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I. Introduction (Hans-Bernd Zöllner)

Burma and the World - the World and Burma: Broad Issues, Strong Asymmetries

This paper contains material on a crucial issue in Burma’s modern history: the Second World War, or more precisely, the war in Europe before it reached Burma and put a stop to the publishing of books promoting independence and caused the beginning of an armed struggle to reach this aim. Three books on the subject are introduced more or less in detail, complemented by some speeches from a debate in the Burmese Parliament in February 1940 on the issue of Burma’s attitude towards the war.

Ba Hein’s “World War and Burma’s Future” (ကမ္ဘာစစ်နှင့်ဖျင်ဆင်မှုများ) came out first, in the midst of October, 1939, six weeks after the outbreak of the war in Europe. It was published by Tun Aye’s Myanma Publishing House. The second book on which this Working Paper focuses carries almost the same title: “World war and Burma” (ကမ္ဘာစစ်နှင့်မြန်မာနိုင်ငံ). It was published some six months later by Nagani in April 1940. It contained one longer article written by Aung San and three short contributions by Dr. Ba Maw, and Fabian U Ba Khaing on the same topic, as well as an announcement by Thakin Soe concerning a book on Dialectic Materialism and a statement of the “Nagani policy” in connection with some books written and published by Dagon Khin Khin Lay.1

Finally, some material on a book published one month before the Nagani publication is presented: Hla Pe’s and Ba Khaing’s “War and Communism” (ကမ္ဘာစစ်နှင့်ကြယ်စီးရီး), which looks at the same topic from a special angle.

The first two books were already conceived before the war broke out. Ba Hein started to write his essay before the hostilities started. This is indicated by the date given at the end of the booklet’s foreword. This date is September 1, 1939, the day on which Germany invaded Poland and two days before Great Britain and France declared war on Germany. As in other parts of the world, the coming war was perceived as a reality in the minds of Burmese people before its outbreak. The only question was when and where it would start and, most importantly, what it would mean for Burma.

This coincidence of the commencement of the war with the dating of the introduction to the

---

1 See below under III, 12.2. - The issue of the circumstances of Dagon Khin Khin Lay’s relationship with Nagani will be dealt with in the documentation of her books published by Nagani (Rays of War - No. 35 - and World Enemy - No. 43) will be discussed in the Working Paper on these publications.
explanation of its consequences for Burma signifies how closely the course of development of world affairs was observed by sections of Burmese society in the late 1930s. For them, globalisation was already a certainty long before this word became a catchphrase. This was quite reasonable because of the colonial situation which linked the Province of Burma to the British Empire and thus to the other global players of that time acting as its rivals or partners. The broad horizon of Burma’s political situation of that time was, therefore, the whole world and what happened in it, war being just one phenomenon of global happenings. This observation leads to the assumption of one asymmetry among others.

a) The accounts of 20th century history usually refer to the wars which commenced in 1914 and 1939 using capital letters.¹ This capitalization treats the First and the Second World War as proper nouns, thus singling them out from other wars as unique entities. In Burma, this way of spelling was taken over after the second great war of the century. But the war which according to the standard histories broke out in September 1939 in Europe² was already named a world war even before it had begun - let alone before Japan entered it with the assault on the American fleet at Pearl Harbour in December 1941. It can be assumed that Burmese observers took a different view of the events, at least in part. For them, world wars were not single events but a continuum characterizing a state of the world culminating in special forms of violent acts between nations. This different perception can be attributed partly to the fact that from a Burmese standpoint, a great war had been taking place nearby for quite some time, ever since Japan’s annexation of Manchuria in 1931 and the escalation of hostilities since July 7, 1937 when the so-called Marco Polo Bridge Incident happened.

Another reason for the Burmese perception of events may be found in the traditions of the Burmese-Buddhist world view according to which (derived from the Pali kappa) means both “world” and “aeon”, thus linking space and time and conferring a cosmic connotation upon the term “world war”.

b) Another more obvious asymmetry is related to the information obtained in Burma on world affairs and the information about “the world” on Burma. Certainly, developments in the new province were closely monitored in the Burma Office, which was established under the Secretary of State for India and Burma under the Government of Burma Act of 1935. But the “man on the

¹ During and after what was to be named “World War I,” it was only after the Second World War that it was known for example as “the Great War” or “La Guerre du Droit” (the War for Justice).
² In Aung San’s eyes, the war started in China. See document II of this volume.
street” would and could not know much about what happened in the Empire’s new province, simply because he could find only a few news items in the media covering related developments in Burma. Burmese media, on the other hand, informed their readers extensively about what happened in Europe. This difference reflected the very diverse nature of dependence which directed the flow of information. Burma depended on Britain. Therefore, anything related to Britain’s future was interesting and could be expected to be in demand by the public. Consequently, there was a great supply of news concentrating on big issues like global ideological trends, developments in Fascist states as well as in the Soviet Union and so on. On the other hand, the British Empire depended on what happened in Europe, America and in its many dominions and colonies. This reduced the space for extensive coverage of what happened in the smaller parts of the Empire. Of course, the same regularity applies to the coverage of events if the Burmese case is compared with countries like France, the United States and Germany.

The said asymmetry is rather normal. But it affected and still does affect the relationship between Burma and the countries outside Burma because there is an interdependency of information, attitude and action. Since disproportionality of information remains even today, albeit for slightly different reasons than those pertaining to the period before the Second World War, the booklets under review here may shed some light on the Burmese side of its relationship towards the world.

c) Another disparity can be found by looking at the relevance attributed to contemporary events leading to or following the outbreak of war by the authors of the two books and by people outside Burma. Obviously, the Burmese authors were convinced that the imminent war was crucial for Burma’s future. The assessment from outside was, however, rather different. This can be exemplified by the travelogue of Sir Stafford Cripps, who visited Burma in late December 1939 for a few days, that is, between the dates of the two books’ publication.¹ Cripps, a Labour MP who at that time had just been expelled from his party because of his people’s front’s leanings and his being a sympathizer of the Indian - and in particular Gandhian - campaign for independence, visited Burma during his travel from India to China. He was - with the consent of the Foreign Office - on his way to Moscow where he wanted to explore the possibility of Soviet cooperation in the struggle against Nazi fascism.

Cripps used his five days in Burma to talk to many people, British as well as Burmese, and concentrated on getting informed about the social and political conditions of the country and the

policy of the colonial administration. In Rangoon as well as in Mandalay he was guided by members of the Thakin organisation who showed him around. He visited a factory, workers’ living quarters, and met peasant labourers. He was distressed by what he saw, criticised the British administration and was impressed by the Dobama organisation because “[t]hese young people strike me as the most serious minded and intelligent people from the political point of view that we have met in Burma. They have been organising the peasants and the workers throughout Burma both politically and industrially.” He thus regarded them as a counterpart to the Labour Party. But he failed to mention the attitude of his hosts towards the war in Europe. For Cripps, the issue of “war and Burma” had no place on the political agenda of Burma.

It was very different for the Burmese people he met. Dr. Ba Maw, one of the authors of the 1940 published book on the war, and according to Cripps the “most vital” of the Burmese politicians he met, recounts his meeting with the British politician in his memoirs.

Cripps wanted to see Burma free, but remaining within the commonwealth, “in her own interest as much as in that of the commonwealth itself,” he explained, and gave quite candidly the reasons for this belief. “But what do you think the Burmese will do if they don’t get all they want?” he asked me as he was about to leave.

“The Burmese will act in the Burmese way,” I replied, trying to evade the question.

“What is the Burmese way?” he persisted, his interest aroused.

“That’s a Burmese secret,” I said.¹

Here, two ways to freedom and independence are formulated: the British way and the Burmese way. Even if there was personal sympathy between the two colloquists, there was no “third way” to bridge their different opinions. U Maung Maung’s description of Cripps’ meeting both with Ba Maw and other older politicians as well as with the younger Thakin-generation points to what Dr. Ba Maw’s “Burmese secret” was:

[Cripps] had a very frank talk with Dr. Ba Maw and his colleagues in Rangoon and with the leaders of the Dobama Asiayone (Aung San, Nu², etc.) in Mandalay, where they were holding the all-Burma committee conference. Both groups expressed their demand for Burma’s independence and vowed to make the best use of the opportunity of the war.

Unlike Dr. Ba Maw, with his cryptic reply, Aung San expressed the “Burmese way” directly:

He answered: “Say you have got my fountain pen, and since you are not going to return it to me, I

² Nu did not attend the Mandalay meeting. He was in China with the Burmese “Friendship Delegation” and visited Chungking some weeks before Cripps arrived there. (*See Working Paper 6 of this series.*)
will do this,” and so saying he reached out and took Cripps’ pen out of the visitor’s pocket. That made everybody laugh. Cripps, it was reported, said he would have done the same thing if he were in their position. Cripps mentioned neither of the two anecdotes in his diary. For him, as well as for his British compatriots in Burma, whose conservative and patronizing attitude towards the country and its inhabitants he criticised, the war had a significance completely different from the understandings of the Burmese he met. One may wonder how he, a left wing socialist on his way to Moscow, might have assessed the books under review here, particularly the one on “War and Communism”.

**Developments in Burma between September 1939 and August 1940**

Cripps’ journey through Burma was, according to his diary, an undisturbed one. No demonstrations, no protests or anything else pointing to disorder is reported. This impression reflects the view of the British authorities who felt secure and in control of the country. On the other hand, almost three months before the visit, the British-educated and charming Dr. Ba Maw and the Thakins together with a third group had formed an alliance to fight the British administration on the war issue. On October 1, 1939, they had established the Freedom Bloc as a different kind of a “popular front” than the one aspired to by Cripps. The formation of the alliance was brought about by the declaration of war by the Governor of Burma in the name of the province on September 4, 1939. The parliament was in session at the time but did not debate the issue, which belonged to the “revered subjects” of the Government of Burma Act 1935. The Burmese Senate, the Upper House of the Parliament, passed a message of loyalty to the British king.

The establishment of the new league was arranged at various meetings after mid-September and announced in October, 1939, through newspaper reports. The first name of the alliance was “Burma Freedom League” (Myanmapyi-lutlatye-gaing) and later changed to “The League of the

---

2. Cripps does not mention the name of Aung San. For him, the leader of the reception committee, Kyaw Myint, was the most promising young Burmese politician. The former deputy chairman of the Rangoon Students’ Union, 26 years of age at that time, became a minister under Nu after the war.
3. This was the Mandalay branch of Ba Pe’s Nga-bwint-saing (five flowers) “party”; see Maung Maung 1980: 199. Another important partner involved was the students, but the students’ organisations did not join the alliance formally.
4. According to Maung Maung, the first announcement was made by *Thuriya* on October 11 (Maung Maung 1980: 199 and 279, footnote 19); according to Taylor, the first political statement of the Bloc was issued on October 2 (Taylor 1974: 420).
Way Out” (*Bama-Htwet-yat-gaing*). The latter name connected the alliance with the popular story of a mystic named Bo Bo Aung whose story was extremely popular and who was invoked in the Nagani Song.\(^1\) The choice of the name was meant to raise popular support in favour of the alliance and against the Government which at least half-heartedly supported the British war efforts.\(^2\) Mass meetings were organised to inform the populace about the aims of the alliance, the first of them taking place October 22 at the Shwedagon Pagoda, attracting some 3000 people. The bloc proclaimed some demands as preconditions to Burmese support of the war. These demands were:

1. In accordance with the principles of democratic freedom Great Britain shall give immediate and formal recognition of Burma’s right to determine freely her own form of government.
2. A Burmese constituent assembly, elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage, shall be summoned to enable Burma to determine her own form of government,
3. In the meantime a convention shall operate requiring the Governor to seek and accept in all matters the advice of his Ministers who on their part shall obtain the assent of the House of Representatives in regard to vital questions of national policy concerning defence, monetary policy, etc.\(^3\)

These demands were only thinly concealed demands for immediate complete independence as the “way out” of the colonial situation. The wording of the demands carefully avoided open confrontation with the government, though Ba Maw in his speech at the first meeting said that he was not heading for any office but for jail. Later, however, speeches became more and more seditious. Soon the slogan “Britain’s Difficulty is Burma’s Opportunity” was coined and carried on.

The activities of the Bloc caused a variety of reactions. A Mandalay monks’ organisation tried to forge an alliance comprising all Burmese political parties both in and outside the government. The attempt failed, as well as endeavours undertaken by politicians like U Saw to draw capital from the longing for unity. These failures once more illustrated the frictions and splits among the Burmese politicians. Such frictions existed within the Freedom Bloc as well. On February 23, 1940, the Burmese Parliament discussed the “war issue” and passed a resolution. It regretted that the Burmese people had not been asked whether or not they wanted to participate.

---

\(^1\) For the text of the song see vol. 1 of this series, p. 22-23; for Ba Maw’s version of the naming see Ba Maw 1968: 67-68.
in the war on the side of the British and asked for the recognition of Burma’s right for independence. The resolution was passed, and a much more strongly worded amendment rejected.\(^1\) Dr Ba Maw, who was regarded as the leader of the opposition in Parliament gave an eloquent speech.\(^2\)

Six days later, on February 29, the Government issued the “Defence of Burma Act and Rules” which intended “to provide for special measures to ensure the public safety and interest and the defence of British Burma and for the trial of certain offences”.\(^3\) Under the Act, special powers were given to the government. The Rules listed punishable offences such as “giving false statements” and “obstructing lawful authorities,” paving the way for the arrests of members of the Freedom Bloc after agitation increased following a rally on June 9 in Rangoon. Nu was arrested after he gave the first speech on this occasion and was sentenced shortly later; many others followed. Ba Maw was arrested on August 6, released on bail and sentenced on August 29, 1940 to one year of imprisonment. Thakin Soe, who wrote the last contribution of the book, published in April 1940, just before the “hot phase” of the Freedom Bloc’s activities started, was arrested in July. All were freed after the Japanese army entered Burma in early 1942.

The Japanese were accompanied by a Burmese army under the command of Aung San. For him, too, an arrest warrant was issued, but he managed to evade imprisonment. Instead, together with another Thakin, he boarded a ship to China on August 8. This was to be the beginning of the story of the 30 Comrades and the Burmese Independence Army.

Ba Hein and Ba Khaing were not imprisoned. It seems that both had some reservations about the Freedom Bloc. Ba Hein, as a staunch communist, resented the Bloc’s contacts with the Japanese in Rangoon.\(^4\) Regarding Ba Khaing’s attitude towards the Bloc, there is no direct information up to now. From his critical assessment of Burmese politics in general in his “Political History of Burma”, one may conclude that he was critical of the tactics of the Bloc as well. From his remarks in his contribution to “War and Socialism” one may conclude that he might have supported any means to reach independence as a precondition to overcome the misery of the poor in Burma.

Anyhow, the contributors to the books covered here had a different theoretical background and

---

\(^1\) See III. for details.

\(^2\) It is partly reprinted in his memoirs: see Ba Maw 1968: 75-85.

\(^3\) The Defence of Burma Act, 1940 (Burma Act No. 1 of 1940) (29. February 1940). Acts and Rules to provide for special measures to ensure the public safety and interest and the defence of British Burma and for the trial of certain offences. [As modified up to the 1\(^{st}\) of July, 1945.] Published under the authority of the Governor of Burma, 1945: 1.

\(^4\) See Working Paper 3 of this series, p. 27
pursued diverse political strategies. On the other hand, all could be labelled “leftist”. Three of the authors of the first two books, Aung San, Ba Hein and Soe, were members of a meeting in August 1939 that later was regarded as the founding date of a Burmese Communist Party. Ba Khaing followed the idea of the Fabian Society which laid the intellectual foundation for the Labour Party. Ba Maw called his party sinyetha - “Poor Man Party”, but preferred to call it the “Proletarian Party”, thereby signalling a similarity with leftist Western groupings.

This leads to the question of how differently or coherently they treated the issue of Burma and the World War.

**World, War & Burma in Theory and Practice. Some Questions**

As the slogan connecting England’s war problems with Burma’s opportunities shows, the connection between the imminent war and Burma’s future was guided by strong pragmatic if not opportunistic motives. This applies to the publishers of the books as well. There was a market for books on the war at that time. Moreover, Ba Hein was a rising star whose comments on the war could be expected to find many readers, and the authors of the Nagani publication were very well known, too. Three of them were leaders of the Freedom Bloc, the spearhead of the most prominent Burmese response to the outbreak of the war.

On the other hand, it has to be asked whether in and behind these practical deliberations some general patterns can be discerned. Three clusters of themes are proposed. They are closely related as three dimensions of “world” - spatial, temporal and functional.

a) The world and Burma - then, later and earlier

Burma is embedded in the world. Therefore, it is necessary to know about the world if the situation of Burma can be properly understood as a prerequisite for appropriate action. This logical order is clearly expressed in Aung San’s arrangement of arguments, which reproduces the argumentation of the “Dobama manifesto” drafted by the then General Secretary of the Dobama Asiayone and passed by the committees which met in Mandalay at the end of 1939.

---

2 “Catalogue of Books”.
3 It is not known yet how many copies were printed. According to Kyaw Hoe, the book was “blocked” by the government. It did not make it into the “Catalogue of Books”.
4 The relatively small number of 4000 booklets printed according to the Catalogue may be partly explained by the fact that the book was “blocked” as well.
The text states that the great powers of the world are competing for the limited space and resources on earth, employing means which can be either unfavourable or favourable from the weak nations’ and poor people’s point of view. The war between imperialistic capitalist countries cannot be supported because there is no rationale for a “just war”. The interests of countries like Burma, therefore, become a yardstick for the reading of the present situation of the world. Moreover, the intimate interrelationship between the world and Burma requires that the Burmese view of world affairs and their effects on Burma be carried to people in other countries sympathetic with Burma’s needs. At the time of the manifesto’s drafting, Nu was in China performing just such a task. In March 1940, Aung San headed a Dobama delegation to India to attend the yearly session of the Indian National Congress; among the members of the group were Ba Hein and Than Tun. 

Burma was not only seen as an object of world affairs but also as an active subject, capable of reading the world situation in her own right and looking for allies in the fight for her just cause. This reasoning was not confined to the crucial pre-war period. An article written by Aung San on the International Situation, published shortly after the war,1 displays the same line of argument. Long lists of favourable and unfavourable tendencies are presented, the latter outnumbering the former, as a foundation for assessing Burma’s chances and choices in the future. Nu, as Prime Minister, followed the same tradition in pursuing the quest for peace both nationally and internationally through his diplomatic travels.2

One may ask if the neutralist foreign policy begun under Nu and later continued to the extreme under Ne Win was a consequence of the Burmese interpretation of the world’s respective situation under the same principles which guided the authors of the booklets written before the war, rather than a retreat from the world. During the period of polarisation between East and West it might seem difficult to find partners supporting the interests of Burma instead of just their own. This hypothesis can be supported by the fact that the “Burmese Way of Socialism” came to an end when the Cold War finally ended with the breakdown of the Soviet Empire, and that Burmese leaders cited this collapse as their reason to open up the country.

