu Hluttaw shall draw up, approve, and enact the constitution of the Union in compliance with above general guidelines.

(ii) All nationalities shall have full rights of equality, racially as well as politically, and in addition to having the full rights of self-determination, it is necessary to build a Union with a unity of all the nationalities which guarantees democracy and basic human rights.\textsuperscript{54}

Conclusion:

In this paper, I have argued that the democratic movement in Burma since 1962 was the continuation of the federal movement led by SCOUHP in the late 1950s and early 1960s. At the same time I have highlighted the fact that the role of the UNLD in the struggle for democracy and federalism is the continuation of a political role undertaken by the SCOUHP in the federal movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The only difference between the SCOUHP and the UNLD is neither the policy nor the goal, but the political situation. In the early 1960s, the Federal Movement was seen mainly as a separatist movement by the majority ethnic Burmese (Burman). Thus, the non-Burman nationalities under the leadership of the SCOUHP did not receive enough support from their fellow citizens, the Burman majority. At the Taunggyi Conference, for instance, three delegates who belonged to U Nu's Party were against the move for the formation of a genuine federal union, despite the fact that they all were non-Burman politicians.

By contrast, the movement for federalism is now seen as the movement for equality. The UNLD non enjoys strong support from all the democratic forces in Burma, especially the National League for Democracy (NLD) led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the National Coalition Government of the Union of Burma (NCGUB) headed by Dr. Sein Win, the National Council of the Union of Burma (NCUB), the National Democratic Front (NDF), the All Burma Student's Democratic Fronts (ABSDF), and other democratic forces. They all agree that the ultimate goal of democratic movement in Burma is the establishment of a genuine federal union, where all

\textsuperscript{52} The protocols of UNLD's Second Conference, held the YMCA Hall, Rangoon from June 29- July 2, 1990.
\textsuperscript{54} See also in my upcoming book Peaceful Co-existence: Towards Federal Union of Burma (in Burmese), the text of "Bo Aung Kyaw Street Declaration" is reprinted.
indigenous nationalities can live peacefully together. This unity in the same policy is the best hope not only for the UNLD but also for the future of the entire Federal Union of Burma.\(^{55}\)

\[\@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \@ \]
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The Federal Aspiration:

The Union of Burma is a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural "nation-state", which was founded on the basis of the 1947 Panglong Accord. The aspiration of the signers of the Accord was to jointly gain independence from the British, and to establish a Union of equal and co-independent states, i.e., with no nationalities or state being subordinated to any other state within the Union. That is, all constituent states if the Union were envisioned as being the equal partners of Burma proper or Ministerial Burma, the home state of the largest ethnic nationality, the Burma (or ethnic Burmese).

However, as history or political events would have it, the Union of Burma that came into a actual being was not in accordance with the aspiration of the non-Burman nationalities. Contrary to the Spirit of Panglong, the 1947 Constitution (finalized in September) craeted a "Union" where Burma Proper enjoyed the status of the Mother Country, i.e., whose cabinet, government, and parliament were also those of the whole country. This kind of arrangement made the other states of the Union subordinate to Burma Proper. Their relationship to Burma Proper (or the Burma State) was like that of Scotland and/or Wales to England.

An attempt was made by leaders of the non-Burman ethnic nationalities and states in 1961-1962 to address the issues of inequality and other problems related to the dominance of Burma Proper over other member or constituent states. They proposed constitutional reform aimed at making
the Union a genuinely federal one as agreed at Panglong. This move - the federal movement - was squashed in 1962 by the military, dominated and controlled by Burman officers.

In 1974, General Ne Win, the military dictator and chauvinist, imposed a new constitution, the Lanzin Constitution. A notable fact about this constitution was that the state structures and arrangements, as outlined on paper, looked highly decentralized, even federal like. However, the only and ruling party, the Lanzin Party, which held all powers was not democratic, and was moreover controlled and dominated by military officers (in, and out, of uniform). The Lanzin state-order was therefore one where its formal (on paper) decentralized, federal-like, features cloaked a highly centralized state where military subordinates of General Ne Win exercise real and significant power.

In the post-1988 period of struggle, the Burmese opposition forces and nationalities organizations have adopted as its goals, ONE, the restoration of democracy and TWO, the establishment of a new Union, one based on the principles of federalism, national self-determination, and equality. There have been signed several accords re-affirming the goals mentioned. These agreements are the Maneplaw, the Mae Tha Raw tha, and the Thoo Mwe Klo Agreements. It might be added that Democracy, and Federalism have been the aspiration of the peoples of Burma and nationalities since before the obtaining of independence.

**State Constitution: Its Meaning and Significance:**

One the other hand, as can be seen from history or the unfolding of historical events, Burma has not had any experience of federalism. Noteworthy in this regard is that none of the constituent or member states of the 1948 Union of Burma had constitutions of their own.

The absence of state constitutions in what was supposedly a Union of equal states is a very serious flaw. What this situation indicates is this: namely, that whatever power the governments of states enjoyed and exercised in the 1948 Union were given to them by a central government - and this is a characteristic of a unitary state order. In a unitary state order, power lies in the hand of the central government, and the powers of local governing or administrative units are derived from, or developed to them by the central government.

In contrast, in a federal state order, the member or constituent states are the basic and founding units of the federation, and whatever powers they exercise or possess are not given to them by the center. The powers of the respective states, and it is thus stated in most state constitutions in countries that are federal in form.

A federation is formed when a number of states agree for some reasons to live and work together under one flag. And because there is an agreement among founding states to band together as equal partners, there arises a need for another category or level of government to handle matters of common interest. Accordingly, this government - the federal or national government - is given, or vested with some powers by the member states. In a federation therefore it is the power of the federal government (or center) that is derived - i.e., given to the federal center by the member or constituent states.
In federalism therefore, the federal or national government is not a superior government that holds all power. Various and significant powers are held by the member states, and this is spelled out clearly in the state constitutions. As well, some powers which are shared by all is given to the federal government, and this is also spelled out or defined in the federal constitution.

There is therefore in a federation, two levels of power, and two levels of government. It might also be said that there are two "sovereignties", but which are intertwined, yet separated. Hence, there are in federalism two constitutions. One is the federal (or national) constitution, and there exist concurrently, another set of constitutions, i.e., the constitutions of member or constituent states.

In Burma, however, although state constitutions are basic to the idea or concept of federalism, they did not exist, and not much attention has been given, until recently, to state constitutions on the part even of nationalities leaders and organizations. This is indeed a strange situation.

**State Constitutions and Ethno-nationalism:**

State constitutions are inherent and necessary components of a federal state order or system where power is shared between two levels of governments. Therefore, looking into state constitutions and the drafting of state constitutions can be viewed as a very important process in situations where the goal is to establish a federal union - like the current situation in Burma.

State constitutions also serve a very crucial purpose. It is the function of the state constitutions to create order, to define how individuals, groups, population segments, and as well how various structures within a state will relate to each other and interact with one another. The constitution also lay down the rules of the game, regulatory and other rules, and as well institutional and other boundaries, so that actions and relations become predictable (or "readable", even transparent) and thus ensure stability and harmony.

There are all kinds of constitutions. Some are democratic and empowering or enabling, while others are restrictive and repressive. Some constitutions define nation or community in a very narrow way, favoring certain groups and ethnic segments over others, while others are liberal, ethnically open or neutral, and some recognize ethnic interests and aspirations.

In the process of looking into state constitutions, one cannot escape the fact that in Burma, the politics of ethnicity plays a very major role at both national and state level politics. Almost all political players in Burma are deeply inspired by ethnic interest and aspirations or are greatly influenced by ethnic orientations and sentiments. History is narrated and understood in ethnic terms, and wars - both ancient and modern -- are seen as wars of aggression and resistance between ethnic nations, i.e., between Burmans and Shans, Burmans and Mon, Rakhine and Burmans, and so on.

Moreover, successive governments in Burma, especially the military elites (and rulers), have defined nationhood in terms of the Burman language, Burman history, the Burman claims to empire-food, and so on. They have also repressed and suppressed the language, tradition, history,
and identity of the non-Burman nationalities, or relegated them to the margins, as subordinated culture and language, etc.

The results has been politics and political struggles that revolve around ethnic nationalism, with each ethnic group or segment advancing its ethnic interests, and/or projecting ethnic aspirations or fears, or resentment, anger, and so on. There has been generated a pervasive demand for ethnic self-determination on the part of almost all ethnic groups in Burma. There is even demands for independence or separation on the part of some nationalities forces.

This focus on ethnicity or ethno-nationalism is therefore very, very problematic. This is all more so since no territorial unit - no state - is ethnically homogeneous. Even Burma Proper - the Burman state - is a multicultural, multi-entity. The Shan, Kachin, Karen (etc.) states, are all multicultural and ethnically diverse. And all ethnic groups in Burma ( and in the various states as well) are mobilized around their respective ethnic identities and aspirations.

In looking into state constitutions, therefore, there is a need to take into serious account the awakened ethnic consciousness, aspiration, fear, anger, suspicion, etc., that afflicts or drives all political leaders and organizations.

**Constitutional Framework: Addressing Ethnic Aspirations:**

One area that needs to be seriously and might be fruitfully, looked into is how the respective state constitutions can address the demands for ethnic self-determination, or defuse ethnic anger, suspicion, and resentment.

The key and crucial question therefore is how can ethnic aspirations for self-determination be met? One area that might be rewarding to look into is a system of administration where power is democratically decentralized. This us a system where local communities within a state, defined ethnically or otherwise, are administratively empowered by the constitution of the state to manage their own affairs, autonomous of control from the top, i.e., the state government.

In this kind of administrative arrangement, powers with regard to matters of local interest and concern are left in the hands of the local community and the local government of the state would deal only with matters that transcend local interest, and it will perform functions and provide services that are beyond the scope or the capacity of local governments and local communities.