Anyway, these deliberations provide some evidence that continuity might exist in the Burmese

1 See below under III.12.
perception of the country’s integration into the world and that it may be worthwhile to investigate this topic further, as well as the way in which this perception is linked to the Burmese worldview before the colonial period.

b) The laws of history.

The same applies to the related topic of the perception of world history in relation to developments in Burma as expressed in the texts which are documented and commented upon in this paper. Clearly, Ba Hein’s historical review of the roots of the war, which then had just started, is based on Marxist reading of history starting with the period of an assumed original communism, continuing with a brief account of the stages of feudalism and capitalism, and finally explaining in detail developments after World War I.

Clearly, after Ba Hein’s conviction, certain laws would determine the cause of history. Therefore, the independence of Burma is not only “just”, it could be called inevitable. Burmese people have to work for it; not just in the opportunistic way of exploiting British war-time difficulties, but in a way keeping the door open for a post-war alliance with the former colonial power.

This firm confidence in the laws of history leads to the question of how it related to the Burmese-Buddhist concept of cyclical aeons of rise and decline. Since the Marxist concept aims at a dialectical path to a classless society reproducing the original communism on a much higher level and thus at an “end of history”, there seems to be a contradiction with the traditional Buddhist concepts of rebirth, both of man and of world. It would be interesting to know how this (assumed) inconsistency was dealt with.

On the other hand, it can be asked how the leaders of independent Burma assessed and assess the course of history. Nu and Ne Win tried an amalgam of socialism and Buddhism, although in rather different ways. Here, it could be very interesting to compare Ba Hein’s and other pre-independence thinkers’ views on history to the philosophy of the Burma Socialist Programme Party, “The System of Correlation of Man and the Environment,” which in its Chapter II elaborates on “The Laws of Process of the History of Human Society” and in Chapter IV on “The Determining Role of the Working People”.

Finally, it can be asked what kind of understanding of historical processes has been in the minds of the contestants for power after 1988.

c) The reasons behind different assessments of how to act politically

A short overview of the different stages of Burmese and Myanmar history exposes the variety of arguments about how to relate Burma to the world. Under Ne Win, Burma isolated herself,
maybe in order not to be drawn into violent international conflicts. After 1988, the country was isolated by the Western world in order to open it up for “democracy”. The latter politics are based on a kind of belief in historical laws similar in form to Ba Hein’s but materially different, because here it is assumed that the world as a whole is determined to become an association of democratic, ex-socialist countries.

In other words, the very different assessments of how to conduct Burmese politics may partly depend on rather diverse perceptions of how history works. If there is some truth in this assumption, a more thorough look into philosophies of history could be of more than academic interest.

**About this Volume**

a) The material in this working paper is very much weighted towards the Nagani publication which contains the only text of Aung San from the two book clubs documented in this series of papers. His contribution was twice translated into English. The first translation was made by U Tin Htway and is contained in his unpublished M.A. thesis on the emergence of political writing in Burma of 1979. The second one by U Thet Tun is part of a book entitled “The Writings of General Aung San” which was published by the Universities Historical Research Centre. No other text published by Nagani or the Burma Publishing House was rendered into a non-Burmese language until now and thus made-accessible to readers who are not used to consulting primary sources and academic works.

This special treatment of the text is not due to its outstanding style or intellectual brilliance but merely to the late Bogyoke’s paramount role in Burma’s history. Nevertheless, the text deserves thorough consideration in many ways.

In this paper, both translations are reproduced in order to give the reader a chance to make up his mind about the meaning of Aung San’s Burmese text and - if he can read Burmese - to compare it with the original text, which is also reproduced here.

This paper contains three commentaries on Aung San’s writing. The first comes from the Burmese side. Dr. Shwe Sin Aung from the Department of Burmese Language and Literature of Yangon University reviews the text and states: “The article … can serve the further study of the political program and policy of the Dobama Asiayone from the historical stand point.” Susanne Prager-Nyein, born in Germany and now living in the United States, is a historian who has written an excellent dissertation on Aung San which investigates the cultural context of his life
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and political impact.\(^1\) Her essay puts the article in the context of the time and into Aung San’s biography at the brink of constitutional engagement into armed struggle. Joanne Dunne, an English Ph.D. candidate, stresses the relationship between literature and society. The three assessments from different perspectives may serve as a stimulus for further discussion.

b) For each of the four texts published together with Aung San’s pamphlet, two translations into English are published here as well, providing another opportunity to compare them with the Burmese original. From the two comments on the World War, Ba Khaing’s remarks are particularly interesting because they state that Burma’s path to independence will be a very long one.

c) In his essay, Aung San mentions the “Bama Letyone Tat” (Steel Army), a paramilitary unit of the student movement which can be regarded as a forerunner to the Burmese Independence Army founded in late 1941 in Bangkok. This was one of many private “armies” at that time which promoted discipline and the physical exercise and aimed at protecting the nation. The first of these was the Ye Tat (Green Army) founded by Aung Gyi in 1930. Tin Htway’s work on the beginnings of political literature in Burma contains translations of two marching songs of the two “armies” mentioned. They are reproduced to provide an idea about the martial spirit of those days.

The text following documents Aung San’s world view one year after the war, in September 1946. As usual, the comments of Kyaw Hoe’s Nagani bibliography on both books are included in English translation.

d) The material on the Nagani book is framed on one side by two contributions on Ba Hein’s booklet — a review by Shwe Sin Aung and a commentary by Bernhard Dahm, one of the leading and now most senior German researchers on Southeast Asia. Finally, some basic information on a “joint venture” of Thakin Hla Pe and ‘Fabian’ Ba Khaing is given.

At the end of this paper, two speeches in the Burmese Parliament are reproduced. As mentioned above, on February 23, 1940, the parliament discussed Burma’s attitude towards the war. What U Kun and Mr. Bourne, representing the Burmese and the English side in the parliament, had to say illuminates the greatly asymmetrical, if not totally different, assessment of the “Burma and World War” issue by representatives of both sides.

The wide gulf between these two positions cannot be said to be bridged even today. Different assessments of Burma’s situation vis à vis the world still tend to be irreconcilable. One aim of this paper is to present some material for discussing the different world views both then and now, both here and over there.

September 2009 (latest update)
II. Material on Ba Hein, *World War and Burma’s Future*

1. Kyaw Hoe, Bibliographical Information
(Translated by Frankie Tun from Kyaw Hoe’s Nagani-Bibliography p. 107)


The time was close to the Second World War. Why there is a war? Will the Second World War break out? If so, from where it will start? How are they going to fight? And what will the Burmese do? The book is written to answer those questions. (This was mentioned in the advertisement of the book)

It says that the Burmese will have to do something when the world war breaks out. The book says it will guide the reader what to do. It was published as a special book from Tun Aye.. Even though it was meant to be published on the 15th of September of 1939, since the world’s political situation changed within days and nights, the publication was delayed to collect more and more information. The publication was announced for October 15. The price was set at 3 penny. It was blocked by the government.
Title of Ba Hein’s Book
The World War and Burma’s Future was published by Burma Publishing House in 1939 just when the clouds of World War were hanging over the world. Thakin Ba Hein, the author was a very prominent politician. His aim in writing the book has been to tell the Burmese people about the causes of the war and the likely situations which could develop for Burma out of it.

Biography of the author

Thakin Ba Hein, an important student leader during the colonial period, was born on 10 Waxing moon of Waso, 1279 Burmese Era (June 28, 1917) at Hanthawaddy-kaingpayat, Inwa (Ava).

His parents were U Hmin and Daw Oo and he was the second youngest son of seven. He was educated at Yun-dan-yat Sakyathiha kyaung in Mandalay, and in Mandalay Intermediate College and then in Rangoon University. In 1938 he was elected President of Rangoon University Students’ Union, and while still a student, he joined the Dobama Ah-ai-ah-yone and put the Thakin title to his name. During the great oil-field workers’ strike, on December 12, 1938, when workers’ march was forcibly halted, Thakin Ba Hein took part, along with other student leaders, to support the strike. He spoke for their cause and agitated the masses with the words "myin khwar ta chet pauk lyin mee hoon hoon tauk say ya myee" (with ‘myin khwar’ meaning a horse’s hoof, he meant to say that a step made by the horse of the mounted police would ignite a great fire). His detention by the British government, for breaking the Section 144 of the Code of Penal Procedure during the strike led to the Third Students’ Strike.

After leaving the university in 1939, he collaborated with Thakin Soe, Thakin Aung San and Goshal in the secret organization of the Communist Party. In 1941, he became President of Dobama Ah-si-ah-yone. He opposed the Bama Htwet Yat Gaing (Burma
Revolutionary Party) in its policy of accepting Japanese assistance for Burma’s independence; he had an intense hatred for fascism. During the anti-Japanese revolt he was in charge in Pegu Yoma region as political leader.

He was married to Daw Khin Gyi. While he was taking treatment for malaria in St. Peters’ Hospital, he got the news of the expulsion of the Communist Party from AFPFL and subsequently he passed away.

**The book’s abstract**

Now the clouds of war are heavy the world over. More than forty-one million perished in the First World War (1914-18). Accordingly, some informed people speculated that the people had become so scared of war that they didn’t even like to hear a whisper of the word war. Before the speculations subsided, explosions of cannons and bombs had reappeared in various parts of the world. To quote Clemenceau, the French political thinker, “To think that because of the First World War, people have become so scared of war has now been proved wrong. And the future awaits the sacrifice in sweat, blood and lives of humans. Europeans have not realized war as the greatest foe of mankind.”

In the previous war capitalists fought among themselves for territorial gains. But the educated men of the capitalist side couldn’t see the evils of capitalism. Factory workers, dirty with dust, would know about the exploitation of the poor by the capitalists better than university professors immersed in books.

In ancient times, when *bon-wa-da* (communism) prevailed, people would not have understood about the nature of war. It was due to the making of personal possession of property, farms and land and factories that oppression of one class by another arose. In the middle ages, from 1100 to 1600, when religious wars broke out, the ruling elite dragged the ignorant masses into war by making religion an issue for the war.

In India and Burma, we see the English imperialists are creating religious riots as a means to divide and rule.
System of banking and financial monopoly, imperialism and fascism are just transformed appearances of capitalism. The nature of capitalism is to give the ownership of land, vehicles, factories to the few capitalists while it requires the working classes to labour in order to produce profit for the capitalists. To put it another way, it is the exploitation of the labour of those who own no capital by those who own it. Capitalism had developed during the period from 1400 to 1600, but until 1750 it wasn’t a ruthless system. Following 1800 AD, when the industrial revolution arose, the world economic situation changed. Many factories were erected and the fine products from them were exported to far away lands. Competition in the sale of goods and the struggle among the capitalists intensified. They worked hard, in competition, to reduce production costs, to mass produce and to sell at cheap prices. To sell cheap products they needed better means of production; to get that, they required financial investment. Thus as Karl Marx said, “The bigger capitalist destroys the smaller capitalist.”

When small capitalists could not recover, big capitalists, making alliances, monopolized the whole production process. They set production quotas and fixed prices. When large factories produced large quantities of goods they had to find new markets.

New markets had to be sought not because there was a surplus of goods in the country; rather, it was either because there were not enough people who would buy when the goods were sold at a profit, or it was impossible to sell in other capitalist countries. In this situation, industrially underdeveloped colonial lands became the market for capitalist nations. Then, in addition to obtaining raw materials from the colonies, the capitalist nations got the opportunity of investing in them their surplus money.

So long as the native people did not yield to colonial domination, they resisted using all available means at their disposal. In such cases, the natives had to bleed into streams of blood, due to the cannons and bombs from the warships that came in the wake of the capitalist merchants. This was due to the armed trading of the capitalist powers. Such greed had led to colonization to such an extent that after seventy years there is no space left in the world for further colonization. The World War of 1914-18 was a war over unequal sharing of the spoils among the capitalist nations. Although the First World War
was over, capitalism is still alive and the intention to struggle for territory has set the world on the road to the Second World War.

Again, fascism developed from the suppression of the revolution by labourers. Fascism arose from the attempts to prolong capitalism. There are seven basic characteristics of fascism: (i) it sustains the capitalist system in the face of the revolution involving the confrontation of class against class (capitalist versus poor) and the progress in the means of production, (ii) ruthless exercise of power by the capitalists, (iii) ruthless suppression of the right of workers to organize, (iv) disregard of democracy and the right of the people to elect the government, (v) government’s role in the business and banking, (vi) empires being subject to the control of a single economic system, (vii) preparation for war which is a consequence of the capitalist system. “Fascism could lead to eternal peace”, said the Italian dictator Mussolini. German dictator Hitler said: “War can promote human qualities which, in time of peace, can become degraded.” It was for this reason that in 1936, responding to Roy Howard of the American newspaper Scripts, Stalin, the Russian leader answered,” It is Germany and Japan where the World War starts.”

Since after the First World War, there had occurred throughout Europe labour uprisings against the capitalist governments. In Russia, they were able to destroy the capitalist government and establish a nation of the working people based on communism. Thereafter, a series of labour revolutions against the capitalist governments erupted around the world. In 1924 there was an uprising in Estonia, in 1925 in Syria and Morocco. The Chinese revolution came in 1925-27; and in 1927 there was a revolt in Vienna, Austria. There was internal rebellion in Germany from 1929 to 1933. In Spain, in 1931 there was the uprising of the poor people. During 1930-34 the civil disobedience movement took place in India; and in Burma, the peasants’ revolt of 1931. In 1934, there was labour unrest in France. In 1934, armed rebellion occurred in Austria and Astoria. Also in South America labour uprising took place. In this way there has emerged a succession of events which tended to uproot the capitalist system.

After the First World War, the nations of the world made two important treaties: the
Versailles Treaty which concerns Europe, West Asian countries and German territories, and the Washington treaty for affairs concerning nations apart from Europe. At the beginning of the war, America remained neutral, but prospered by selling arms and weapons to contestants. However, towards the end, labour movements prompted America, in order to save the capitalist system, to take sides with England and France, thus bringing the war to a conclusion. After the war, England, France and America disagreed over the sharing of the colonial territories, producing England versus France and England versus America confrontations. America intervened to disrupt the English plans for the build up of its navy. Japan also planned to build up its navy. Towards the end of 1921, the Washington conference was convened to produce the naval agreement of a 5 : 5 : 3 ratio in terms of warships for England, America and Japan respectively.

England and France have been looking aggressively at each other. When war came between Turkey and Greece, France was behind Turkey, and England behind Greece. To prevent France’s dominant role in Europe, England supported Germany. That Germany was able to rise up from its trodden status was due to England’s support. In 1923, due to an American plan for financial loans to Europe, for some time, European economy revived and political stability improved as well. In 1925, in order to pay attention to the west coast of Germany, England, France, Belgium and Italy made the Treaty of Locarno. In 1926, France and Germany got better relations. That year when the disarmament conference was convened, Russia was also invited. In 1928, by the Briand-Kellogg Pact, various nations agreed and signed to denounce war.

In the mean time, European nations had to bear the heavy burden of American debt; they had work hard to boost domestic production in order to repay the debts. They had also to compete to find markets for their goods. There were more products than there are markets and there piled up surplus goods in capitalist states. Factories had to be shut down and workers laid off, resulting in mass unemployment. Peasants in colonial countries which had been exporting raw materials faced famine. In this way, the world came to face the dreadful global economic crisis of 1929-33.

The economic depression prompted nations which had denounced war to think of it once
again. Changes took place rapidly in international politics. In 1930, German parliamentary government was suspended temporarily, and in 1933 Fascism (sic) was openly adopted. In England, a national government that was semi-fascist came to power. Japan, in gross disregard of the Briand-Kellogs treaty, the Nine Nation treaty and the League of Nations, invaded northern China; then withdrew from the League of Nations.

In 1932 while Japan was raining bombs upon Shanghai and Chapin, the disarmament conference was in progress. After three years it ended in failure. The Lausanne conference declared not to pay war reparations. The Ottawa conference decided to apply foreign custom duties to the whole British Empire. Russia had developed by means of the five year plan to become the world’s second economic power. In 1933, after Hitler became dictator, Germany withdrew from the League of Nations. American president Roosevelt initiated the fascist-like New Deal economic plan. The world economic conference with no chance of success ended in failure. In 1934, Germany started a massive rearmament programme. Cruel assassinations of army officers, believed to become disobedient, took place; and Austrian chancellor Dollfuss was assassinated. In Austria and Spain, workers took up arms against Nazism. Russia joined the League of Nations. In 1935, Germany disregarding the Versailles treaty, expanded its military establishment; made naval agreement with England and entered into alliance with France and Russia. Italy, in defiance of the League of Nations invaded Abyssinia, a member of the League. Disregarding the Washington agreement, Japan expanded her naval forces. In 1936, England boosted her defence spending to an excessive level. Germany by sending armies into the region of Rhineland broke the agreement made in the treaty of Locarno. Such unexpected political changes have been pushing the world to the brink of world war.

In the mean time, Spain had fallen under Franco, a follower of Hitler and Mussolini; France was now facing the menace of Fascism on all sides of her boundary. Czechoslovakia had been invaded and had fallen under Germany. Fascist Hungary, by its invasion of Romania brought itself into contact with Poland. In this way Poland was exposed to the threat from Germany. Again, Germany, by making an enforced treaty
with Romania acquired oil and wheat from her; then it demanded the port of Danzig from Poland. By obtaining gold and minerals from Czechoslovakia and Romania, Germany had strengthened herself enough to be able to militarily confront Russia. But rather than face an immediate clash with Russia, Hitler chose first to attempt to invade France and Belgium. In the East, Japan’s expansionist policies have already put China with a population of 400 million in flames of war. In this way various parts of the world is now aflame in conflicts. During this period, the Russian parliament endorsed the Russo-German Pact; the German air force bombed twelve Polish towns including the capital Warsaw; England sent an ultimatum against an attack on Poland; the air, naval and land forces of France and England mobilized to be ready for war. Such state of affairs has made the probability of Second World War almost a certainty.

In its colonial countries English propaganda put the blame for the war on Germany. It urged the colonies to forget, for the time being, their status as colonial subjects, but to rally with England to teach Hitler the lesson for his reckless actions. The Governor of Burma, representing the British imperialism, in his speech in the Burma parliament said, "As small states, just like the big ones, should be entitled to enjoy their national freedoms, they should, in order to preserve and protect these freedoms, stand up with British and French governments in supporting Poland which has been provoked by Germany." However, for the Burmese people, who for over one hundred years never had a trace of national freedom, these words meant nothing. The act of annexing new colonies and exploiting from them is in direct contrast to the statement that war has been fought to protect freedoms.

Again, there is the interesting breakdown in talks to establish the English-French-Russian alliance. Capitalist England and France have no desire to come into alliance with Russia, the common power that would destroy their system. For this reason, they supported Germany to crush Russia. They allowed Germany to build up her air, naval and land forces and the military occupation of Ruhr and Rhineland. They watched with folded arms when Italy invaded Abyssinia, and assisted Germany to annex Austria and Czechoslovakia. They looked on when the workers rebellion in Spain was crushed jointly by Germany and Italy. British aim was for four nations, Italy, Germany, France and
England, to pull together to destroy Russia. But Germany and Italy rather than turn toward Russia antagonized England and France. Because of the threat from Germany, Russia turned to them to seek alliance.

The draft agreement proposed by England contained a clause that Russia would protect Poland and Romania from German aggression, but did not include any provision for the defence of Russia itself, and Russia could not agree to it. On the other hand, the Russian proposal required that in case one of them was attacked by an external power, the signatories would all fight to protect its integrity, as well as for the protection of small East European states. England could not agree to this as it would be a great blow to fascism. Thereafter, Russia, realizing the pretext of England and France, made a non-aggression treaty with Germany, thus exposing, for the world to observe, the true intentions England and France who did not like to see world peace.

On the other hand, it could be seen that Hitler has no intention of attacking Russia, but has been preparing for the Balkans. Having had its plan crumbled, England made alliance treaty with Poland for defence against Germany.

Again, in the conflict between China and Japan, England has been favouring the Japanese. They ignored the persecution of British citizens in China by the Japanese. Questioned in the House of Commons about the issue, Prime Minister Chamberlain obliquely replied, “Britain possesses no power in the East to demolish the Japanese navy.” Moreover, England accepted the “Tokyo Formula”, negotiated between England and Japan. It recognized the annexation by Japan of Chinese territories occupied by it. The true British intention had been to first destroy the Chinese communists and then to share with Japan Chinese territory. It was also assumed that Japan’s occupation of China would enable her threaten Russia.

With the declaration of war by England against Germany the Second World War has begun. British dominions such as Canada, South Africa, Australia, have the right to debate and decide in their parliaments whether they should join the war and fight for Britain. Yet, subject India and Burma, as subject nations were denied the same right of
self-determination. It has to be assumed that they were already at war, since it began, on the side of Britain.

The Governor of Burma has been issuing war related pronouncements. The time has come to be an important period when Burma can be lost from the British Empire and attention has to be paid to the menace of its internal freedom fighters. During the First World War, because of its alliance with powerful Japan and because native people in the empire had not been strong enough, it wasn’t too difficult for Britain to protect the empire. This time, however, anti-imperialist forces have gathered strength and there is the prospect of war with Japan. For this reason, the Committee of Imperial Defence has established the fortress of Singapore and plans are under way to set up the Council of Southern Pacific Defence to defend the British territories in the region. As part of British and French military cooperation, Indian forces are planned to be sent to Singapore. In addition, the idea to establish an India based army has been contemplated.

As for Burma, as there is no immediate threat from outside across the land border, attention is focused on prevention of internal unrest. According to the new constitution of 1935, the defence department is placed under the hands of the governor. After Burma’s separation from India defence forces have been organized for the security of Burma. These include one British infantry battalion, one battalion of cavalry, a company of sappers and miners, three battalions of Burma rifles, already trained and one in training, military police, six battalions of Shan State and Burma security, one auxiliary regiment at Pyawbwe, one in Mandalay and two in Rangoon, Burma Police force and Rangoon Police force. In addition, one battalion of Burma Auxiliary Force composed of Europeans and half-English and one battalion of Burma Territorial Force of natives have been organized.

Whatever the circumstances, it is the desire of every Burman to get complete freedom for Burma, to set up an independent state with self-determination for Burma’s foreign policy, economy and defence. As full independence only can fulfil this desire, struggle for Burma’s independence is a just cause.
There are two alternatives open to Britain with regard to Burma. First, full independence may be granted to it. This should enable Burma and England to become friendly countries providing advantages in trade. So long as Burma’s freedom and democracy are protected, in international affairs, Burma will always stand behind Britain. The second alternative is to keep the status quo, to continue to keep Burma under British rule. This will lead to a confrontation with forces for Burma’s independence producing, in the long run, disadvantages for Britain. For this reason, England would not be inclined to choose the second option.

Whatever decision England makes, it is for the Burmese nationals to organize and develop the anti-imperialist movement. Some politicians hold the opinion that Burma should attain its independence which Britain is in trouble (*Ingleik ah khet, Bama ah chet*, meaning England’s woes, Burma’s opportunity, they used to say.) This is a small idea. Actually, Burma’s freedom is a major task for all Burmese nationals regardless of whether there is a world war or not, and whether England is in trouble or not.

**Comments**

The World War and Burma’s Future is a book that had been important in pre-war Burma politics. Published at a time when the war was imminent, it constitutes a timely document. At the time, Burma was under English imperialism and its independence movement was gathering momentum. Organizations like Young Men’s Buddhist Association (YMBA), the General Council of Buddhist Associations (GCBA), Burma Revolutionary Party, Dobama Ahsihyone etc. had been organized to promote the struggle for independence. It was important at the time to judge not only the intensions of the British in power, but also their allies as well as their adversaries.

Political repercussions in the wake of the First World had not had much impact upon Burma. But the Second World War had been of great significance for Burma. The First World War had been confined mainly to Europe, but the Second was wide spread, involving Japan and East Asian countries as well. Burma also was directly involved in the war. Unlike the First World War which was only a military contest among capitalist
powers, the Second involved, in addition to the capitalist versus capitalist struggle, the ideological contest of socialism and communism against capitalism. This required that Burmans, struggling for their independence from capitalist Britain, should study the nature of capitalism, the causes for the Second World War and the political, economic and military background of all the contestants in the war.

This requirement had been met by the book “World War and Burma’s Future”, whose author Thakin Ba Hein himself had been an activist in Burma’s revolution. It was especially relevant because the author explains the causes of the war in relation to capitalism. The book reveals the profit motives and territorial ambitions of the capitalist system, and the war as a result of the capitalists confronting each other as they grabbed colonial possessions. The political upsets as they occurred are highlighted against the background of international politics. In a way the book the eyes of the Burmese people subjected to colonialism.

The book also generated revolutionary awareness about fascism - the worst of capitalism. It explains how fascism emerged and also the labour movements which attempted to oppose it. In particular, the book intends to make Burma to take the correct route during the war. Related with the Second World War, the book provides guidance about the actions to be taken for the future independence of Burma. The specific point is the promotion of the idea that, whether England was in trouble or not because of the war, the forces for Burma’s independence would have to get the support of the people and steadfastly go ahead with the struggle. Accordingly, the book made a timely contribution to the political principles to form the basis for Burma’s movement toward freedom.

At the present too the book represents a resource where we can study, the nature of colonialism and characteristics of capitalism, the causes of the Second World War, Burma as a battle ground during the war and the views and opinions of pro-independence Burmese fighters. In these respects the book remains document to provide a historical point of view.
3. Bernhard Dahm, Commentary

The report gives a good impression of Thakin Ba Hein’s attempt, to present to the Burmese public shortly after the outbreak of the Second World War his analysis of the origins of the War and of the chances it offers for the Burmese people to attain their independence from British colonial rule.

The author (Ba Hein), at the time of writing a student leader and recent convert to Communism, bases his analysis on Marxism. His interpretation of recent historical developments demonstrates that capitalism, imperialism and fascism necessarily lead to war, and that even the losses suffered in World War I could not stop the greed of the capitalists to prepare the next war in order to maximize their profits in parts of the world not yet under their domination. These arguments can be found in all Marxist writings, some more and some less differentiated.

It would have been interesting, therefore to know, what sources were used by Ba Hein, whether he bases his review of events leading to the outbreak of World War II on other Marxist writers, or whether their selection and interpretation is his own. In the report we do not find any references which might help to clarify originality and learnedness of the author. This would be important to know because in a number of cases the interpretations as they are presented in the report are rather short and often very one-sided. Take for instance the question: what prompted the US to enter WW I in 1917? Was this really nothing but a reaction to labor-movements in order to save the capitalist system (cf. report p.3)? Or, did Ba Hein say nothing more about the Ottawa-(Empire)-Conference in 1932 or about the New Deal program of President Roosevelt in 1933 than what is quoted in the report on p. 4f? Or, was it only the reason of “self defense” that made the Soviet Union sign the Hitler-Stalin-Treaty in August 1939, as is mentioned in the report on p.6? Was it not also an encouragement of Stalin for Hitler to start his war against the West? In short: Does Ba Hein simply repeat stereotypes or does he discuss alternatives?

Aside from all ideological bindings, there are some distortions in the text, which definitely need corrections. What is the source, for instance, for the number of deaths in WW I, given with “forty-one million” (report p. 2)? As far as I know, the correct number is close to ten million! Or, with regard to the reference to Germany’s “West coast” in the context
of the Treaty of Locarno (report p. 4) it should read “in order to pay attention to the western neighbors of Germany”, Germany has no “West-coast“.

It would be good, if at least some of the questions could be answered by the author of the report, so that one can get a more differentiated picture of Ba Hein. The latter’s two intentions, however, to denounce capitalism and to appeal to his people “to be ready” for the chances offered by the war, however, become very clear in the report!

Passau, August 2007
4. Response of Shwe Sin Aung to the Commentary

Dear Bernhard Dahm

I’m so grateful to you for your opinions over my review of The World War and the Future of Burma. As you understand, Thakin Ba Hein compiled the book from a Marxist angle. The author emphasized capitalism and imperialism as the major causes of the outbreak of the First World War.

It is found that the author referred to the newspapers published in 1938-1939 for historical facts. The author himself did not vouch for the accuracy and correctness of the historical facts. In the Introduction of the book the author mentioned:

“The author is not responsible for the accuracy of the opinion contained in this book. The plans for Burma’s tasks are not the firmly fixed rules for tasks, and instead, are just guiding points to be considered for comrades in their formulation of the tasks.”

Hence, it can be noted that the author, based on historical events intended to instil the basics of Marxist ideology in the public and to open their eyes for anti-imperialist resistance, and it is not a compilation on historical research. It is found that the author assessed the gathered information from the viewpoints of Marxist ideology. He also mentioned the references in the footnote such as World Politics by Dutt, Anti-Dhuring by Engels, Man’s Worldly Goods by Huberman, Fascism and Social Revolution by Dutt, etc.

According to World War records, the primary cause of America entering the war was the fact that a German submarine had submerged an English sea-going vessel, with 124 American passengers on board, in May 1915. But the author did not assume this to be the only cause. From Marxist tenets, he opined that America, a capitalist country had entered the war to avoid workers’ strike and protect capitalist system. Despite the mentioning of historical facts in a series, he had not made any assessment on them, and not gone deeper into their accuracy.

Concerning the 41 million deaths in World War I, it is not known from which source the author had taken the fact. Thanks to your information. I have come to realize
that the real number of war deaths was about 10 million. “The western coast” of Germany may be a misnomer. Thakin Ba Hein, as a knowledgeable person, may have understood that there was no western coast in Germany. It can be assumed, as you say, that the western coast refers to the western neighbours. It may also refer to the areas on the western bank of the Rakhine State.

Sincerely yours

Dr. Shwe Sin Aung

(March 2009)
III. Material on Aung San, Ba Maw, Ba Khaing, Soe, World War and Burma

1. Kyaw Hoe, Bibliographical Information
(translated by Frankie Tun from Kyaw Hoe’s Nagani-Bibliography p.68-69)

45 Aung San, World War and Burma (Written by General Aung San, Dr. Ba Maw, Thakhin Soe, Fabian U Ba Khine) Yangon, Nagani, 1940

The book was published by Nagani Book Club at Yangon with the address of 248, Luis Street, Yangon. It was published on the 17th of April, 1940 with a circulation of 4000. Each book was sold for 9 penny for the non members.

The article of General Aung San, the World War and Burma, was also included in the book called, `Communism and We Burmese` written by Thein Pe Myint which is the compilation of other articles of U Thein Pe Myint. That book, “Communism and We Burmese”, was actually the collections of Nagani Articles under the title of Marxism and the Communism in 1954. There are altogether 18 pages. The rest of the authors were only 13 pages.

It was mentioned that Thakhin Aung San wrote this article since a friend asked him to write about the World War and Burma (not more than 60 lines). There were so much to write about this topic and he could express only a gist.

This war came about due to the expansionism and the Soviet Russia stood on the right side by supporting the independence of the small countries. It was mentioned with the many events and views.

Concerning the world’s situation, Burma’s policy is mentioned as not accepting oppressions and expansionism. When the country is not independent it cannot help in the war. It will have mutual relationship with the neighbouring countries but no wish for war.

In relation to the Burmese events, it mentioned details about reinforcing the recruitments for Burmese independence.
World War and Burma, Reproduction of Title Page

The copy of the booklet obtained is a copy of a damaged original. The reproductions are larger than the originals.
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4. Tin Htway, Translation of Aung San, World War and Burma

WORLD WAR AND BURMA

by

THAKHIN AUNG SAN

As soon as this war broke out the English, French and Germans all declared their war aims. Indeed, this was just a formality to get support from other powerful countries. If we disregard these published aims and if we really examine the roots of war, the only possible cause of it is to be found in capitalism. In this world, if we shut our eyes to the existence of capitalism - that is, the blood-sucking attitude of one person to another, one class to another - one country to another, there will always be wars one after another.

If we analyse the present wars, Japan is fighting China on behalf of Japanese Capitalists. They don't want to see Western exploiters like English, American and French capitalists in China: they want to monopolise the whole country. That is why they attacked China. The war between Germany and England and French is also attributable to the same cause. But the civil war in Finland was a different matter. It is a war of capitalists against proletarians. Well, these wars are inevitable as long as we tolerate the horrible existence of capitalism whose main aim is only exploitation and profit with whatever means, however unjustifiable. It is not to be wondered at.

We don't want war. We don't want one person oppressing another, one class oppressing another, one country oppressing another. We don't want big nations oppressing small ones, or strong ones

1 Tin Htway, pp.
strangling the weaker ones. We want nothing of this kind. That is why we don’t want the imperialism which enslaved all our people and overpowered our country. We want to destroy it and we are determined to do so. We have our reasons for wanting to crush imperialism. We don’t hate foreigners, we don’t hate other races – by no means. The reason we oppose imperialism is that we can’t accept injustice and we will never accept it. We hate to see any war – it can produce no benefit to mankind. The reasons of the present wars and conflicts throughout the whole world are rested in imperialistic ideas and policies... Therefore, as far as these present wars concerned, the very first duty of all Burmese citizens is to join with other world wide forces and crush capitalist-imperialism down to its roots. To this, I need add no more.

In this present war – for the benefit of Burma, it is very important to realize that Burmese political parties have a great responsibility now. To that end the Dobama Asi-ayone took great care and paid great attention. The Dobama Asi-ayone gave full co-operation in establishing freedom and achieving national unity. Not long ago, the Dobama Asi-ayone held their All Burma Executive Committee meeting in Mandalay and a resolution was passed as follows: -

After listening to the report of the political situation by the Central Executive Committee, this All Burma Executive Committee meeting has agreed to announce this as their policy for World Affairs and Burmese Affairs.

(A) World Affairs

(1) The British and French Governments have declared as their
reason for their part in this present war against Nazi Germany that they are protecting the Free World, Democracy, and are preventing the maltreatment of small countries by big ones.

(a) Poland’s ex-government was a feudalist capitalist-fascist government. It enjoyed no popular support from the people. That explains the ease with which Germany occupied parts of Poland. When the Proletarian [what he means is ‘Socialist’] Soviet Army marched into Poland the villagers and peasants from that areas gave them a hearty welcome.

(b) Burma and India have demanded their independence in alignment with the published war aims of the British Government which has not yet bothered to send a reply.

(c) The French Government persist in their cant about freedom and democracy, yet they have declared the French Communist Party illegal and tried to crush it. Moreover, there is no sign that France will allow her colonies their independence.

(d) What is actually taking place in Finland in a civil war. Soldiers from the Soviet Union, champions of World Peace und World Freedom who always help with words and deeds, are fighting hand to hand with the people’s Finnish Government.

For all the reasons given above we believe and declare that this present great war in not for the sake of the independence of small nations nor for the world’s freedom. It is only the evil result of imperialism.
(2) As for the Soviet Union

(a) As soon as she achieved power, that is as soon as she became Socialist in 1917, she granted independence to all her colonies including Finland.

(b) In the cause for World Freedom for instance in China, Spain, etc., she has given her help and she is still helping.

(c) She signed a non-aggression pact with the German government, with whom she had a similar treaty since the World War I up to 1931, just to preserve her present strength, after she had made fruitless efforts for 5/6 months negotiating with British and French governments for World Peace against Hitler and the Nazi regime.

(d) She has already signed peace treaties with her neighbouring countries without taking undue advantage of their relative weakness.

(e) She has granted freedom to the peasants of the occupied by her in Poland, of which she had to take charge immediately and control because it was deserted by the Polish Government.

(f) To protect Finland’s independence, she has signed a mutual-aid pact with the People’s Finnish Government for reasons such as those given above, we recognise the Soviet Union as a ‘blazing light’ (champion) of Proletarians and of lovers of the World’s Freedom not only in the present war but also in previous wars.

(3) World affairs and Burma’s affairs are inseparable. In world affairs we proclaimed our politics and attitudes -

a) We do not like and we will not accept any political ideology which will oppress and exploit at the price of another country’s freedom.
(b) Until our country regains her independence, we are not going to consider ‘war support’ for any other country.

(c) For mutual benefit we will maintain our friendship as far as we can with any country, especially our neighbours and the countries from the East.

(d) In every war many people die or become slaves; ordinary folk pay more taxes; and because of the profiteer’s people suffer and life becomes more difficult. Therefore, we must try to end this present war, which is only the result of imperialism, as soon as possible – and proletarians from all over the world and all the colonies under foreign rule must seize the initiative and strive to this with all their might.

(B) Burma’s Affairs

(1) Having declared our policy in World Affairs the following is our policy in Burma’s Affairs.

(a) We must do all we can to crush imperialism, which made our country, Burma, a slave. We must do our best to destroy the new administration (under the Government of Burma Act of 1935), the fortress of British imperialistic machinery. And we must try to create our own Burmese Government according to the wishes of our people.