As far as Burma is concerned, the system of democratic decentralized administration is a very novel one, and has never been experienced by the people or leaders. The fact of the matter is that this system is compatible with the principle and practice of democracy and at the same time recognizes and acknowledges the self-determination aspiration of various ethnic groups and cultural segments.

Given the fact of heightened ethnic politics and ethnic demands in Burma, and also given that aim of democratic and nationalities leaders and organizations is to establish democracy and promote self-determination, it might be the case that the various states of the new Union will
have to necessary - unavoidably --consider adopting a decentralized democratic administrative system, which has long been established and practiced in stable democracies.

State Constitutions, Capacity Building, and National Reconciliation:

Due therefore to the multiethnic composition of all states in a country called the Union of Burma, and owing to long years of confrontational politics based on ethnonationalities perceptions and demands, it is important for ethnic-Burmese and nationalities leaders to seriously study or look into state constitutions. The reason why this is important is because how the state constitution is drafted -- and the mechanisms and structures that it provides -- will significantly determine how different ethnic groups will live and work together within each member state of the future democratic, federal Union.

It is envisioned by the National Reconciliation Program/NRP - which was establishment by nationalities and ethnic Burmese leaders of the democratic movement - that for national reconciliation to be a success, a firmer and better understanding of how ethnic nations can live and work together, and how they can resolve problems (and even conflicts) peacefully and democratically, is most essential. It is also believed -- by the NRP and leaders of the democratic movement -- that looking into federalism, the concepts and principles of federalism, federal structures and mechanisms, and importantly, looking at state constitutions, will enhance the capacity of nationalities leaders to help their ethnic nations determine their future in a peaceful and democratic manner.

As well, the process of looking into and drafting state constitutions initiated by the NRP constitutes a very important step in reaching the goals of the democratic movement. The State constitution process would, ONE, lay a firm, bottom-up foundation for federalism (i.e., genuine federalism), and TWO, the draft state constitutions could and would collectively serve as a solid political platform for international leaders and forces in negotiation with other players and actors on the Burmese stage.
UNLD (LA)
United Nationalities League for Democracy
(Liberated Area)

Inaugural Conference
January 15-19, 2001

NEGOTIATING FOR CHANGE IN BURMA

By

Harn Yawngwe

Director, European Officer for the Development of Democracy in Burma
(Euro-Burma Office), Brussel, Belgium.

The recent news that the leaders of the National League for Democracy (NLD) and the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) have met since October 2000 to initiate a dialogue makes the topic of this paper very timely. While I believe the development is positive, I also believe that we need to be cautious. Most of us are well aware of the failure of previous peace negotiations.

The involvement this time of the United Nations supported by the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) will hopefully make a difference—especially for the ethnic nationalities of Burma. It must be remembered that successive United Nations General Assemblies (UNGA) have called for a Tripartite Dialogue— the military, the democracy movement and the ethnic nationalities—to solve Burma's problems. It is, therefore, crucial that the UNLD and other ethnic nationality organizations understand the dynamics and process of political dialogue and negotiations.

RECENT BACKGROUND:

In recent year, several international attempts have been made to try and bring about political change in the country through negotiations between the NLD and SPDC/SLORC:

(iii) The August 1998 proposed by Human Rights Watch
(iv) The so-called October 1998- "US$1 Billion Proposal" by the UN/World Bank.
(v) The May 1999 attempt by the UN support by ASEAN to send a special Envoy
(vi) The March 2000- Seoul Meeting, to coordinate international efforts
NLD POSITION:

The NLD has since the beginning called for a dialogue with the military. This was repeated after the 1990 general elections but ignored by SLORC.

Even while under house arrest, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi made official statement to US Congressman Bill Richardson in 1994 that she and her party are ready for a dialogue and willing to discuss anything with the view of starting a process of restoring democracy in Burma. The NLD's position has not changed since she made this statement.

OPPOSITION TO DIALOGUE:

In the past, opposition to dialogue did not come from the ethnic nationalities or the NLD. The Shan Federal Movement and the Conference on Constitutional Reform held in Taunggyi in 1960 were attempts to have a political dialogue with the ruling party in order to solve long-standing political problems. The 1962 coup-d'etat stopped the dialogue.

Dialogue between Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and other leaders of the NLD and leaders of the ethnic nationalities, have not been possible. Professor Josef Silverstein has said that this is part of a deliberate policy on the part of the military to "divide and rule".

"They have blocked all her (ASSK's) efforts both to travel to areas inhabited by the minorities and hold talks. They also have put dialogue restraints on the minority groups. As a condition of the cease-fire agreements with them, the military rulers have demanded that those who signed should not communicate with those who did not. By keeping all political groups apart, SPDC hopes that the people will see and accept the military as the only leaders in the country and gather behind it."