(b) We are unhesitatingly ready to co-operate with any other political parties or associations who believe and accept the above points and for the sake of our country we will do all we can to achieve political unity in Burma.
(2) The previous special meeting of All Burma Executive Committee has laid down above politics and has passed a resolution that the Central Executive Committee should be empowered to fulfil the terms of these politics. Thus, we declare that we endorse our support of the basic policy points of Burma Freedom Bloc (a united political front, which consists of Sin-yar-tha Party, Ngar-bwint-saing Party, and Dobama Asi-ayone) - As the Burma Freedom Bloc is gaining support from the nation, it is very obvious that our people are impatient for their freedom and unity.

With the aim of strengthening the politics and activities of the Burma Freedom Bloc ....

a) It is necessary to do all we can to arouse the political consciousness of our people and make them realize the real value of freedom.

(b) It is necessary to bread new ardent leaders who will lead these people.

(c) It is also necessary to have financial support. And resources for our independence movements...

This All Burma Executive Committee has decided recruit more and more Dobama Asi-ayone members; to organize and establish Bama Letyone Tat and to give vigorous training; to organize classes and lectures to further political knowledge; to organise (nation-wide) seminars and meetings; to collect more party funds; to propagate our aims and objects not only in Burma but also abroad. In this way, we can show the extent of our initiative and genuine

1 Bama Letyone Tat - a kind of private army sponsored by the Dobama Asi-ayone.
willingness and co-operation with the Freedom Bloc.

This is the time for the Burmese Independence Movement to transfer from the theoretical stage into the practical stage. Actions or deeds alone are not important. One must know the right time and the right place for these actions to have maximum effect. Basically, we are not questioning the importance of man and his efforts, but action at the right time and the right place will give quicker results and more considerable achievements. In the Burmese Independence Movement we have already the second and third points - that is, right time and right place. Thus how shall we achieve this effort?

(1) First as Burma wants Freedom, she has now demanded it. This fact must be well publicised not only within Burma but all over the world and our organization must be as effective as possible.

(2) While we are propagating our ends, for the sake of our country's independence we must try to achieve political unity in our country regardless of parties, policies and personalities. When we say 'political unity' we do not merely the unity of leaders. To be able to stand against the imperialism we need all our people - workers, students, women, business-men, office-workers, peasants, tenant-farmers, field labourers, Shan, Chin, Kachin, Karen and all our minority races - to be united. That is, the unity of the whole nation. At present, in our Dobama Asi-ayone, apart from so-called educated and some wealthy people, like doctors, lawyers, business-men etc., our organization has already had some effect and we have already achieved a degree of unity. The reason why we organized the Freedom Bloc was to gain co-operation in the national freedom movement.
(3) While we are propagating, while we are seeking political unity – we must not overlook the importance of the present existing problems of peasants (the most important problem), workers, etc.

(4) After we have finished our preliminaries and when we are prepared we will choose one method which has been proved to be the best and most suitable in the world’s independence movements and will fight systematically stage by stage for our freedom.

If we lay our plans like this and if we pursue them accordingly, it is most likely that we shall see an Independent Burma in the very near future. Even if we can’t get independence, at least we will get a much better administrative system – there is no doubt that we will get better leadership and the standard of political awareness will also rise in response. Best of all, we will gain valuable experience. Then it will be much easier for us to take the next steps in our fight for freedom.

So what we must do from now on and what we must give our special attention to is ..... 

(1) With the help of students or using student power, we must give propaganda lectures about our aims and objects, throwing light on major subjects like independence, the abolition of the (present) Arms and Ammunition Act and giving a true picture of world events. We must establish voluntary fighting forces like Bama Letyone Tat. We must seek to increase the membership of Dobama-Asi-Ayone. We must get in touch with foreign countries such as China, India, United Kingdom, etc, either personally or through letters, to publicize our ends. We must publish books and pamphlets about Burma. To achieve the whole nation's support, we
must arrange All Burma Political (Unity) Meetings; National Weeks; Resistance Day against the present administrative system (or The Government of Burma Act, 1935); and during the National Week we must collect anti-imperialism and Freedom for Burma signets to show our strength.

(2) As the trend of present-day politics is not as it as in olden-days (it is no longer a gentlemen's affair), we must always remind the people and instigate them to be alert ...; to encourage nationalistic ideas; to forget partisan spirit; to achieve comradeship among workers, peasants, students, among all classes of people; to achieve genuine unity among all regardless if they are Shan, Chin, Kachin, Karen, etc.; most important of all is to let all the native people in Burma know, without distinction and discrimination, that 'freedom' is for them and not to let them forget that their freedom is their duty.

(3) We must do all these things and at the same time, we must not neglect other problems of our peasants, workers, students, and in connection with these problems we must always seize our opportunity to talk about independence, the evils of new administration, etc. These problems may perhaps appear small, but these are preliminaries for the major issue (Revolution) and the solution to people’s social problems, economic problems and political problems depends mainly on our country's freedom. We must try to ensure that those facts are clearly known to all individuals. We must seek more membership (for Dobama Asi-ayone). We must organize more Bama Letyone Tat and we must collect 'Independence Funds'.

(4) At the forthcoming Dobama Asi-ayone Convention, we shall present our forthcoming activities and future plans for our
independence movements,

For example, we want draw a political plan to fight. This anti-imperialist revolution, which must be acceptable to all people, regardless of class und category. We must do our best to produce many young leaders who will lead this revolution. We must lay down the necessary rules and regulations about how we are going to collect, preserve und speed our ‘Independence Funds’.

‘Independence’ is not a thing which you can easily achieve by proposing a motion in Parliament. A Parliamentary Motion is only good for publicity und propaganda. It needs action. We will only achieve it by action. We will get nowhere by lying around sleeping. It is no good trying sole leadership. It is no good buying votes - or chasing the offices. It is no use shouting slogans all the time. We must. Work with all our might. We must work painstakingly. We must do our best whatever the cost may be. We must sacrifice ourselves. Then only we will meet our ends. Then only we will get what we want - that is, our victory crown - Independence. Imperialism - Capitalism - whatever it may be - has also its ups and dons - impermanence is one of the Four Noble Truths. Nothing and nobody can escape it. Capitalism has to create workers. Imperialism has to create an educated class to use as the tools in their bureaucratic machinery for their conquered people. But these workers and educated people, when they achieve some enlightenment, revolt against their creators and the system. The imperialists have to build railway systems, highway roads and better communications in our country so that they can transport their goods and commodities with less cost to make more profit. But on the other hand, these roads and better communication systems have served for us as a mainstream for our national unity. In this way, capitalist-imperialism has played
its part in our society with mixed results – with one hand it carries a flaming torch and with the other a bucket of water. They have done something good for us, as well as exploiting us as much as they could and they have oppressed us inhumanly. Because of these irregularities, there is no cause to be surprised that the present situation in Burma has reached its height in tensions and troubles. Therefore, our duty as members of human society is to study the pros and cons of imperialism seriously and be prepared to take the necessary actions when time comes.

While we are preparing for our independence movement we must be careful not to let disunity create classes or races among us. No (nature) of the imperialist masters’ tactics to split us. No unnecessary haste. Don’t give up hope before we have actually started. Our victory is sure, of that there is no doubt. So have still a lot of good time – and this is our opportunity to do our best for our country’s independence. Well, dear comrades, let us not waste our time and let us do all we can with all our means and might.

OUR REVOLUTION SHALL SUCCEED.

Sd. Thakhin Aung San.
Requested by a friend to write on World War and Myanmar in not more than 60 lines, I have compressed my multifarious thoughts into this piece.

With the outbreak of war, war aims have been announced to the world at large by England, France and Germany. Actually these declarations were made with the ulterior motive of lobbying the support of other powers in the world. These war aims apart, if one ponders over the real causes of wars, one will arrive. At the conclusion that wars will break out so long as the exploitation of one man by another, of one class by another and of one country by another, in other words, capitalism persists.

To analyse the current conflicts, Japan invaded China because Japanese capitalists do not relish the exploitation of the Chinese economy by England, America and France but wish to monopolize it. The war between Germans and the Anglo-French has a similar motivation. The civil war in Finland is a fight between the capitalists and the proletariat. These are merely consequences of the existing form of profit-oriented capitalism.

We do not want wars. We detest exploitation of one man by another, of one class by another and of one country by another. That is why we want to do away with colonialism under which our people have been enslaved. We are determined to eliminate it. The reason we wish to destroy it is not because we hate foreigners or other people but because we detest any form of violence or senseless conflict. As warlike activities taking place today throughout the world are under the influence of imperialism, the immediate obligation of the people of Myanmar is to unite with other forces in the world to uproot capitalist imperialism. This needs no elaboration whatsoever.

The responsibility of political parties towards the country regarding this world conflict has become very important. Dobama (We Burmans) Organization has paid close attention to this matter and has participated in the setting up of the Freedom Bloc to
organize for the independence of Myanmar. All Burma Executive Committee Meeting of Dobama Organization recently held in Mandalay has made the following declaration.

**World Affairs and Myanmar’s Role**

Having heard the political report of the Central Executive Committee, the All Burma Executive Committee Meeting has arrived at the following conclusion regarding world affairs and Myanmar’s role.

(A) World Affairs

(1) The raison d'être for the declaration of war by England and France upon Germany is alleged to be the Great Powers' persecution and domination of weaker countries, and infringement of world democracy.

   (a) Previous government of Poland, being a land-owning capitalist fascist government lacking in popular support, was easily toppled and half the territory occupied by German forces. When socialist Soviet forces similarly occupied the other half, they were accorded a warm welcome by the peasant population of Poland.

   (b) The people of India and Myanmar have made a demand for freedom at the same time as the declaration of war aims by Britain, but have not as yet received any clearcut response.

   (c) On the pretext of defence of freedom and democracy, the French government has declared the Communist Party illegal. Nor has it granted independence to dependent territories.

   (d) In the civil war now raging in Finland, the armed forces of the Soviet Union which has always given moral and material support to world peace and freedom are fighting on the side of the Finnish government.

Considering these facts, we declare that the present war is not for the sake of the freedom of small countries nor is it for the freedom of the world at large.

(2) The Soviet Union has

   (a) on achieving power in 1917, granted independence to all its dependencies.

   (b) helped and still is helping China and Spain for the sake of world freedom.

   (c) vainly negotiated for six months with Britain and France for resistance to Nazi Germany for the sake of world peace and now for the preservation of its own power has
renegotiated a non-aggression pact with Germany, a country with which it has maintained a non-aggression pact since 1934.

d) negotiated fair and reasonable treaties with neighbouring countries.

e) taken measures for the freedom of peasants immediately upon occupying territories abandoned by the Polish government,

f) negotiate a treaty for mutual assistance with the Finnish people’s government without impairing its independence

In the light of the above, the Soviet Union is recognized as a shining example for the freedom fighters and the proletariat of the world not only in this war but also in the previous ones.

3) Since Myanmar’s affairs are intertwined with world affairs, our world view is as follows:

a) We reject any “ism” that oppresses and exploits other nations.

b) So long as our country is not free, we cannot consider war assistance to other countries.

c) We shall maintain friendly relations for mutual benefit with all other nations, particularly neighbouring and Asian Countries.

d) Since war takes many lives, enslaves many people, and impoverishes the masses through higher taxes and profiteering, we should bring this war caused by imperialism to an early end and struggle for the freedom of oppressed nations and the proletariat.

(B) Myanmar’s Affairs

1) Having made known our understanding of world affairs as above, we declare our stand-point regarding Myanmar’s affairs.

a) We must struggle to get rid of imperialism which has enslaved Myanmar. We must destroy the bastion of imperialism i.e. “91 Department Administration” and acquire as soon as possible a Myanmar Administration that we desire.

b) We are prepared to march along the same path with any political party or organization that professes the same objective, and shall work towards that kind of national unity.

2) Along this line, the recent extraordinary session of the All Burma Executive Committee (of Dobama Organization) has transferred full powers to the Central
Executive Committee. Accordingly, the Organization has formed Burma Freedom Bloc together with Sinyetha Wunthanu Party and Ngapwintsaing Wunthanu Party. We hereby confirm the three basic principles of the aforesaid Freedom Bloc Considering the substantial support the Bloc has received, it is obvious that the desire for self-rule and unity is strong throughout the land

With a view to strengthen the capacity of the Freedom Bloc,

(a) we must strive hard to enhance the awareness of and eagerness for independence of the people.

(b) we need responsible leaders to: direct the people on a daily basis.

(c) we require financial capacity to take timely measures for national freedom.

Consequently, this meeting of the All Burma Executive Committee decides to efficiently carry out the functions of the Freedom Bloc by expanding the membership of the Dobama Organization, setting up and training Bama-letyone-tat, conducting political classes and seminars, mobilizing financial resources, and doing propaganda work abroad.

At the present juncture, the issue of Myanmar’s freedom has progressed from, speaking and writing to action stage. In all actions the deed need to be compatible not only with the venue but also with the timing. This is the rule of action for all leaders and men of action everywhere. In the struggle for Myanmar’s freedom, the choice of time and place is correct and only the deeds of men are needed. How?

(1) That Myanmar desires independence and that the issue of freedom is now being joined must be publicized both at home and abroad.

(2) During the publicity campaign, political unity necessary for the country’s independence must be strived for. Political unity means not merely unity among the so-called political leaders, but also among the workers, students, women, merchants, clerical workers, farmers, farm workers, Shans, Chins, Kachins, Kayins, masses in Chin Hills who are pivotal for the struggle against imperialism. Dobama Organization has now achieved substantial unity of masses in addition to middle class members and intelligentsia like lawyers, merchants, brokers, and lawyers. The purpose of forming the Freedom Bloc was to mobilize such uncommitted people.

(3) At the same time, regionally as well as class-wise, (especially among
workers and most importantly among peasants), mobilization for the struggle ahead must be started even from small current issues.

(4) After mustering sufficient forces, and learning from examples of other countries, the fight for freedom must be waged in a manner most suited to Myanmar.

If such measures are taken unceasingly and vigorously, Myanmar might achieve the status of an independent country. Even if she did not achieve independence, given worthy efforts by her people, her political status is likely to be considerably enhanced. The country’s administrative status, the people’s political status and the leadership level are bound to be improved.

Lessons will have been learnt from the struggle so that the next freedom struggle will be facilitated.

**Measures to be particularly undertaken are:****

(1) Countrywide publicity campaign with the help of students aimed at freedom struggle, abolition of Arms and Ammunition Act, actual world situation, formation of volunteer corps like Bama-letyone-tat, membership drive for Dobama Organization, personal or postal information to such countries as China, India and England, publications on Myanmar, country-wide mobilization through All Myanmar Conferences, anti-colonial referendum at anti-administration protest rally on April 1 and during national news releases.

(2) In the light of the changed political situation, mobilizing every Myanmar to nurture patriotism and eliminate sectarianism, bringing about unity among workers, peasants and students, and with Shans, Kayins, Kachins, Chins, etc., enlightening nationals, government employees and subordinates that freedom benefits all.

(3) Simultaneously to seize the opportunity at the occurrence of incidents concerning workers, peasants, students, traders, taxpayers, etc., to publicize on freedom, administration, war, and abolition of Arms and Ammunition Act, to inform the public that these incidents are forerunners of the future revolution, and that their economic, social and political demands hinge upon independence, to mobilize association members and volunteer corps as well as financial resources.

(4) Preparation of all work programmes on Independence for the forthcoming Conference of Dobama Organization.
For instance, drawing up of a comprehensive political programme that comprises all the demands for all the people of various races and classes that do not contradict one another, especially with the interests of the workers and peasants; devising a scheme for recruiting and training potential leaders for the forthcoming struggle; financial rules and regulations for the freedom fund.

Independence cannot be won by mere passing of resolutions in the Legislative Assembly, which is merely an exercise in publicity. Not by showmanship, vote buying or office seeking, but by incessant struggle and sacrifice, can we achieve victory. Imperialism and capitalism are not immune from vicissitudes of fortune. Capitalism hires workers and colonialism trains employees to work for them. But when workers and intellectuals acquire experience and status, they revolt against capitalism and imperialism. Rau and road that the colonial masters built to carry their goods facilitate our contacts and fraternity. As a result of playing the dual role of firebrand and fireman, (in Myanmar analogy, holding a firebrand in one hand and a water-bucket in the other), capitalist-imperialism not surprisingly provokes discontent. It is up to the people to study its vagaries and keep ready to confront it when the time comes.

In the struggle for freedom, the races and classes should take care to hold hands together, and be wary of the machinations of the imperialists to foment disunity. We should not be too hasty (in Myanmar analogy, to have spent all our arrows before the enemy appears) nor too hesitant (wanting to surrender before the battle is joined). We are sure of our ultimate victory. Times are opportune, so let us endeavour for our freedom, comrades!
4. Aung San, World War and Burma (Burmese Text)
မြန်မာစာကြည်စောင့်အောက်ပါပါသည်။
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(3) သုံးစွဲမှု

[ဥ] အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ သူများ ဒေါ်လာပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းထိပ်မှုကို ကျက်စွာ ကြည့်ရှုနိုင်စေရန် ဖန်တီးကြည်သော အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ သော့ဖောင်ရွယ်စေရန် အခြေခံခိုင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။

(3) မူလမှားစီးစားပြုလုပ်သည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။

(3) မူလမှားစီးစားပြုလုပ်သည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။ အမည်စုစုပေါင်းစုစုပေါင်းပြုလုပ်ကြသည်။
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သေတြောင်းသော ကြည့်စဉ်ကို သေချင်းစွာ ရှာဖွေရာတွင် ရှိသူများ၊ သောက်ချက်ရှိသူများနှင့် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ချိုးမတ်သော ကိုယ်စားလှယ်များ သေချင်းစွာ ရှာဖွေရာတွင် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

လူများအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရာတွင် သေချင်းစွာ ရှာဖွေရာတွင် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

လူများအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

ကျင်းပသော အချက်များအတွက် သေချင်းစွာ ဖော်ပြရန် နိုင်ပြီး လိုအပ်သည်။

_Translated into English by Thakhin Hla Kun_

Thakhin Aung San, one of the top leaders of the Myanmar's most influential nationalist party during the pre-war period, explained the policies of the party combining his own views in it.

The period was significant because it was then the masses of the nation were strenuously engaged in the independence struggle.

**The author’s life sketch**

Thakhin Aung San was born on February 13, 1915, to Advocate U Phar and Daw Suu at the town of Natmauk. Aung San's grand father was U Min Yaung who rose against the invading British forces. U Min Yaung was headman of the Myo Lu Lin Village near Natmauk when the British took away Myanmar's last King in captivity. He was a famous revolutionary leader.

Aung San was engaged in politics for national freedom since his first days at the university. He became widely known from the beginning of the 1936 University Students' Strike. He also acted as the editor of the Student Union's organ, the Oway Magazine. He participated in establishing the All-Burma Students Union as a frontline leader. Then he became the general secretary of the Dobama Asi-ayone, the most popular nationalist organization.