CONDITIONS FOR DIALOGUE:

Silverstein goes on to note that, "If the dialogue is to proceed, then the participants must come as equals, each with the right to choose its own leaders" and that pre-conditions limiting the dialogue must not be set. Silverstein said that in the past, the military had not been keen to discuss such issues as whether Burma will be federal or unitary, and whether or not it will be a democracy.

We must also remember that if we want a political dialogue and negotiations, this means that both sides will have to compromise. The question is, "Are we ready to make compromise?" and "What are we going to compromise?" If we cannot compromise on any issue, it is useless to talk about a political dialogue and negotiations.

On the other hand, a political dialogue and negotiations does not mean that we have to trust the opposition and that our opposition will be sincere. If we trusted each other completely, there would be no need for a dialogue and negotiations.
We negotiate because we disagree on basic and fundamental issues. We negotiate because we want to get our opponent to yield to our arguments. They also want us to yield to their arguments. It is normal that both sides will try to get their opponent to compromise more than they have to. Instead of fighting with arms, a dialogue is fighting with words and we cannot let down our guard. Like in warfare, we have to be well prepared or we will lose.

It will be very dangerous to assume that because the SPDC has initiated a dialogue with the NLD, the military is going to give up power - that it is negotiating a surrender. This is far from the truth. Nobody including SPDC will negotiate if they do not think they can win. While negotiating, the SPDC will try to further weaken the position of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the NLD, and the ethnic nationalities, in order to get a better bargaining position, and gain what they cannot achieve by arms.

NEGOTIATING - TEN LESSONS:

The following has been adapted from a talk by Jan Egeland, former Norwegian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs given on 9 December 1998 in Oslo at the workshop on 'Transitions' at the Norwegian Parliament:

(1) Define goals of negotiations

Goals cannot be defined broadly as 'establishing a democracy and respect for human rights'. For any negotiations to succeed, all parties must see the need for compromise and want to negotiate.

(2) Define the real interest of all actors involved

In any conflict, there are conflict entrepreneurs - people who benefit from the conflict. They do not want the conflict to end. The interest of each actor needs to examine carefully.

(3) Define the role of third parties

What role do you want parties to play? - Technical advisors, hosts, facilitators or mediators? The recent UN initiative was a mediation role. Do we want a mediator?

(4) Define the kind of third party operator you want.

Do you want an individual like Jimmy Carter? A non-government organization, or a government? Or an international body likes the UN. A small country with no self-interest is possible.

(5) Do not under estimate intra-party tensions.

Intra-party tensions will arise. It will be necessary for the negotiators to 'sell' their argument to their own side because negotiators are exclusive. The negotiators usually become closer to each other than to their own colleagues. Tensions can kill negotiations.
(6) **Remember that negotiations will end in a compromise**

Most people will feel frustrated or unsatisfied with a negotiated settlement. Do not enter into negotiations if you want total victory, i.e., immediate democracy.

(7) **Power Relations are always asymmetrical**

The stronger party in the negotiations with always get more than the weaker party outside forces intervenes. Power relations can change during negotiations. Both sides will try to exploit the other's weaknesses. This is a normal part of negotiations.

(8) **Timing is crucial**

The right sender has to send the right message to the right recipient at the right time for negotiations to succeed (see below, on selecting the right messenger).

(9) **Publicity should be avoided**

Discretion is needed while negotiations are taking place. The public and other parties need to be won over once tentative agreement is reached. Publicity before any agreement is reach will ensure that the negotiations will fail.

(10) **Implementation will be more difficult than reaching a settlement**

The implementation of any settlement can be very difficult. This is especially true if expectations have been raised unrealistically.
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"ကြားခွင်သူများ၏ လူဦးရေအရေအတွေ့ စိတ်ဖြင့် ချောင်းချင်းသော အကြမ်းဖက်ခြင်း ပြုလုပ်ရန် အမှန်တကယ် ဆောင်ရွက်ရန်"
ဘိုင်းသောအချက်အလက်များ တွေ့ရှိနေပါသည်။

(YMBA/GCBA)

1936 ကမာဘာသာစကားမှ စီးပြားသောစာလုံး ဒဏ္ဍာရီ “အခြားသော စာသီ” ထွန်းကောင်းပါသည်။

မိုးရီးယား သင်္ကေတးများက အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။

မိုးရီးယားသင်္ကေတးများက သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများကို အလွန်သင်္ကေတးလုပ်ငန်းများ စမ်းသပ်မှုပါလျင် များကို စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနှင့် အခြေခံ၍ မျိုးဆဴ့၍ ပြုလုပ်နိုင်သည်။
(၃) UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများအဖွဲ့အစည်း ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။ UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

(၄) NDF အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ

NDF အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများအဖွဲ့အစည်း ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

(၅) အယူအဆများ

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများအဖွဲ့အစည်း ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

(၆) UNLD (LA) အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

UNLD အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်းမှာ ဗျာသားများ မိမိရဲ့အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဝင်ရောက်ရန် အရေးကြီးသော အဖွဲ့အစည်းများ ဆောက်လုပ်ခြင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။
UNLD ကို ပြုလုပ်ရန် အချိန်မှာ အသင်းများအတွက် ချိန်စီမံစောင့်ရှောင်မှု ရှိရန် လိုအပ်ပါသည်။

UNLD အတွက် ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှ အပြည်ပြည်ဆိုင်ရာ ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှ အပြည်ပြည်ဆိုင်ရာ အလိုအလျား စီမံစောင့်ရှောင်မှု ရှိပါသည်။

သင်္ချောင်းကျသည် အော်ထိုင်ရာအခြေခံ အကောင်အထည်ဖော်သည့် မြန်မာနိုင်ငံ၏ အများအားဖြင့် တက်ရောက်သည်။

သင်္ချောင်းကျသည် အော်ထိုင်ရာအခြေခံ အကောင်အထည်ဖော်သည့် မြန်မာနိုင်ငံ၏ အများအားဖြင့် တက်ရောက်သည်။

“သင်္ချောင်းကျသည် အော်ထိုင်ရာအခြေခံ အကောင်အထည်ဖော်သည့် မြန်မာနိုင်ငံ၏ အများအားဖြင့် တက်ရောက်သည်”
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By
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“ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ရေးသို့မဟုတ်စစ်ပြောင်းသည် မာတွေ့မြင်ချက်နှင့် စာကြောင်းအလားဖြင့် သမိုင်းပြောင်းလဲခြင်း”

စိုက်ပျိုး

မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းပြည်သူများ သို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေကြည့်ရှုပ်ရေးရာများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။ မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းသို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။ မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းသို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။

အကြောင်းကြောင်းစာရင်း

မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းသို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေကြည့်ရှုပ်ရေးရာများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။ မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းသို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။ မှတ်ချက်ကောင်းသို့မဟုတ် သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လေ့ရှိသည်။

1988-1990 အတွင်းစာရင်းကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။

1960-1970 အတွင်းစာရင်းကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။

1950-1960 အတွင်းစာရင်းကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများ အထွေထွေ သယောက်တချိန် အထွေထွေ ရှိခဲ့သည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။ သယ်ယူများကို ပြုလုပ်လျက်ရှိသည်။
«այսօր առաջադրություն տրվելով այսօր առաջադրությունից հետո առաջադրությունը տրվելու միջոցով կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագրել կամ այսանշան ստանալը.»

համաձայնագիր

Աջակցության դեմ աջակցության մեջ աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից հետո աջակցությունն աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից գրանցման պատճառով համաձայնագիր կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագիր կամ այսանշան ստանալը.

պատճառադրություն

Աջակցության դեմ աջակցության մեջ աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից հետո աջակցությունն աջակցության վերջին պատճառով համաձայնագիր կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագիր կամ այսանշան ստանալը.

այսօրական պատճառ

Աջակցության դեմ աջակցության մեջ աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից հետո աջակցությունն աջակցության վերջին պատճառով համաձայնագիր կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագիր կամ այսանշան ստանալը.

Աջակցության դեմ աջակցության մեջ աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից հետո աջակցությունն աջակցության վերջին պատճառով համաձայնագիր կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագիր կամ այսանշան ստանալը.

Աջակցության դեմ աջակցության մեջ աջակցության հետ աջակցությունից հետո աջակցությունն աջակցության վերջին պատճառով համաձայնագիր կարելի է տալ համաձայնագիր գրանցման պատճառով, դառնալը համաձայնագիր կամ այսանշան ստանալը.»
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Daniel Aung, M.P., (Moung Piang, Shan State)
Lahu National Development Party (LNDP)
"နောက်လောင်စာ\/နောက်လောင်စာ အခြေခံမှီးမှုအတွက် ဖြစ်စဉ်တန်း"
ဘာသာဖတ်လိုလျင်ပါ။ စြိုး/စြိုး ပေးချက် အရေင်း တစ်ခုစီမှ ပေးအပ်ခြင်းကို အဖော်ဖျက်ခြင်း ယူဆနာချက် ရေးသားလျင် သေချာစေမည်။
အားလုံးဝင်ချက်ကို ရွေးချယ်ပါ။ အတွက် အသုံးပြုပါ။ အမှတ်တံဆားသည် အတွက် ရှာဖွေပါ။

ညီညွှန်းခြင်း ပြုလုပ်မည် (၂) ပြုလုပ်။

ကျော်ကြားခြင်း အက်းသော အကွေးများ အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ သိမ်းဆည်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။

ယုံကြည်ထားသည့် အလုပ်သို့မဟုတ် အလုပ်များ ကို လွှဲပြောင်းပါ။
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STRENGTHENING THE UNLD AND ETHNIC FORCES

By

Sai Win Pay

M.P., (Mong Shu, Shan State), Member of Presidium of UNLD (LA),
Shan Nationalities League for Democracy
(Strengthening the UNLD and Ethnic Forces)
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"JOINT ACTIONS BETWEEN ALLIENCE FORCES"

By
Sao Ood Kesi

Member of Presidium of UNLD (LA),
Shan State National Races League for Democracy
"အိုင်းငယ်စီးရီးလွှဲခြင်း"
INTRODUCTION

The United Nationalities League for Democracy (UNLD) was established in 1989 as an umbrella political organization for the non-Burman nationalities in Burma. From the very beginning, the UNLD political platform called for the establishment of a genuine federal union based on democratic rights for all citizens, political equality for all nationalities and the right of self-determination for all member states of the Union.