He became a top leader in the 1938 (1300 BE) national front called Bama Htwetyat Gaing (Myanmar's Political Way-Out Front), working as member of the leading body. In 1940, he led the 5-member delegation sent to the supreme assembly of the Indian National Congress, held at Ramgarh. Since then he became a close colleague of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru.
In May 1938, an arrest warrant was issued by the British authorities for his anti-war speeches. A prize of five kyats was declared for his arrest. Next month he slipped out of the country aiming to reach the Chinese communist leaders. But he became stranded at the Chinese port City of Amoy which had already fallen into the Japanese invaders’ hands. There he got contact with the Japanese and continued to work for his nation’s freedom.

During the whole period of Japanese occupation Aung San built up the national army. Then he became one of the anti-Japanese resistance leaders. After driving out the Japanese occupation forces, he led the political united front, the Anti-Fascist People’s Freedom League (the AFPFL). While striving for the national independence under the slogan “Freedom Within One Year” he fell victim to the assassination by the group of murderers headed by ‘Galon’ U Saw on 18 July, 1947.

The facts of the article in brief

The subject of World War and Burma is written at the urging of a friend. As world war has broken out at the present time the belligerent countries have declared their war aims. Such declarations are meant to win over the world people to their side. But when analyzed, the main reason which prompted the war, it is found that the reason is capitalism that wants exploitation of one man by another, of one social class by another class and of one country by another country. The main reason for Japanese invasion of China is that the Japanese feared domination by the British, the French and the Americans in China. That is why the Japanese launched pre-emptive strike. The war between Germany on the one side and Britain and France on the other is also war between capitalists, they have the same war aims. So they have become enemies. Civil war in Finland also is a battle between capitalists and poor people. The culprit is capitalism that takes profits as their main objective.

As for us we do not want imperialism that is making Burma its subject, just as we do not want the wars between capitalists. We have to root out this capitalist imperialism
with the combined strength of world people.

The role of Burmese political sections becomes important as the war has progressed. Seeing this role the Dobama Asi-ayone has founded the Burma Freedom Bloc. The meeting of the Dobama Asiayone Central Committee issued a statement that declares the present war broke out because of imperialism. The statement pointed out the neglect of freedom and justice for the colonies. It pointed out, for instance, the easy German take-over of the fascist Poland which does not get popular support. It also pointed out the British neglect of the independence demands made by Burma and India. The French government's suppression of Communist forces in its country is also cited.

On the other side, the Soviet Union have come up as the beacon of workers, peasants and poor people of the world, in view of her deeds of granting independence to her subject nations since after the 1917 revolution. Also the assistance being given to the Chinese and Spanish freedom movements as well as the actions for freedom of Polish peasantry makes her such a beacon. She had to make a pact of non-aggression with Germany as negotiations with Britain and France for a treaty to repel the Nazi enemy has failed. All these acts support the fact she has been recognized as the header of the world people.

The Dobama Asiayone has viewed that the causes of world wars are the capitalist system. It is of the view that it does not want any policies that harm the freedom of countries in the world. It refuses military help to other countries so long as our own independence is denied. It declares mutual assistance with all countries.

The Dobama Asiayone will struggle for self-rule after abolishing the “91 department regime” that is supporting imperialism in Burma. In this struggle co-operation would be built up with the people and political sections that hold common objectives.

Holding the above-mentioned views the All-Burma Dobama committee have made alliance with the Sinyetha Wunthanu, Ngar Pwint Saing Wunthanu parties to establish the Burma Freedom Bloc. To make this Bloc gain strength it is necessary to
strengthen the spirit for freedom, to make good leaders appear on the scene and to have a strong fund. For these purposes we need to increase the Dobama members. We need to build up Bamah Letyone volunteer corps and increase their training. Political classes shall have to be opened, build up political funds and also launch propaganda abroad.

The present time is one when priority should be given more to work than to talking. Great endeavour by the whole people is especially needed. The demand for Burma's freedom is being raised and this fact shall be made known as wide as possible in own country and abroad. Political unity of class organizations in the country must be built up. Strong forces for the independence struggle will have to be built up on the basis of upheavals of workers and peasants. In waging independence struggle we shall have to use the best methods suitable to our country, after studying the revolutionary methods and tactics used across the world. If we follow this line of action consistently Burma will surely attain freedom one day.

Therefore the main tasks to be carried out include world-wide propaganda campaign to do with the help of students and youth; establishment of volunteer corps such as Bamah Letyone volunteers; enrolment campaign for Dobama Asiayone membership, convening of an all-Burma political meeting with the masses of people taking part; mobilization of the whole masses of people's unity without any sectarian spirit; awakening of the consciousness that the independence is for all people including national races, lower strata people as well as servicemen. Propaganda campaign must be launched for freedom, military duty and abolition of arms act through the minor discontent boiling in the country these days.

Furthermore, a political line of action that meets the interests of various social classes will have to be adopted. Method of struggle will be sought for by leaders collectively. Rules for Independence Fund collection is also to be laid down. Success cannot be achieved only through speeches and propaganda. Independence movement cannot be carried out by individualism. Success will come only through strenuous effort, not by chasing after government positions.
Capitalism has a way of building roads and bridges in the colonies and also producing intelligentsia and intellectuals for their own benefits. If looked at from one side such actions bring about solidarity and wide knowledge among people that can become good supports in making revolution against capitalism. What we must have special care is the imperialist tactics to create divisions between nations and social classes. Moreover, we must avoid such habits as impetuosity in the revolution, the untimely failure and surrender even before the war has started. Very strong endeavours are needed for the freedom to be achieved.

Analysis

This article entitled “World War and Burma” describes the action programme for Burma's independence in relation to the world situation prevailing at the start of second world war. In one way this is the statement of views on world affairs and policies to be followed for Burmese affairs. The author was a politician struggling for the nation's independence. He was also the General Secretary of the Dobama Asiayone (The most popular nationalist party). Therefore he presented his visions in connection with the ideology and policies of the Dobama Asiayone.

At that time the especially popular ideology was socialism or leftism. The article describes the various steps of the program adopted by the Dobama Asiayone. This presentation heightened the entire people’s political consciousness and revolutionary will. Special mention must be made that the article pointed out the real reasons underlying the outbreak of world war was capitalism and imperialism. With this focusing the article urged the overthrow of British imperialism that had enslaved Burma.

For this reason this article has been a political article that came out appropriately in the then obtaining situation. The article also can serve the further study of the political program and policy of the Dobama Asi-ayone from the historical stand point.
6. Joanne Dunne, Synopsis of the Article: World War and Burma by Aung San 1940

This article was written by Aung San in 1940, prior to the occupation of Burma by Japanese forces. However, due to the nature of its contents, and earlier anti-imperialist speeches given by Aung San, shortly after it was written, the British authorities issued a warrant for the arrests of Aung San and other nationalist party members, including Ba Maw. However Aung San received a well-timed warning and escaped Burma for Japan before he was imprisoned. The main points of this article had been delivered in talks and speeches given by Aung San on several occasions, including (see AS p41 -53)

In this paper I will endeavour to give a summary of the main points of the article and then put them in context with the political and historical movements of the period. In particular I will focus on the role of Aung San himself, and the ways in which he became such an important person in the fight for Burmese independence, together with the politics of the period and their particular relevance to the rest of the world during the crucial period.

Brief Summery of Article

After reading through the article several times, I think that the main point which stands out against all the others is Aung San’s belief in fighting for Burmese independence against British Imperialism. In the first two paragraphs he declares that all wars are down to one thing: Capitalism. Or, as he perceives
it, the *blood sucking attitude of one person to another, one class to another – one country to another*. This is the one true cause of all wars in the world. He goes on to explain that this kind of imperialist - capitalist exploitation is the reason why Burma has been enslaved for so long, and he wants all Burmese citizens to join with other world forces (anti-imperialist) to crush capitalist forces. He disputes the allies’ claim that they are fighting for justice, and he argues that they are using this so that they can gain support from other (imperialist) powerful nations.

At the recent Dobama-Asi-ayone meeting in Mandalay he explains that there were several resolutions passed, including the disagreement that the present war against Germany was to protect smaller countries against larger aggressors, and he uses specific examples of imperialist propaganda to justify this: Poland and her feudalist capitalist fascist government; Burma and India’s demand for independence, and the British Government’s failure to respond to their requests; The French Government’s lack of tolerance with the French Communist Party; and the Finnish civil war.

From this point Aung San then commends the Soviet Union as a shining example of world humanitarianism and fairness. Again he gives examples of this in juxtaposition with other world (imperialistic) powers. At this point the role of socialism becomes clearer; as in 1917, as soon as the Soviet Union became socialist, she granted independence to all her former colonies, has given help to China, Spain etc, has signed a non-aggression pact with the
German government, granted freedom to the peasants of Poland and signed a mutual-aid pact with the Finnish Government. This is in stark contrast to Capitalist regimes.

He sees Burmese independence and anti-imperialism as one and the same, and refuses to help any country in the war effort until Burma is granted her freedom to pursue her own anti-imperial form of self-government. However, as far as possible he wants to maintain friendly relations with all countries, but especially the countries of the East.

From this point the article turns to more specific Burmese political affairs. He begins by condemning the present regime in Burma for being too pro-British, and hence pro-capitalist. His vision to create a political party that is willing to fight all forms of Imperialism, and calls for any parties who share this purpose to join forces and fight for their independence. He wants to achieve his vision by strengthening the Burma Freedom Bloc and arousing political consciousness within all political parties and also within society as a whole so that they realise the value of freedom. However, he recognises that this needs to be done in systematic stages, and that political unity is of the utmost importance. Here he mentions the large section of Ethnic minority peoples within Burma, and extends his vision of unity to these as well. His vision is of a totally united country which is able to stand up and fight against imperialism to gain their freedom. His strategy for achieving unity and political awareness include: moves to recruit more Dobama Asi-ayone members; to establish a Bama
Letyone Tat (a private army); to organise classes and lectures to promote political awareness; to collect more funds to support this; and to propagate aims both within Burma as well as overseas.

He briefly acknowledges some of the technological advancements that the British have brought to Burma, but emphasises that the cost in human oppression is far worse. Again, his stress is on the importance of unity among peoples and government against all forces of the evil of imperialism.
7. Susanne Prager Nyein, An Essay on Aung San’s “World War and Burma”

I. Introductory Remarks

Aung San’s treatise on “World War and Burma”, published in April 1940 by Nagani with a circulation of 4000 copies, can be regarded as a summary of the manifestos and policy statements, which he had authored in the previous months as general secretary of the Dobama Asiayone and of the Freedom Bloc. The article reflects the mainstream position within the nationalist movement towards the Second World War, which was the categorical refusal to support the British and their “imperialist” interests. Above all, the pamphlet is a barely disguised call for the involvement and preparation of the people of Burma for an impending (armed) fight for independence.

The date and time of the publication is important and worth mentioning, since it marks the transition of Aung San’s nationalist activities from within the legal, constitutional frame to an armed struggle. The article was published just a month before Governor Dorman Smith enacted the emergency law, “Defence of Burma Act”, which extended his power to take action against the opposition and persons who were suspect of agitating against the British (war-) interests. Many Thakins, members of the Dobama Asiayone, and other nationalists belonging to the Freedom Bloc were arrested in the same month, and eventually on June 5th, 1940 a warrant of arrest was issued for Aung San for delivering a “seditious speech” in Henzada. Aung San went underground and left the country in August in a clandestine operation to seek support for an armed struggle from the Japanese.

II. The Pamphlet

Aung San’s “World War and Burma” is roughly arranged into two parts: he first describes the world situation and the cause and background of the war and then links it to Burma’s affairs, to finally deduce and substantiate the future strategy of the Dobama Asiayone and the Freedom Bloc. Given the manifesto-like language, the publication is targeted mainly at fellow nationalists and party members.

At first sight, the “World War and Burma” seems to be another nationalist reading
written in the Marxist-revolutionary jargon, prevalent and popular in the circles of the young Burmese nationalists at the end of the 1930s. Due to the leftist rhetoric and many almost modular Marxist verbalizations such as “imperialism enslaved our people”, or “wars are inevitable as long as we tolerate the horrible existence of capitalism”, Burma seems to be interchangeable with any other colonized country. A contemporary reader might even be tempted to scan the publication rather cursorily since it does not promise much new historical finding. Only at second sight, when one reads thoroughly and unperturbed by the ideological formulas, the article opens up more detailed information and insight into the specific situation in Burma, particularly the mood and actual state of the Burmese nationalist movement in the face of World War II.

This does not mean that the Marxist-leftist rhetoric was just an idle veneer for Aung San or his comrades. The powerful ideology and language of Marxism certainly provided them the possibility to transcend the local situation and perceive their movement and interests in a transnational context. Clive Christie put it succinctly when he described, that “the Marxist ideological viewpoint on revolution, nationalism, and socialism constituted the most important unifying viewpoint that linked the anti-colonial movements of the region between 1919 and 1980.”¹ We can even add that the Marxist worldview not only linked nationalist movements in the region but also constructed comparability with leftist revolutionary and liberation movements in Europe and the world and thus was the first modern political ideology able to create an empowering, virtual community of interest on a global scale.

Accordingly, when Aung San explained the current world situation, he portrayed it as a struggle of two opposing economic-political systems: capitalism/imperialism versus socialism/communism. Thus, the real reason for the war was perceived as defence of capitalist interests and its off-shoot imperialism and not - as pretended by the French and British governments- of democracy and freedom, particularly since these governments denied the same rights to the colonies and suppressed the communist opposition in their own countries. Oblivious of Stalin’s tyrannical regime at that point of time, Aung San portrayed the Soviet Union as the only country that had guaranteed its colonies freedom, supported liberation movements, liberated the oppressed classes,

and was working towards world peace.¹ Due to the “real” ideological and economic reasons of the current war, Aung San declared the position of the Dobama Asiayone as one of total repudiation: “Until our country regains her independence, we are not going to consider ‘war support’ for any other country”. Moreover, he demanded a consolidated effort of the proletarian of the world and the colonized countries to take up initiative and end this imperialists’ war.

In the second part of the pamphlet, Aung San dealt with the situation in Burma and the implication of the war for the independence movement. It becomes clear that it was about translating theory into practice, or going beyond theorizing the freedom struggle by concrete plans and actions. Rather generally, he defined the ultimate goal of the Dobama Asiayone and the newly created alliance of nationalist parties, the Freedom Bloc, as the destruction of imperialism and the British administration and setting up of the own people’s government in Burma.

When he specified the different steps to reach the goal he actually reiterated the Dobama Asiayone and Freedom Bloc party platforms, which he had both authored. Thus, the main issues were the creation of national unity and the mobilization of the population, by which he meant to inform the people and get them involved in the movement by all kinds of measures, publications, lectures, demonstrations and action days etc. Finally, he made unmistakably clear that more voluntary fighting corps like the Bama Letyone Tat had to be formed and that contacts had to be established with China, India, and Great Britain.

That Aung San had still no clear-cut plan, how to translate his ideas into reality, is obvious when he at one point rather opaquely mentioned that the “method” to choose in the final stage of their struggle would be “the best and most suitable in the world’s independence movements”. Moreover, at the same time he expressed doubts if independence could be reached directly in the first place, but reassured his readers (and probably himself) that in any case, Burma would get a better administrative system.

Closer to the end of the pamphlet, Aung San returned to the Marxist-leftist analysis of the capitalist-imperialist system at work in Burma. He assessed that this system would inevitably, like the Buddhist karmatic “law of impermanence”, lead to its

¹ Stalin’s non-aggression treaty with Germany, Molotov-Ribbentrop-Pact, appeared as political “peacefulness.” Needlessly to say that the secret military alliance protocol, which divided Poland, Finland and other East-European countries into spheres of interest between Germany and the Soviet Union, was not known at that point of time.
own downfall and revolution. “Capitalism has to create workers. Imperialism has to create an educated class to use as the tools in their bureaucratic machinery for their conquered people. But, these workers and educated people, when they achieve some enlightenment, revolt against their creators and the system”.

Surprisingly, and in spite of the formulaic-revolutionary language, we encounter at this point of the publication a most unexpected thought of Aung San, alluding to the Janus-faced experience of colonialism as modernizing force. Aung San conceded that the capitalist-imperialist system, while it has “exploited and oppressed us inhumanly”, has also brought some modern developments to Burma, better transportation and communication systems, and helped the nationalist movement to unify the country. With his typical pragmatism indicative for his undogmatic attitude in ideological matters, he concluded that they have to consider the pro and cons of imperialism and act accordingly, “when time comes”.

In parts, “World War and Burma” sounds redundant and sometimes like a quickly sketched speech. Especially, when Aung San repeatedly made the point that politics requires the contribution and participation of all people, that freedom and independence does not come effortlessly to the people, but means duty and sacrifice, and something one has to fight for. Then again, rhetorically the repetitions made sense. They could evoke the feeling of time pressure and urgency. Moreover, the content appealed to Burmese concepts of rebellion and sacrifice.⁠¹ After all, it was his main intention to mobilize fellow nationalists in the independence struggle and to convince them to join the Dobama Asiayone and its militant arm, Bama Letyone Tat.

The Marxist outlook and language in “World War and Burma” provided Aung San with a powerful tool to express revolutionary ardour and to mobilize and energize fellow-nationalists. Within this modern-ideological framework, he could instil the idea of an impending revolution against British colonial rule. “Well, dear comrades, let us not waste our time and let us do all we can with all our means and might. Our revolution shall succeed.”

---

¹ To gain and consolidate political power by force as well as to be able to make sacrifices were traditional but still vital concepts of Aung San’s leadership within the nationalist movement. See Susanne Prager, Nationalismus als Kulturelle Reproduktion. Aung San und die Entstehung des Post-kolonialen Birma. Ph.D.-thesis, Universität Heidelberg 1998, p. 279.
II. Historical Background and Setting

Given the increasingly popular Marxist revolutionary discourse, that backed anti-colonial movements in the region at the end of the 1930s, as well as the tense world political situation before the outbreak of World War II in Europe, the young Burmese nationalists were in high spirits. They obviously felt empowered and anticipated a major change of the political scene in Burma caused by the events in Europe. Aung San had carefully followed the political developments and Hitler’s diplomatic manoeuvres. Long before he wrote the article “World War and Burma”, he had called the Burmese in a speech during the general peasant and workers-strike in January 1939, not to support the British in the pending “capitalist-imperialist war”.¹ He and his political comrades believed that a war of the “capitalists” and “imperialists” would weaken the position of the great colonial powers and ultimately benefit the colonized countries. Thus, the prospect of war in Europe was accompanied by great hopes and even millenarian expectations within the population, fostering the idea of an impending New Era and coming just ruler.² When eventually war broke out in September 1939, the nationalist movement gained momentum and Aung San jumped into bustling activities.