The member parties of the UNLD contested the 1990 general election under the slogan of "democracy and equality" and won 67 seats in the national parliament of the Union of Burma. The election results established the UNLD as the second largest political party in Burma.

The UNLD was unilaterally dissolved and declared illegal by the ruling military junta. The UNLD political platform stood in direct contrast to the policies of the military regime that was intent on establishing a unitary state dominated by the central government.

STATEMENT

A. The UNLD was re-established as the UNLD (LA) in 1998 by its original members, most of whom had been forced to flee the country.

B. The Inaugural Conference of the UNLD (LA) was held from January 15th. to 19th. 2001 in a liberated area. The Inaugural Conference reaffirmed the original policy platform which calls for the following:
   (1) The establishment of a genuine Federal Union;
   (2) The guaranteeing of democratic rights, political equality, and self-determination for all nationalities of the Union of Burma;
   (3) The building of a firm unity among all nationalities in the Union based the principles of equality and justice for all;
   (4) The promotion of the economic, social and cultural development of all member states of the Union;
   (5) The abolishment of all types totalitarianism in Burma;
   (6) The establishment of internal peace and tranquility through dialogue.

C. The UNLD Inaugural conference re-confirmed the seven principles of federalism for the future constitution of the Union of Burma, which had been adopted by the UNLD conference held in 1990 at the YMCA Hall in Rangoon.
These seven principles are:

(1) The constitution of the Federal Union of Burma shall be formed in accordance with the principles of federalism and democratic decentralization;

(2) The Union Constitution shall guarantee the democratic rights of all citizens of Burma including the principles contained in the United Nation's declaration of universal human rights;

(3) The Union Constitution shall guarantee political equality among all ethnic national states of the Federal Union of Burma;

(4) The Federal Union of Burma shall be composed of National States; and all National States of the Union shall be constituted on terms of ethnicity, rather than geographical areas. There must be at least eight National States, namely, Chin State, Kachin State, Karen State, Kaya (Karenni) State, Mon State, Myanmar or Burman State, Rakhine (Arakan) State, and Shan State;

(5) The Union Assembly shall consist of two legislative chambers: the Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) and the Chamber of Deputies (Lower House).

(i) The Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) shall be confirmed of equal numbers of elected representatives from the respective National States; and

(ii) The Chamber of Deputies (Lower House) shall be composed of elected representatives from the respective constituencies of the peoples.

The creation of Chamber of Nationalities based on equal representation of the member states of the Union is intended to safeguard the rights of National States and minorities in the Union government. It is also intended as a symbol of equality among all the nationalities of the Union. All National States of the Union of Burma shall be represented equally in the Chamber of Nationalities at the Union Assembly.

(6) In addition to the Union Assembly, all member states of the Union shall have Legislative Assemblies for their own respective National States. There must be a clear separation of Union Assembly, or Federal Parliament, from the Legislative Assemblies of the member states of the Union. The residual powers, that is, all powers, except those given by member states to the federal center, or the Union, must be vested in the Legislative Assembly of each National State. In this way, the Union Constitution automatically allocates political authority of legislative, judiciary, and administrative powers to the Legislative Assembly of each National State. Thus, all member states of the Union can freely exercise the right of self-determination through the right of self-government within their respective National States.

(7) The sovereignty of the Union shall be vested in the people of the Union of Burma, and which shall be exercised by the Union Assembly. Moreover, the federal government shall have authority to decide on action for:
(i) Monetary policy,
(ii) Defense
(iii) Foreign relation, and
(iv) Such other authorities as may be temporarily vested in the federal government of the Union by member states of the Union.

D. The UNLD Inaugural conference elected a panel of consultative honorary committee members (patrons) and the members of the UNLD presidium and the UNLD secretariats as following:

Members of Consultative Honorary Committee

1. Dr. Chao Tzang Yawnghwe (Shan)
2. Pu Lian Uk, M.P., (Chin)
3. Teddy Buri, M.P., (Kayan)
4. Daniel Aung, M.P., (Lahu)
5. Dr. Maran Laraw, (Kachin)
6. U Khin Maung Kyi (Rakhine)
7. Sao Seng Suk (Shan)

Members of Presidium:

2. Dr. Za Hlei Thang, M.P., (Chin National League for Democracy)
5. Pu Thang Lian Pau, M.P., (Zomi National Congress)
7. Chao Ood Kesi (Shan State National Races League for Democracy)
8. Mahn Nyunt Maung (Union Karen League)
9. Khu Shar Reh (Kayah State All Nationalities League for Democracy)
10. Kya Aye Maung (Lahu National Development Party)
11. Khun Tet Lu (Union Pa-O National League)
Standing Body of Presidiums:

1. Khun Manko Ban
2. Dr. Za Hlei Thang
3. U Tha Noe
4. Sai Win Pay
5. Khu Shar Reh

Secretaries:

1. Dr. Lian H. Sakhong
2. Sai Doue

WORKING COMMITTEES

Policy Making & External Affairs:

1. Dr. Chao Tzang Yawngwhe Leader
2. Teddy Buri Asst. Leader
3. Pu Lian Uk Member
4. Dr. Maran La Raw Member
5. Daniel Aung Member
6. Dr. Lian H. Sakhong Secretary

Organizing & Alliance Affairs:

1. Khun Manko Ban Leader
2. Sai Win Pay Asst. Leader
3. Khu Shar Reh Member
4. Khine Myo Khine Member
5. Pu Thang Lian Pau Member
6. Kya Aye Maung Member
7. Dr. Lian H. Sakhong Secretary
8. Sai Doue Secretary

Information & Office:

1. Mahn Nyunt Maung Leader
2. Sai Kyaw Thet Asst. Leader
3. Khun Tet Lu Member
4. Sai Win Kyaw Member
5. Saw John Lulay Member
6. Zo Suan Member
7. Aaron Ngun Ceu Member
8. Sai Doue Secretary

UNLD (LA)
Date: January 19, 2001

UNLD (LA)
UNITED NATIONALITIES LEAGUE FOR DEMOCRACY (LIBRATED AREAS)

9. The United Nationalities League for Democracy (liberated areas) was established in 1989 in order to represent the interests of the various nationalities living in the liberated areas. The League is an umbrella organization for various national organizations and seeks to promote democratic and national self-determination in the liberated areas.

10. Since its establishment in 1989, the United Nationalities League for Democracy has worked to promote the rights of the various nationalities living in the liberated areas. The League has played a key role in advocating for democratic and national self-determination in the liberated areas.

11. The United Nationalities League for Democracy is committed to promoting the rights of the various nationalities living in the liberated areas. The League is determined to work towards a future where all peoples living in the liberated areas are able to exercise their right to self-determination.

12. The United Nationalities League for Democracy is a strong advocate for democratic and national self-determination in the liberated areas. The League is committed to working towards a future where all peoples living in the liberated areas are able to exercise their right to self-determination.
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CONSTITUTION OF UNLD (LA)
AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

AIMS:

The UNLD (LA) adopted the following policies as its Aims:

Aims of UNLD (LA):

1. To implement the UNLD's original objectives and programs;
2. To support UNLD activities at home;
3. To engage in activities denied to those at home;
4. To work in concert with democratic forces, both at home and abroad, both Burman and non-Burman.

OBJECTIVES:

The UNLD adopted the following policies as its objectives:

(1) To establish a genuine federal union.
(2) To guarantee democratic rights, political equality, and self-determination for all nationalities of the Union.
(3) To build a firm unity of all nationalities in the Union based on the principles of equality and justice.
(4) To promote the development of all member states of the Union.
(5) To abolish all types totalitarianism in Burma.
(6) To establish internal peace and tranquility through dialogue.

PROGRAMS:

The UNLD adopted the following policies as its objectives programs:

Objective Programs of UNLD (LA):

1. Together with other forces, to struggle for democracy and equality simultaneously:
2. To struggle for the realization of Tripartite Dialogue:
3. To assist others in exerting political pressure on the SPDC:
4. To assist in the enhancement of groups pressing for the realization of Tripartite Dialogue:
5. To coordinate with the UNLD, other ethnic parties, cease-fire groups at home and the NDF and other ethnic groups abroad;
6. To support the NRP activities;
7. To assist in the drafting of state constitutions;
8. To expose the truth about the so-called National Convention and the people's genuine desires;
9. To highlight the UNLD's struggle for the peaceful resolution of the ethnic question.

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF FEDERAL UNION

On the formation of a genuine Federal Union, the UNLD has adopted seven principles of federalism for the future constitution of the Federal Union of Burma, at its conference held in Rangoon, on June 29- July 2, 1990. These seven principles are:

(1) The constitution of the Federal Union of Burma shall be formed in accordance with the principles of federalism and democratic decentralization.

(2) The Union Constitution shall guarantee the democratic rights of citizens of Burma including the principles contain in the United Nation's declaration of universal human rights.

(3) The Union Constitution shall guarantee political equality among all ethnic national states of the Federal Union of Burma.

(4) The Federal Union of Burma shall be composed of National States; and all National States of the Union shall be constituted in terms of ethnicity, rather than geographical areas. There must be at least eight National States, namely, Chin State, Kachin State, Karen State, Karen State, Kaya State, Mon State, Myanmar of Burma State, Rakhine (Arakan State), and Shan State.