As General Secretary of the Thakin Party, Dobama Asiayone, he initiated and was instrumental in forming the Freedom Bloc (in Burmese called Htwet Yat Gaing) in October 1939, an alliance between different nationalist groups and parties, mainly the Dobama Asiayone and Ba Maw’s Sinyetha Party. To be able to take advantage of the weakened position of Great Britain in face of the war, he intended to bundle all nationalist forces across party lines and ideological differences and force the British colonial administration to make major political concessions, most importantly the recognition of Burma’s right for independence.³ The Freedom Bloc organized anti-war campaigns to inform the Burmese population that the British had “failed to apply principles of democratic freedom in our country though they professed such principles in the world outside for which they said they were fighting the war”.⁴

³ See U Nu, Saturday’s Son. New Haven 1975, p. 100.
Moreover, parallel to the political campaigns at the end of 1939 he formed together with Thakins Ba Swe, Hla Pe, Kyaw Nyein, Mya, and Nu the underground organization, *People’s Revolutionary Party*, PRP. Therefore, when he was writing “World War and Burma” he had already started to prepare for clandestine operations and an armed struggle. This marked, however, not a major shift in his nationalistic approach, for he had never ruled out the use of militant methods in the independence struggle or felt confined to any special method or ideology. Even as student, he had formed a volunteer student corps that practiced military exercises and had later invested some time in organizing the *Bama Letyon Tat*, a volunteer army of the *Dobama Asiayone*.\(^1\) Now, he and his Thakin-colleagues wanted to use the PRP to recruit and train young students and nationalists for multiple underground activities and guerrilla warfare, which should ultimately paralyze the British administration.\(^2\) Their major obstacle, however, was the lack of weapons.

The activities and events in the following months until Aung San’s departure, which eventually led to his cooperation with the Japanese, are historiographically not easy to reconstruct and some have to remain ambiguous and nebulous. It seems that the PRP first tried to get weapons from the Communist Chinese, but a trip of Thakin Nu to Chunking in December 1939 in this matter turned out to be fruitless. In March 1940, Aung San and some colleagues travelled to India to attend the Ramgarh session of the Indian National Congress and visited different cities in India. Ostensibly the trip was planned to discuss the new Manifesto of the Dobama Asiayone with the Indian leading nationalists and to pursue a better coordination of both movements in the anti-imperialist struggle, but presumably the main reason was “to get support”.\(^3\)

Yet, it is improbably that Aung San would have been so foolhardy as to have expected support for an armed struggle from Gandhi and Nehru. Both were known for opposing any violence in the anti-colonial struggle and had taken a principal stance in the war issue. They did not want to take advantage of the Britain’s distress in face of the war, the more so since they had identified Germany and Japan as the bigger enemies.\(^4\)

---

Therefore, it is more than likely that Aung San from the start was only interested in establishing contact with Subhas Chandra Bose, whose radical and militant approach was more corresponding with his own ideas. And indeed, he met Bose a few times during his stay in Ramgarh allegedly to discuss a further cooperation.¹ Years later he stressed that Bose epitomized the image of a real revolutionary, who “continually thinks about the implementation of revolution and is not consumed by debates about western political ideologies, communism, socialism, or fascism”.²

When Aung San returned to Burma, he still had no prospects to get arms. But he was more than ever determined to use the tense and unstable war situation to the advantage of the independence movement and to take any action and opportunity to weaken the British colonial system considerably. Against this background, we have to approach “World War and Burma”, which was published shortly after his return from India and reflected his intention as general secretary of the Dobama Asiayone to mobilize the people and take the independence movement one-step further into militancy.

Eventually, Aung San accepted help from Japan a few months after Nagani published “World War and Burma.” Obviously, he had used the Marxist discourse as a perfect revolutionary tool but had not fully embraced the ideological doctrine. Japan was the first and only country that promised concrete support for an armed struggle. Thus, any possible objections against cooperation with “imperialist” Japan could be brushed off in face of the prospect of an armed struggle against the British and regaining independence. After all, this was what he had aimed for in the first place, when he wrote “World War and Burma”.

² Aung San, Speech of the Minister of War, Bogyoke Aung San, 23.1.44) In. Mya Daung Nyo, 30 Comrades: p.16-17. The emergency law issued by Governor Dorman Smith in Burma in May 1940 foiled any further meeting or contact between Bose and Aung San. But a few years later they met each other again in Burma, both as leader of an “own”, national army and as allies of the Japanese.
8. Joanne Dunne, Remarks on Aung San, World War and Burma

‘Bogyoke’ (great general), Aung San was one of the most important figures in Burmese history, and is often referred to as the ‘architect of Burmese freedom’. He is such a well-known figure both within Burma, and also in the rest of the world that a detailed biography is hardly necessary for the context of this paper. However, I think that to help contextualise the article, and to gain insight into his political thoughts, and beliefs set against the background of world events around 1940, a brief account of his life is necessary. Aung San lived in a period of intense political upheaval. The 1930s were the formative years of Burmese politics; a decade dominated by extremist and militant agendas. The debates of the Student’s Union, the underground movements of the young nationalist politicians, the rise of anti-colonialist feelings, ideological debates of the far right and far left and mass demonstrations all took their toll on Burmese affairs.

Under the 1935 constitution, Burma had what appeared to be a government. This was an add-on to the 1935 India Act, as part of which Burma had been separated from India, while been given as much home rule as an Indian Province. It had a House of Representatives with a 113 seats, including 12 given to ethnic Karen constituencies and 11 for business groups. There was also a 36 member senate, designed as a conservative check, limited (through high income eligibility rules) to businessmen, professionals and landowners. They also had a cabinet, headed by a prime minister who was responsible for this new parliament. However, the real power still lay in the hands of the British governor and officialdom, with the Burmese political parties holding the middle ground. Besides, Burmese politics was never a straightforward affair and was rife with inter-party arguments and disagreements. In the five years from the time that Burma was separated from India until the Japanese occupation, the country had four ministers. From 1937 to 1939, Dr Baw Maw and his Sinyetha party, which had only 16 members in the House of Representatives. The next two ministers were: 1939 – 1941 U Pu, and from1941 – 1942 U Saw. U Saw, was, prior to his election, looked upon as an extreme nationalist with pro-Japanese leanings. And no well-defined two party system ever developed in Burma, which added to the frequency with which ministries changed and divided. (1). The ministry of Sir Paw Tun was a final attempt at administrative rule, however Japanese occupation intervened, and events took a complete
Aung San

From an early age Aung San displayed a tenacity and honesty that was to separate him from the long list of Burmese politicians. For example, in her book *Freedom from Fear*, his daughter describes how at the age of thirteen he went on hunger strike so that his mother would allow him to leave home and to attend the National School at Yenangyaung. At the National School he began to take an interest in the speeches of political personalities and to participate in debates. In 1932 he went Rangoon University. During his first year he was involved in a debate led by his brother which proposed that monks stay clear of politics. During his speech his awkward use of English, mixed with his dry manner of delivery heralded cat-calls and abuse from the audience. However, this did not deter Aung san, and he continued to deliver speeches and give talks albeit to the mockery of the audience. His resolve and determination to face obstacles and challenge pre-conceived doctrines was to have a huge impact on the course of politics in the next decade.

A year before Aung San joined the University was the year of the Hsaya San uprising. Saya San had been appointed by the U Soe Thein faction of the GCBA to investigate grievances of the villagers of the Tharrawaddy district concerning taxes, debt and access to forest land. Saya San left the GCBA in 1928 to form a resistance to taxation, but this soon broadened into a nationalist movement which aimed at overthrowing British power. In 1930, Saya San and his ‘Garuda Army’ organised a nationalist rebellion which spread through most of lower Burma. During 1931 the British government used military force to suppress the peasant army, which claimed the lives of over three thousand Burmese. Saya San was captured and executed in November 1931. The British played down the rebellion, claiming that Saya San was a superstitious extremist who wanted to become king. But among the Burmese, the rebellion aroused great sympathy and stirred the nationalist spirit. Several young leaders entered politics, possibly motivated by the spirit of martyrdom displayed by the executed rebel leaders. Among this new group of nationalist leaders were Dr Ba Maw, U Kyaw Myint, and U Saw.
From 1935 Aung San's involvement in student politics grew. By this time he had begun working with influential figures such as U Nu, Hla Pe, Thein Pe and Kyaw Nyein. The spirit of Nationalism in Burma was growing, and by 1936 the young nationalists had entered all of the major posts in the Student’s Union (3). Aung san was elected to the executive committee, and also became editor of the union magazine. Nu was one of the leaders of the All-Burma Youth League, which had been founded by Thakin Ba Thaung and Thakin Lay Maung, who were also the founders of the Dobama Asi-Ayone (we Burman Association). Founded in 1931, the Dobama Asi-Ayone became popular throughout Burma, particularly with young nationalist youths. Members of the organisation addressed each other using the title Thakin (master), a term that the British had insisted the Burmese use when addressing them. By using this pre-fix the young thakins were expressing their will be masters of their own, and not subjugated by the British hierarchy.

By 1938 Aung San was one of the leading figures in student politics, and as a president of the ABSU his delivery speech at the second conference at Bassein in which he proclaims his intentions to help Burma become independent:

*If Burma’s education is to be effective it must be thoroughly overhauled and revolutionised. But this is not possible until freedom is won. It is therefore the duty of the students and the youths of Burma to strive to reach the day when they will enjoy the best education possible. Their tasks as the future citizens of Burma are two fold. Firstly they should prepare themselves mentally and physically for the struggle for freedom and secondly, they should lighten the burden of imperialist education on their shoulders by agitating against it (India office records L/R/5/207 Burma Press Abstract no 17 1938)*

In 1939, Aung San left university to become a full time member of the Dobama Asi-Ayon. Although popular among the young nationalists, the association was not universally accepted, and many of the older generation considered them arrogant and above themselves. Even within the organisation itself internal differences caused rifts and arguments. The faction split in two, and Aung San joined the majority faction led by Thakin Kodaw Hmaing. The other, with seemingly more right-wing leanings (4) was lead by Tun Ok and the Dobama’s other co-founder, Ba Sein. Both broke away in 1938. Among their followers
was a then little known postal clerk, Shu Maung. Later known as Ne Win.

**World War and Burma: In Retrospect:**

On September 1st 1939, fifty-six Wehrmacht divisions, led by Colonel Generals Feder von Bock and Gerd von Rundstedt, crossed the border into Poland, and the British Empire declared war on Germany. For a while Burma remained comfortably far away from the war, but many politicians saw the war as an opportunity. Many of the Thakin side leaned to the left and saw fascism as a threat, but many saw it as an opportunity as well, as:

‘Colonialism’s difficulty is Freedom’s opportunity’. Dr Ba Maw helped to form the ‘Freedom Bloc’, an alliance of Ba Maw’s Sinyetha Party, and the Dobama Asi-ayone, the students and some individual politicians. Aung San was the general secretary. The message of the Freedom Bloc to the nation was that the people should only support the war effort, if they were promised independence at the end of the war; if the British government refused, the people should fervently oppose the war. There were differences of opinion about how to do this. Some like Ba Maw wanted to seek an alliance with the Japanese. Others wanted to join forces with the Chinese, this faction included the future prime minister U Nu. The message of the Freedom Bloc was clear: Burma wanted her independence, and would go to any lengths to achieve it. The freedom Bloc kept up pressure on the British authorities with a series of mass independence demonstrations and rallies across the country. The authorities responded by jailing many of the nationalist leaders, including Ba Maw. With a warrant out for his arrest, in of August 1940, Aung San smuggled himself aboard a ship bound for Amoy. Subsequent arrangements were made to smuggle other nationalist leaders out of Burma to Japan for military training. They later became known as the ‘Thirty Comrades’.

For a whole generation of Burmese, the Second World War was without a doubt a major determining political experience. Burma was devastated by the armies of two colonial powers, as they trampled through her towns and countryside, destroying property and ruining infrastructures. What the invading Japanese army did not destroy, retreating British soldiers burnt down in a calculated ‘scorched earth’ policy. Three years later the pattern was repeated in reverse as the British army re-entered Burma. But it was not only the Japanese and British who occupied Burma; nationalist Chinese armies continued operations in the north-east frontier area, and the ethnic Kachin suffered horrendously as a result. As
fighting swept across Burma, the years 1940 – 1949 and the revolutionary traditions that developed as a result fuelled almost 60 years of insurgency and unrest that continue to this day.

In his book *World War and Burma*, Aung San expresses his great desire for Burmese independence, and for him and his comrades, the war marked the start of a major and ultimately successful uprising for national independence. However, when the *Thirty Comrades* and the Burmese Independence Army (BIA) fought on the Japanese side it was with the belief that Burma’s independence would be their prize. But their choice to side with the Japanese had other more long term consequences, both regarding their place in world politics, and (possibly more seriously) politics at home. Unfortunately the position of Burma under the Japanese was one of disillusionment and fear. The hope that they would be ‘free’ under their fellow Asians was soon shattered, and they found that they suffered more under the Nippon army than they did under the British.

In her book *Not out of Hate*, Mye Mye Lay describes the fear and hatred that many Burmese had of the Japanese, and also the fear and distrust that many people felt against the *Thakins* who they perceived had brought the Japanese into Burma. Nevertheless, once the truth of the situation became clear, another opposition movement was launched by the BIA. Then with the Allied forces already pushing back Japanese troops, a new incentive was launched, this time against the Japanese rulers. This became an important factor for the allies’ victory in Burma. With the help of the Burma National Army (re-named BNA), the allied forces took back control of Burma, and thus helped speed up the conclusion of the war.

In the beginning Aung San had mixed feelings about involvement with the Japanese, but was willing to use any means to expel the British from Burma. As he wrote some years later:

“In this plan I also visualised the possibility of a Jap invasion of Burma – but here I had no clear vision (all of us at that time had no clear view in that respect though some might now try to show themselves, after all the events, to have been wiser than others)” (5).
He was aware of the terror and ravages that Japanese fascism had brought to China, and the kind of ‘independent’ states that they had set up in Manchuria and Korea, but when the situation reached crisis point he was left with no choice. The British were unwilling to take the Burmese position seriously, and felt that they were simply subjects of the British Empire, and as such had no right to their own opinion. One incident that conveys both the extent of nationalist feeling in Burma, and also the reluctance with which the British were willing to acknowledge the situation, was a resolution passed during U Saw’s regime by the House of Representatives. Stating that it: “regrets that the British government have made Burma a participant in the war between Great Britain and Germany”. U Saw went to London in 1941 to demand that the third clause of the Atlantic Charter (right of self-determination of nations) be applied to Burma. A few weeks later Prime Minister Churchill replied that the charter did not apply to nations in which the people owe allegiance to the crown. Consequently, Aung San’s reservations were put to the side, and his colleague, Ba Maw was convinced that an armed revolution with Japanese military was the best approach. In his memoir Ba Maw said:

My mind was restless the whole of that night. For the first time since the outbreak of the war I saw the future a little less mistily…I suddenly became convinced that the war would go on and, before it ended, Japan would be in it. In that event, in that event it would be very much in her interest to start an uprising in Burma and the other British colonies in the East. Our revolution could be accomplished that way. I at once decided to work for such an understanding with the Japanese (Ba Maw Breakthrough in Burma)

Besides, the young nationalists had to respect a fellow Asian race whose achievements they admired. During the 1904 Russia Japanese war, Japan was able to defeat the powerful Russians, and for the people of Asia her victory had a great significance. Japan, an Asiatic power, had proved that European armies and navies were not invincible. And, as Aung San said on several occasions “we stand for friendly and business-like relations with any foreign nation, especially with those in out neighbourhood and the far east”.
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Aung San accepted any idea or method which might help him to achieve independence. His political activities and his involvement in different groups were motivated solely by this desire. In addition to his involvement with the DAA and the Freedom Bloc he was also active within Burma Communist Party and the Burma Revolutionary Party, which was a secret branch of the DAA organised by Thakin Mya (6). Although, according to his daughter, in her book *Freedom from Fear* “Aung San was not fanatical in his belief in communism or any other rigid ideology. He found much to attract him in the broad range of socialist theories, but his real quest was always for ideas and tactics that would bring freedom and unity to his country. Burma’s place in the world and her reactions to world political movements of the time cannot be overlooked. Burma stood in a unique position, in that unlike India, she had only been a part of the British Empire for some 60 years, and had never fully accepted the authority of colonial rule. However, prior to the British invasion, the authoritarian rule of the Burmese monarchy meant that the country had little experience of democratic systems. Hence, the appeal that socialism presented to the nationalists.

The founders of the Dobama movement were initially awakened through Marx’s explanations of imperialism and colonialism, which led in the late 1930s to a growing interest in socialism and a broader international outlook. Aung San stresses the need for a united Burma, and in the last few years before the war, the Thakins searched for ideas and tactics which would help them inspire the nation, and win their independence from Britain. This was not an easy task, in particular because Burma was not just a nation of Burmans, but also of other diverse ethnic nationals, including Shans, Chins, Kachins, Karens, Mons and other indigenous people. And as Aung San acknowledges in his speech to encourage nationalist ideas; to forget partisan spirit; to achieve comradeship among...all classes of people regardless if they are Chin, Karen...etc...most important of all is to let the native people know that without distinction or discrimination that freedom is for them.... He stresses the importance of all Burmese working together to form a united front against the British.

And as colonial rulers the British had discouraged the development of anything like a ‘nationalist’ culture, which would have been contrary to their economic and political
interests, the ethnic nationals were in many ways sceptical of any form of nationalist movements. During the period of British rule in Burma, they employed a policy of ‘Divide and Rule’. Throughout the era of colonial rule the British persisted in the preferment of recruits from the ethnic minorities into the armed forces. Local Karen troops played a vital role in the suppression of lower Burma in 1886, and again in the Saya San rebellion. In 1939 there were only 472 Burmans in the British army, compared with 1448 Karens, 886 Chins and 881 Kachins (18). The British policy of ‘divide and rule’, also meant that the highland (non-Burman) areas where administered separately from Burma proper, and the Burmese were not permitted to extend any common ties of culture among all the people of the hill areas. This policy further exasperated already existent tension between the majority Burman and the ethnic people. Consequently, when following independence, armed insurrections broke out with the minorities, writers and missionaries were bitterly accused by the U Nu government of having deliberately sown the seeds of religious and racial conflict (19).

Accordingly, we can see that politics was not an easy task for the young nationalists, but under the leadership of Aung San there was some hope of the country uniting under a common cause and with concise objectives.