(5) The Union Assembly shall be consisting of two legislative chambers: the Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) and the Chamber of Deputies (Lower House).

(i) The Chamber of Nationalities (Upper House) shall be composed of equal numbers of elected representatives from the respective National States; and

(ii) The Chamber of Deputies (Lower House) shall be composed of elected representatives from the respective constituencies of the peoples. The creation of Chamber of
Nationalities based on equal representation of the member states of the Union is intended to safeguard the rights of National States and minorities in the Union government. It also intended as a symbol and instrument of the principle of equality among all nationalities of the Union.

(6) In addition to the Union Assembly, all member states of the Union shall from their respective National States. In Federalism there must be a clear separation of Union Assembly, or Federal Parliament, from the Legislative Assemblies of the member states of the Union. Moreover, the residual powers, that is, all powers, expect those given by member states to the federal center, or the Union, must be vested in the Legislative Assembly of the National State. In this way, the Union Constitution automatically allocates political authority of legislative, judiciary, and administrative powers to the Legislative Assembly of the National States. Thus, all member states of the Union can freely exercise the right of self-determination through the right of self-government within their respective National States.

(7) The Sovereignty of the Union shall be vested in the people of the Union of Burma, and shall be exercised by the Union Assembly. Moreover, the central government of the Federal Union shall have authority to decide on action for:

(i) Monetary system
(ii) Defense
(iii) Foreign relation, and
(iv) Other authorities which temporarily vested in the central government of Federal Union by members states of the Union.
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ဌာ  (၃)

အလိုလျော်သောစီမံခန့်ခွဲခြင်း

ပေါင်  (၃)

ပြောဆုံး  (၃)

ပြောဆုံး  (၃)

အထောက်အပြားခြင်း။
**ထွက် (၆)**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**ထွက် (၇)**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**ထွက် (၈)**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**ထွက် (၉)**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**ထွက် (၁၀)**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**အကြောင်းအရာ**

မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်းသည် မျက်စာမျက်နားခြင်းအားလုံး (ကျွန်ုပ်ဆိုရင်) သို့မဟုတ် အလေးများအားလုံးစီမံခန်းစာရင်းသို့မဟုတ်

**၁၁** မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်း မှန်သောစာရင်း

**၁၂** မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်း မှန်သောစာရင်း

**၁၃** မျက်စာမျက်နားများခြင်း မှန်သောစာရင်း
(2) အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ဆောက်လုပ်ပါ။
(3) ဆောက်လုပ်နေသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(4) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(5) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(6) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(7) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(8) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(9) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(10) ကူးလာသော အာရေးသင်ကြားအဆင့်နှစ်ခုကို ကူးလာပါ။
(၃) ယောဂွတ်ကြည့်ရှင်း

ယောဂွတ်ကြည့်ရှင်းအမျိုးမျိုး

အသံစိုးရိုက် မျိုးစိတ်ကြည့်ရှင်း

ယောဂွတ်ကြည့်ရှင်းအမျိုးမျိုး

ယောဂွတ်ကြည့်ရှင်းအမျိုးမျိုး

ယောဂွတ်ကြည့်ရှင်းအမျိုးမျိုး

(၄) စီးပွားရေး

စီးပွားရေးအပေါ်

စီးပွားရေးအပေါ်

စီးပွားရေးအပေါ်

စီးပွားရေးအပေါ်

စီးပွားရေးအပေါ်

(၅) စာရင်း

စာရင်းကြည့်ရှင်း

စာရင်းကြည့်ရှင်း

စာရင်းကြည့်ရှင်း

စာရင်းကြည့်ရှင်း

စာရင်းကြည့်ရှင်း

(၆) အကြမ်းဖျင်အကြောင်း

အကြမ်းဖျင်အကြောင်း
(ဗ) ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှူးခံ

(၁) ပုံစံအများကြီး ပြင်သစ်ဖြစ်သောအား

| အမည်အမျိုးအစား | အထောက်အမှန်
|---------------------|-------------------|
| ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှူးခံ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကိုယ်အမှုဆောင် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကူညီပေးချိန် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အောက်ပါအတိုင်း | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အာကာသထိုးများ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်

(၂) ပုံစံအများကြီး ပြင်သစ်ဖြစ်သောအား

| အမည်အမျိုးအစား | အထောက်အမှန်
|---------------------|-------------------|
| ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှူးခံ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကိုယ်အမှုဆောင် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကူညီပေးချိန် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အောက်ပါအတိုင်း | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အာကာသထိုးများ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်

(၃) ပုံစံအများကြီး ပြင်သစ်ဖြစ်သောအား

| အမည်အမျိုးအစား | အထောက်အမှန်
|---------------------|-------------------|
| ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှူးခံ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကိုယ်အမှုဆောင် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| ကူညီပေးချိန် | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အောက်ပါအတိုင်း | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
| အာကာသထိုးများ | မြင်သိမ်းရန်
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