Aung San was well aware that greater unity was needed not only among the ethnic nationals, but also within the political parties. Even the DAA, as we have seen, was divided into two factions. The factions were further sub-divided into at least four different groups by ideology: Marxist intellectuals; those who sought to reconcile Marxism with Buddhism; some ex-policemen and monks who were unsure of ideology, but active in fighting; political opportunists, who according to U Tun Pe ‘those who knew which side their bread was buttered’ (6). The thakins of this period had time, were well-read and plenty of heated arguments, but their organisation was erratic, and their ideology patchy. There were many doctrinal disputes and differences, even among the extreme Marxists. For example, the Burma Revolutionary Party, although calling itself ‘Socialist’ included members who preferred the ‘Marxist’ or ‘Communist’ label and others who refused any designation except ‘Nationalist’. Thein Pe observed that, ‘ideological anarchy permeates party ranks, as men of different shades and creeds swell them’ (7). In January 1939, the All Burma Peasants Organisation was formed, which laid the groundwork for the All Burma Trade Union
Congress (ABTUC). The declared aim of both organisations, again reflecting the impact of Marxism, was the building of a socialist state in Burma (8). During this period it was difficult to place politicians and officeholders in precise categories, but personal ambition for power was the one feature that categorised much of the political scene (9). Another reason for the splits in party politics was the tendency of Burmese administrators to associate politics with career advancement. The hierarchical structure of politics, which in the traditional system revolved around status and personal loyalties, took on a new dimension when it came to promotion within the colonial government.

Possibly, one example of this need for personal power would be the then Prime Minister U Pu, who disagreed with much of what the Thakin party stood for. And as a result, Aung San began to challenge the government on the issue of war. Some leaders of government suggested that the war be used as an opportunity to fight for freedom, while others argued the war should not be used as an occasion to press the government for freedom (10). When the legislature was formed that declared Burma was at war with Germany, U Pu, the then prime minister of Burma, argued that his countrymen should support Britain and not seek to take advantage of her difficulties. Political leaders continued attacking each other, and U Pu’s conduct was criticized even by his own minister U Saw. Aung San tried to push for U Pu’s resignation, but U Pu refused. The Burmese government repeatedly stressed that only after their victory would Britain consider granting Burma her independence.

However, is it any wonder the politicians of the period struggled with how best to do things. The whole world was going through a period of instability, and previously born convictions of the populace were challenged with ideologies, and rising aspirations of previously ‘dependent’ countries. Although, undoubtedly the challenge of and excitement of nationalism and possibility of freedom was both creative and positive to many, it also harboured feelings of fear and a possible sense of failure and hopelessness for others. Even within the nationalist parties there was a lack of definitive theory and doctrine, which meant that many politicians would rather stick with the old ways, and put their faith in the British. Ironically, the seeds of such doubts were, of course, planted by the very mechanics of colonialism, which cast one group in the role of superiority, and the other in the role of the inferior. The possession of an Empire profoundly influenced the way the British thought of
themselves and the rest of the world, it encouraged racial arrogance, and a sense of Anglo-
Saxon superiority. This conclusion could be justified in terms of material, scientific and
intellectual progress and adaptability. The fact that they had dispersed across the globe and
mastered the indigenous race added to the feeling that they alone were fit to rule. But as the
Burmese nationalists searched for cohesive ideas and inspiration, as well as looking at the
political doctrine of socialism, they also for inspiration in other previously dependent
countries, and the influence of culture that had fought the British and won their
independence.

The influence of the press in Burma can not be overlooked as an influential factor in the rise
of nationalism. In Rangoon particularly, there were numerous ‘reading clubs’. Each
quarter may have had a dozen or so such clubs, each with from a dozen to over a hundred
members (11), who banded together to subscribe to one or more newspapers, magazines and
journals. After the separation of Burma from India in 1937, many new newspapers
appeared, and the total circulation of the press was greatly increased. The Riots Inquiry
Commission Report (1939) lists the Burmese press as one of the main instigators of the race
riots in 1938. During this period the British had to endure some scathing denunciation from
Burmese writers whose articles appeared in the Saithan, New Mandalay Sun, The new light of
Burma, and the Dagon magazine. The Dagon Press and Dagon magazine, which had denounced
British policy on the defence of Burma, had to forfeit the security deposit of Rs 500 on the
grounds that they had published inflammatory articles. The new light of Burma, which was
also outspoken on the subject of independence, published an article on 31st October 1949
which read: “The time has arrived for Britain to make a clear declaration regarding her
intention towards India and Burma. We are afraid that if Britain goes on juggling with
words, she will have cause to repent later. Britain is now standing before the bar of
international justice” (ibid).

As well as newspaper and magazines, the literature of the period also influenced many
nationalist ideologies. ‘Leftist’ literature became available in Burma around 1931. Books
brought back by individuals who had been abroad, and in particular those circulated by J.S.
Furnivall’s Burma book club formed an important element in socialist and Marxist works
introduced into the country at this time. And The Thakins, eager for ideas to give more
direction to their objectives were keen to embrace the political trends that where developing around the world. As we have already noted, it was the view that socialism was opposed to capitalism which made this doctrine so attractive to the young nationalists. They were caught up in the spirit of the time which saw leftist ideologies as superior alternatives to capitalism. At the same time, a journalist called U Tun Pe distributed books recommended by Pandit Nehru’s book *Impression of Soviet Russia*. And in the book *World War and Burma*, Aung San praises the Soviet concept as an ideology to look up to and follow.

In 1937 U Nu The Nagani (red dragon) book club was also prolific, and whose mission was to spread leftist ideology in Burma (13). Thakin Kodaw Hmaing, Thakin Soe, Thakin Thein Pe, and Nu published their own translations of revolutionary literature, and by the outbreak of World War II the group had published over seventy books. Among these translations were John Strachey’s *Theory and Practise of Socialism*, the writings of M.N. Roy, and philosophies of Nietzsche and Marx. There were also fictional publications, for example, Maha Hswe 1939 novel *Sithtwet thu*. The story focuses on the hardship suffered under the oppression of the anti-Buddhist Sahn king Thobanbwa. The image of Burma under colonial rule is clear, particularly with reference to the pride the people placed for their army, which, under colonial rule was absent. In many novels of this period the protagonists are often depicted as martyred heroes, who choose self-sacrifice as a necessary price they have to pay for freedom. Again, reflecting the times which saw revolution and militant action as the most effective means of achieving independence.

No doubt, the thakins had always read widely; books as diverse as Sun Yat-sen, Rousseau and various Sein Fein and Fabian texts were later mentioned by Thakins as early popular texts. In particular writing by Irish authors would have promoted the ideology of self-sacrifice, especially as their situation had so many similarities. Even the name *Dohbama* (‘we Burmese’) is associated the same as *Sinn Fein* (‘ourselves’) and in the same words as Aung San so twenty years earlier the Irish had used against the British during World War One “England’s difficulty, could be Ireland’s opportunity”. And the leaders of the 1916 Easter Rising in Dublin, rose in conviction that further involvement by the Irish in the war would lead to far more blood-shed; they hoped that the Rising would take them out of the war altogether. The insurrection at the post office lasted less than two weeks, but when it
was over the British viewed it as treason and shot the leaders. With similar consequences to the rebellion led by Saya San a few years later. And as Bernard Shaw said at the time, regarding the Rising: they should have, under international law, treated the men as prisoners of war: “An Irishman resorting to arms to achieve the independence of his country is doing only what Englishman will do if it is their misfortune to be invaded and conquered by the Germans (14)”.  

It is clear that Aung San recognised this too. During a DAA meeting in 1939, Aung San met Sir Stafford Cripps, an ex-Labour Party member. During the meeting he asked Aung San how he hoped to achieve independence for Burma. Aung San replied that if Cripps took his pen and did not return it, he would first politely request its return. Then if it was not returned he would demand the pen. If this did not work he would attack by force until he got his pen back. (15).  

Aung San wants to promote nationalism, and ‘promote the whole nation’s support, by publishing books and pamphlets about Burma. Maybe he hoped that by stirring the imagination of the masses (and the Burmese had always frequented tea shops to read) they too would rise up in revolt against imperialism. Just as Yeats proclaimed about his play *Cathleen ni Houlihan* (written in 1902) and the subsequent events of 1916 Easter Rising: “When Pearce summoned Cuchulain to his side, what stalked through the post office? What intellect, What calculation, number, measurement replied” (16). His play cast the beautiful nationalist Maud Gonne in the part of a withered hag who would only walk again as a queen if young men were willing to kill and die for her. What Yeats and other writers have recognised is that the conditions for theorising a revolution can be born out before the event, and strike a cord in the imagination, which can in turn prompt direct revolutionary action against powers much greater than one’s own. What the Irish rebels of 1916 did was, as Soviet revolutionary V.I Lenin had predicted in 1914 when he wrote that a blow against the British Empire in Ireland was of a hundred times more significant than a blow of equal weight in Asia or in Africa.(17).  

The rebels (like Aung San) sought a dream; the invention of the Irish Republic was initially visible only to the agents of freedom. In his poem ‘The Fool’ the leader of the 1916 uprising
Patrick Pearse, contemplated a point from which all outlines of the republic would become visible:

O wise men, riddle me this: what if the dream come true?
What if the dream comes true? and millions unborn shall dwell
In the house that I shaped in my heart, the noble house of my thought (p. 220)

The relationship between literature and society has several aspects to it. It can be a reflection of current views and values within a group, which then translates to society at large, shaping political opinion and spreading new ideas. Or in the case of Ireland, drawing inspiration and establishing links with fellow human beings who have suffered similar circumstances and came out triumphant. Both served determining factors that drove the impulse and idea of Burmese independence.

Conclusion:

Unfortunately, Aung San was assassinated before he realised his dream of an independent Burma. For the people of Burma this was a huge tragedy, not only did they believe in him as a person - both for his politics and also for his genuine belief in the future of a United Burma. And World War and Burma continually stresses the need for the people and politicians to pull together, and to work through their differences. Not an easy task, considering that Burma had never had a history of any kind of democratic state. Even prior to colonialism, the rule of the monarch was absolute, and freedom of speech within the court was limited. This was especially true for the hill tribes, who on the whole, welcomed the British, seeing them as saviours from Burman dominance.

Therefore, for the young leaders of the nationalist movement (and, of course, the new leaders of the newly independent state in 1947), their ideologies and concepts were taken from what they had read, and drawn inspiration from. Hence, the Irish fight against the British, and their adoption of similar names – Sinn Fein / Dobama, and their admiration of Soviet socialism. Sadly, the Soviet Union, which touted itself as the world’s first socialist state and one of the pillars of the democratic camp, was an illusion. Under the Stalin
regime, it was already swaying away from the path of socialism so admired by the Burmese nationalists. The Soviet Union soon sought annexation and domination of its neighbours, and carried out repression of its own people. But since it came under the banner of socialism supporters of its ideology were unaware of what was really happening. And there can be no doubt that theoretically at least, it offered a welcome way out of the colonialist’s capitalism.

When independence eventually came to Burma, the new leader U Nu inherited an unenviable position. As we have already discussed, splits within the political parties were rife, and following the assassination of Aung San tensions were rife. Communist factions split and divided some siding with China and evolving underground communist insurgency movements which threatened the new government. The ethnic minorities too were unhappy with the new regime, and formed their own armies – including the Karen, Karenni and Kachin whose demands ranged from complete freedom and independence, to a greater autonomy and voice in the government. Plunged immediately into civil war Burma had to accept foreign aid from the West, but this too came at a price. Moscow’s instructions to communist countries in Asia were to resort to violence against the sham of independence. Moscow radio poured out denunciation against Nu, Nehru, and Sukarno as the ‘running dogs of the capitalist imperialist’. Caught in an increasingly difficult situation, the new leadership decided that since their tasks were to establish the authority of their own government in the face of rebellion and to get on with the task of economic reconstruction they would make every attempt to avoid any involvement with cold-war politics, but would do their best to remain in friendly terms with all nations. Thus, they established the cornerstone of foreign policy later labelled as ‘neutralism’.
9.1 Ba Maw, The World War and Burma
(Translation: Chit Thein Oo)

During the present world war there is only one policy that each and every small nation is to adopt and implement. That is for independent nations to defend their independence, and for nations that have not yet attained independence, to strive to regain it. It is a task in the performance of which all the people of the nations are to sacrifice their lives and property. Politics has become a task the free peoples are carrying out with great courage. Only the people of independent nations are considered to be worthy of being called “human beings”. This has become the principle and policy of the world today. If we Myanmars wish to be worthy of being regarded as “real human beings” we must do the work that will uplift our status to that of being real human beings. We must decide whether we will do this work and if we decide to do it the only thing we need is to act at once. The other words’ are irrelevant, superficial. As in all other small nations, there is only one very important problem for our country. It is none other than our desire and aspiration for independence. The task for us, therefore, is to strive to regain our independence. Our efforts to successfully solve small problems also contribute towards the successful implementation of the major task of regaining independence. This is our political policy which will, right from the beginning up to the end, lead and guide the Burma’s liberation movement.

There is no more need to elaborate on the Burma’s policy for independence. What we need is to work together with might and main. The whole world has become a significant example for us to draw our strength form. While the world is writing a new chapter in its history, we the Burmese must show the Burmese natural characteristics and courage in writing a new history.
9.2 Ba Maw, The World War and Burma
(Translation: Khin Maung Saw)

During this world war, there is one and only policy for (small) countries. (This Policy) is: colonized countries (must struggle for their freedom) and independent countries must struggle (to maintain) their independent status. Struggling either for independence or to maintain an independent status is no more a (simple and normal) case; it has became a struggle for the wealth and (destiny) of the whole country and race. It is (now) a do or die question for us. What is politics? It is the duty and labour for the people struggling bravely for their independence. Only the people of independent countries are respected, if your country is not independent, your race will not be respected. This is the world’s policy nowadays.

I would like to say, if we Burmese want to be put in the list of ‘Standard Human Beings’, and also if we don’t want the name our race to be erased from the list of ‘Standard Human Beings’, we must work like ‘Standard Human Beings’. Hence, we have to decide whether we want to do it or not. After the decision, then we have to do it. I don’t want to speak longer; it is no longer necessary. We Burmese too have one problem and one problem only, like other small nations; namely independence! We have only one duty and one task to accomplish. It is to struggle for our independence. The evolution of other small problems is diverting from this independence struggle. (Here, I would like to say) that my policy is to struggle for independence from A to Z. This is also the policy of Bama Htwetyat Gaing (Burmese Freedom Bloc).

I do not need to say (more about) Burmese Independence. We have to (work) much harder and more effectively. The (events) in the world (nowadays) have demonstrated what we must to do now. We have seen those events. The whole world is starting a new history. We Burmese have to write a new history with our own wishes!

Signed: Dr. Ba Maw

---

1 I put in (in parenthesis) the words or phrases which cannot be read properly in the photo copies which I had to guess according to the sentence construction.
9.3 Ba Maw, The World War and Burma (Burmese Text)
It is natural and inevitable for the dependent nations to strive to liberate themselves from under the yoke of the nations that dominate and oppress them. The nations that rule these colonies are bound to employ various means to prevent the colonies from freeing themselves from under the yoke of colonial domination.

Whether these colonies will regain their independence most primarily depends upon the peoples of these colonies themselves.

The factors that will contribute towards the attainment of their independence are (1) the people of these colonies getting sick of living under the yoke of colonialism and having made up their minds to strive to regain their independence, (2) the people getting united, (3) now being the most opportune time to strive for their independence (the nations that rule them are at war and consequently they are beset by political, economic and military difficulties and obstacles), (4) the colonies having the opportunity to get financial and military assistance from other nations (5) their having qualified and able leaders to make effective use of the money and weapons they receive and (6) the people’s having matured enough and being ready to live as citizens of an independent nation. Ireland, a nation that had all these qualifications, liberated itself from under the yoke of British rule. Similarly, the Balkan nations liberated themselves from the domination and oppression of the Ottoman Empire of Turkey. Hungary managed to regain its independence from Austria. During the First World War which broke out in 1914 Finland succeeded in liberating itself from the Russian rule. Even Ireland a small nation, also managed to free itself from the rule England with the help of Germany. The people of Philippines, then under the domination of Spain, made their utmost efforts to regain their independence. All these former colonies regained their independence because of their having had all the six factors mentioned above fulfilled.

If you take a glance at the present situation of Myanmar, you will find that it is lacking in the six factures. Myanmar has only the will and desire to attain independence, but all the other factors are still lacking. Even India lacks these factors. However, if compared with Myanmar, India is higher in its status and stature. The people of India, though still being unable to take up arms against the British imperialists, are striving to
regain their nation’s independence purely by peaceful means, without resorting to any violent means and thus gaining the upper hand in disrupting and disturbing the British rule. Their great leader, Gandhi, who is very gentle and patient, is now in jail and you will find that he is making a list of those who will strive for national independence with might and main. Moreover, the political leaders as instructed by the Congress, have resigned from their respective posts on the government and giving all sorts of disturbances and trouble to the British government. Germany, the main enemy of Britain, has now come to realize, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the British will not get any assistance from India. The British government regards this as a great blow to their morale and military efforts.

Since Myanmar has not yet reached the lowest level of strength, it will be found that it is still a long, long way to go to regain our independence. However, since the Myanmar people, being unlike the people of India, have realized that they have to rely on their own strength and efforts and will be able to fulfil the six factors mentioned above, it will not be lagging far behind in their struggle for independence. If a farmer who grows paddy feeds his land with fertilisers, build a farm hut, gets the ploughshare and farming implements ready, feed the oxen well to keep them strong and healthy and secures quality seeds before the rains come and makes use of them as soon as it begins to rain, he is certain to reap a rich harvest when the time comes.

In the same way the people of Myanmar need to strive to have the six factors fulfilled, otherwise they will have to wait for years to get this kind of opportunity in spite of their being within reach of those important factors.
10.2 The World War and Burma

By Fabian U Ba Khaing

(Translation: Khin Maung Saw)

It is (normal and understood)\(^1\) in colonized countries that they are struggling for their independence from their colonial masters and the latter will also try to maintain their power and influence by all means in the countries they have colonized. In this kind of struggle for independence, it depends totally on the commitment of the people whether they will achieve their goal or not.

It depends on the following factors:

1. The determination of the populace which does not want to stay under foreign rule and has resolved unanimously to struggle for independence.
2. National Unity
3. Getting a good opportunity, that is to say a chance “to make hay while the sun shines”. (In other words, when the colonial master is at war with another power and has to face many problems and is not able to act freely in the politics, economy and the military affairs of their colonies.)
4. Getting financial support and armaments from other countries (which are the foes of this colonial master).
5. Having a good leader who can lead and manage to achieve the final goal.
6. The state of the people of that colonized country, being alert and fit to be the citizens of an independent nation.

Any county which fulfils these conditions will gain their goal. For example, (American people) demonstrated this to the whole world by winning the war of Independence against England. The Balkan States achieved freedom from the Ottoman Empire. Hungary won the struggle to gain independence from the Austrian Empire. During the First World War in 1914, Ireland struggled for their freedom from the British rule. With the help from Germany, Finland became independent from Russia. The Filipinos struggled for their independence from the Dutch\(^2\) Rulers. These nations achieved their independence because they fulfilled their above mentioned conditions.

What is lacking in Burma

If we consider the case of our country, Burma, many preconditions are lacking. The only condition we could fulfil is the first: the Burmese people want independence. However, (we are not yet) ready to fulfil the other conditions. Not only Burma, but also (India) has some similar problems; however, we (have to admit) that (Indians) are further along the road toward fulfilling these conditions than we are. Indians attempted armed struggles but failed. They see that now and are currently trying by means of ‘peaceful disturbances’ to move the British authorities. Nowadays, most of them are following the peaceful struggle headed by their leader Mr. Ghandi. Mr. Ghandi asked for a list of

---

\(^1\) I put in (--------) for the words or phrases which cannot be read properly in the photo copies or which I had to guess according to the sentence construction.

\(^2\) In fact, the Philippines were under the Spanish rule and the Filipino Struggles were against the Spaniards!
people who dare to be imprisoned for the Independence struggle and many joined his association. Some members of the Congress Party resigned from their government posts as high ranking officers. Because of those movements, the British Government has to face many problems in India. The biggest foe of the British, the Germans, have already taken note that the British could not get proper help from India during this war and this fact represents a major set back for the British.

**Be Alert and Ready!**

As mentioned earlier, we Burmese have not yet reached the level of the weakest (country struggling) for independence and we are still very (far from our goal). In any case, we Burmese are not (a lazy and stupid) race and I know that we Burmese can be mobilized easily and can achieve all conditions quickly in case of necessity. So be alert and ready! If we are alert and ready we won’t lag behind India in our independence struggle.

For example, a farmer who wants to get enough rice, has to prepare even before the rainy season starts by fertilizing the fields, building a hut in the farm, preparing the ploughs and all other equipment, feeding the bullocks properly so that they will be healthy and strong for the whole season, collecting rice seed to plant etc. etc. When the rainy season starts, he is alert and ready to do his job and later he reaps more than enough rice.

In this way, we Burmese who want to get our independence should be alert and ready from this time on. Otherwise, one day we will have to regret and cry for (our destiny) that (the golden opportunity came), but we could not use it because we had (no experienced leader) who could organise and lead us properly as well as lacking other preconditions. If we cannot make hay while the sun shines, we will have to wait for many more years (for another chance). Here, I have to issue a warning for my fellow compatriots: “Be alert and ready from now on”!
10.3 Ba Khaing, The World War and Burma (Burmese Text)
မြန်မာနိုင်ငံတွင် ကြီးမားသော အောင်မြှင့်မှုများအား သိရှိနိုင်စေသည်။ ပြည်သူများ၏ အိမ်ထောင်ထားသော အိမ်များလည်း ဝေးဖြစ်စေသည်။ ပြည်သူများ၏ ကြီးမားသော အောင်မြှင့်မှုများအား သိရှိနိုင်စေသည်။

မြန်မာနိုင်ငံတွင် ကြီးမားသော အောင်မြှင့်မှုများအား သိရှိနိုင်စေသည်။ ပြည်သူများ၏ အိမ်ထောင်ထားသော အိမ်များလည်း ဝေးဖြစ်စေသည်။ ပြည်သူများ၏ ကြီးမားသော အောင်မြှင့်မှုများအား သိရှိနိုင်စေသည်။
11. Two Burmese Marching Songs (translated by Tin Htway)

10.1 Bama Letyone Tat Marching Song

Our Burma is a land of courageous people
Very brave, fearless and daring people.
What they have done and what they have dared is remarkable throughout history.

Yes, dear members of Bama Letyone Tat,
All of you are the real descendants of HEROES.
So, until your bones break and crumble
Fight, for the sake of our Country, our Land.

Let’s turn this OLD AGE upside down.
Let’s found a NEW and […….]\(^2\) AGE
This our duty and we’re burning to achieve our FREEDOM.
Be united, dear comrades, let’s march together happily.
Left - Right - Left - Right.

The country Burma is our country
The land of Burma is our land.
Let us love each other and protect our nation.
Left - Right - Left - Right.

This is the time for Burma (and for us Burmese)
To heighten our pride in our nation
Yes, this is the time for us Burmese, to loose our factional feelings.

---

1 Tin Htway pp.322-323
2 Unreadable (ed.)
10.2 *U Maung Gyi’s ‘Ye Tat’ Marching Song No. 1.*

Dear courageous hero comrades let's take our part, Until the end of our days

   With all our strength (we must fight)

Yes, using our own physical strength

*We Burmese - We courageous Burmese (fight)*

Since a long time ago, it is clearly recorded in history
to have conquered many other cities, many other lands.

With our own Generals, with our own might and arms

Fearlessly, daringly, courageously we have marches (in the past)

Yes, it is our Victory. The Victorious Army singing Victory Songs.

Let our national pride and national courage grow.

Our Burma is our land. We Burmese are born soldiers.

We possess our country

It is our duty, we Burmese soldiers.

We must possess our own country.

Oh men - Burmese men

For a real man even the furthest star in the sky is within his reach. That is sure

(Oh, courageous hero Burmese)

Let's found our own new country, now.

---

1 Tin Htway p. 324.
11. Aung San on the “International Situation” (1946)

Let us first see the favourable side of the picture in analysing the international situation. Here are some salient features. Complete military defeat of all principal Fascist states, overwhelming victory of Democratic ideology over Fascism and general elimination of extreme Rightism throughout the world; a more powerful League of Nations (U.N.O.) in which the most powerful States in the world, namely, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. participate actively; China’s rise to the position of one of the Big Five in the U.N.O., though for the moments clouds of civil war darken over her horizon; Asia’s awakening and rising strength as can be in the armed struggle of Indonesia, developing independence of Indo-China, the independence of the Philippines, the coming of a free, independent India …, Malayan politisation, rise of a progressive young Thai Party in Siam, rising and increasingly powerful nationalism of the Middle East compelling the recognition of the independence of Transjordan, withdrawal of long occupied British troops from Egypt, the rising situations in Syria, Palestine, etc.; democratisation of the people of the world as can be seen in the victories of new democracies in Eastern Europe, republicanisation of Western Europe, the victory of the Labour Party in Britain, Africans increasing consciousness, increasing democratisation of South America, developing independence of British Dominions particularly Australia etc; gradual internationalisation if Burma’s case; the Soviet Union’s ascending strength and position in international affairs; United States twelve-point foreign policy etc.; these form the favourable factors in the international situation.

Now the unfavourable side. Remnants of Fascist menace such as can be seen in Fascist Spain, Mosley organisation in Britain, Labour imperialists in Britain, Kuomintang Right-wingers, Indian vested interests in India and Burma, encouragement of reactionaries and even open Fascists by British imperialism and company in international and colonial affairs; continued existence of international capitalist trusts and appearance of new regional trusts and combines, the means of international propaganda being mostly in their hands; the reappearance of the old Power Politics of

---

Balance of Power and Spheres of Influence; British imperialism’s physical appearance for the moment which hides its weakness from the observation of a good part of the world; continued existence of colonies and semi-colonies; disunity in China; Hindu-Muslim disunity in India; imperfections of Siamese democracy, certain anti-Burmese sentiments there; British machinations in Siam and South East Asia; lack of positive international support for Indonesia; Malaya’s amorphous racial questions; reaction still raising its head in the Middle East, such as the extremely unsettled state in Palestine; brewing campaign for quarantining the Soviet Union from international affairs; U.S. hydra-headed State Department and anti-Soviet Navy; lack of frequent and positive contacts and co-ordinated politics between oppressed and exploited peoples of the world which result chiefly in the Indian and African troops being used for suppression of natural and just revolts of oppressed and exploited peoples (including even their own at times) etc; these form unfavourable aspects of the present international situation.

In the sphere of world relations, there is an increasing conflict of opinions between the Soviet Union on one side and the Anglo-American combination on the other. In Asia, China and the Middle East are the sorest spots while India and South East Asia (including Burma) are also of equal and vital priorities. I shall not be surprised if Asia, especially China, will become the beginning and prime theatre of war if the Third World War becomes a fact. Asia, or rather China was the beginning of World War II. This time it will be not merely the beginning but may even become the prime war theatre itself. For, in Asia, in South Africa and South America, particularly in Asia where she is coming into her own and where almost all those Powers dominating Asia and world politics as well as the Soviet Union and U.S.A are bound up somehow or other in Asia’s tangled skein of geopolitics, international intrigues, rivalries and struggles will get keener and sharper and thus pave the way for World War III.

That does not mean that the Third World War is evitable. [sic!] Contrary to certain opinions and seemingly bad news from China in these few days, I am of firm opinion that large scale military struggle will not yet come for quite a time and that there will be only fresh and more intensive political manoeuvres and mobilisations generally for the Peace contests by means of atomic, food, economic and slandering diplomacies. I don’t however claim to be a prophet and
cannot guarantee that this will be the case in international affairs. But this is the trend that I see.

As things appear to me, the Soviet Union, and the Anglo-American Powers are engaged in keen competitions for the division of respective spheres of influence in the Middle East, while British imperialism seems to be spearhead of the combination for domination of South East Asia, with U.S.A. in the background consciously or unconsciously. Thus there is now, roughly speaking, a division of the world into two main camps, the division between forces of freedom and democracy on the one hand and forces of anti-freedom, anti-democratic reaction on the other; or rather between forces for the old world and forces of the new world, between so to speak, old democracies and new democracies; and not between Democracy and Communism as it is generally painted to be. For from any point of view, communist or non-communist, there is no immediate of Communism being successfully established anywhere in the world. Even in the Soviet-Union where the Communist Party is the sole ruling party without any rival, by the admissions of the Communists themselves, only the primary stage towards Communism is still achieved, and they cannot as yet definitely forecast when full-blown Communism can and will be accomplished. To quote the far-famed Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse Tung, to illustrate again, “Socialism (not Communism as yet, mind you) can be reached only through democracy; this is an undisputed fact of Marxism. …[A longer quotation from Mao Tse Tung underlining the necessity of a capitalist stage in history follows]”

It is therefore clear that ideological struggle now going on all over the world is not between Communism and Democracy, but as I have said, between old and New Democracies. This conflict of ideologies is the reflection of the conflict of mutual materialist interests primarily and a result of mutual knowledge and understanding secondarily.

This rough demarcation of the world into two main camps must be examined here more minutely again. For we should not run away with the simple idea that this will be the case henceforward everywhere and every time. There are and still will be, I think, several intervening factors, forces and circumstances retarding, diverting, breaking, intensifying, complicating this simple or perhaps over-simplified picture of alignments
and re-alignments throughout the world or regionally or nationally, as the case may be. To view the world now just as a simple uniform picture of two camps only will be not only undialectical but also untrue in fact. For we cannot ignore the fact that in any and every country with the possible exception of the Soviet Union there are two nations at least, the one helping forward and the other retarding forces of historical progress. We cannot also ignore another salient fact that, though several imperialisms appear to be tending towards processes of unification cutting across national barriers, there are still several difficulties, contradictions and hesitations amongst themselves, one to another and so forth. At any rate, there dare not yet come out and say that they place the interests of imperialist class over even the interests of their respective nations.

To be Continued. ¹

¹ No. 14 of the Burma Digest could not be found yet.
13. Appendices to “World War and Burma”

13.1.1 Thakin Soe, Historical Materialism

(Translation: Chit Thein Oo)

I spent eight years studying the treatises, big and small, which were secretly read in Russia when every effort was being made to bring out that treatise of enormous influence. The treatises I studied also included the ones which are still not allowed to be read or taught at schools and colleges in capitalist nations, and the books which are banned in fascist Germany. There are over 200 books in number. I also spent five months writing the book “Historical Materialism” on the basis of the most important facts from them.

“Historical Materialism” traces how the human world came into being, how the human society changed from one era to another, what kinds of revolutions caused the changes and all related factors in their proper order.

It is a book which is indispensable for libraries, reading clubs and those seeking knowledge.

It is estimated to contain over 400 pages.

Orders should be sent to the Nagani book agents in the cities and towns as early as possible.

It is priced K3.
12.1.2 The History of Materialism
Written by Thakin Soe
(Translation: Khin Maung Soe)

The author had to study more than 200 books over a period of nearly 8 years before he could publish this book. Some books had to be read secretly while Russia (was under the Czars)\(^1\). The use of some are still forbidden in the schools and (government offices?) of the capitalist (countries). Some books are totally (banned) in Germany. After studying more than two hundred reference works and having collected all pertinent facts, it took another 5 months for the author to finish his book.

In this book, the author analysed and described properly how political systems changed step by step from the beginning of our world and how people had to struggle and even to revolt if necessary in order to change one old system to a new system.

This book is strongly recommended for the book shelves of libraries, readers clubs and those seeking general knowledge as well as for the collections of bookworms.

It has about 400 pages.

As a precaution, we would like to suggest that orders in advance will be highly appreciated as the number of books published is limited.

Price: Three Kyats

\(^1\) I put in (------) for the words or phrases which cannot be read properly in the photo copies or which I had to guess according to the sentence construction.
13.1.3 Thakin Soe, Historical Materialism (Burmese Text)
13.2.1 Nagani Policy not Changed
(Translation: Chit Thein Oo)

I found an article entitled “Has Nagani changed its policy?” in the 12th Waxing Day of Tabaung (Tuesday) issue of the Thuriya Daily. I would like to explain that the policy of Nagani has never changed and will not change in future. It will remain as it has always been.

I would like those wishing to know about Nagani to note that the Nagani Book Club and the Nagani Publishing House Ltd are two separate entities. The principal policy of the Nagani Book Club is to fight against imperialism and so the books and pamphlets which are published by the Nagani Book Club contain those that expose and attack imperialism. If it publishes books of knowledge, they will be ones that do not support or encourage imperialism.

Kaba Yanthu (The Enemy of the World), Sit-Yaung-Chi (The Light of War), Kaba Yokesone (The World of Pictures) and others were written by Dagon Khin Khin Lay and published by Dagon Khin Khin Lay’s Publishing House. The Nagani Publishing House (not the Nagani Book Club) accepted Dagon Khin Khin Lay’s books as job work and printed them and so the policy and ideas mentioned in “Kaba Yanthu” (The Enemy of the World), Lin-Yaung-Chi and Kaba Yoesone (The World of Pictures) are entirely Dagon Khin Khin Lay’s responsibility and they have nothing to do with the Nagani Publishing House. The Nagani Publishing House has accepted as job work not only books and pamphlets but also wedding invitation cards, and religious books. The Nagani Book Club is in no way responsible for the contents of these cards, and books. Before the Nagani Publishing House was established, Nagani books were published by “Law-ka-dan Publishing House” and “Myanmar Yokeshin Publishing House” (Myanmar Crimea). Those two publishing houses published Nagani books as job work and so they are not responsible for the policy and ideas contained in the Nagani books published by them.
13.2.2 Nagani’s Policy will not be changed
(Translation: Khin Maung Saw)

There was an article in the *Thuriya* Newspaper of the 12th day of the waxing moon of the month Tabau1 with the heading “Has Nagani changed their Policy”? Upon reading that article I am obliged to answer that Nagani’s Policy will be the same as (it was, as it is and it will be)2. Our Policy will never be changed.

Just for the readers’ information, one has to differentiate between the Nagani Book Club and the Nagani Printing & Publishing House Ltd., or Nagani Press Ltd. As the basic policy of the Nagani Book Club is anti-imperialism, we sponsor and publish two types of books. One type is supporting the anti-imperialist ideology and movements. The other type is for general knowledge; however, in any case these books of general knowledge should not support imperialist ideology.

The books such as “Enemy of the World”, “The Rays of the War”, “The Picture of the World” etc. etc. were written by (Daw) *Dagon* Khin Khin Lay and sponsored by (Daw) *Dagon* Khin Khin Lay Novel House, however, Nagani Printing & Publishing House Ltd., or Nagani Press Ltd., - here I would like to emphasize that it is NOT Nagani Book Club printed (Daw) *Dagon* Khin Khin Lay’s books by order of the author and as a job of a press. She made her own statement about that in her books. Hence, the responsible person for policy and ideas of these (three) books are (Daw) *Dagon* Khin Khin Lay and her (Daw *Dagon* Khin Khin) Lay Novel House. As mentioned before, the Nagani Printing & Publishing House Ltd., (Nagani Press Ltd.) and the Nagani Book Club are not the same.

Nagani Press printed not only her political books but also many religious books as well as all kinds of invitation cards, including wedding invitations etc. etc.. Since the Nagani Press needs job offers and money, they print all kinds of orders regardless of the ideology propagated by the text. The Nagani Press did its duty as a press and therefore the Nagani Book Club cannot take any responsibility for the content of those books. Before the Nagani Press was established, all books of the Nagani book Club were printed either by the Lokadan Press or Myanma Film Press. These two presses too, printed our books as the duty of a press and therefore these two presses could not take any responsibility for the ideology contained in Nagani books at that time.

In any case, in order to avoid this problem we will add a phrase “Published with full responsibility for the content by the Nagani Book Club” with the seal of Nagani Book Club in all books and articles published by our club in the future.

I hope that I have stated clearly that the policy of the Nagani Book Club has not changed.

Htun Shwe
Executive - The Nagani Book Club

Seal of the Club
“Published and taken responsibility by the Nagani Book Club”

---

1. It is approximately at the middle of March.
2. I put in (-----) for the words or phrases which cannot be read properly in the photo copies or which I had to guess according to the sentence construction.
13.2.3 Nagani’s Policy will not be changed (Burmese Text)
IV. Material on Hla Pe and Ba Khaing, War and General Ideology

1. Kyaw Hoe, Bibliographical Information

Written about the present war and the ideology of Russian communists. It was written by Thakin Hla Pe (Bo Lt Ya) and U Ba Khaing. 2,500 copies were published on March 5, 1940 with the price of 8 Pè. “War and General ideology” consists of two parts. The first part was written by Thakin Hla Pe (Bo Letya) and the second part by U Ba Khaing. In the first part of the book under the title of “General Ideology and War of 1914-1918”, it was translated into Myanmar language from a script written already during the reign of the Tsar. It was actually written in Russian-German, and also in French and Norwegian languages and published secretly. The publication in Russian was not sufficient and the farmers and workers copied them with their own handwriting and distributed further. This script was published in Burma, with the intention of to be read in our struggle to gain Independence. (Pages 1 – 30)

The second part “Why he wars were fought” is from page 53 to 160. The aim is that the Burmese should know their actual situation and to fight for Independence whenever the opportunities arise. References are:

1) Stuart Chase, *The Tragedy of Waste*;¹
2) C.H.D. Cole, *War Aims*²;
3) Simon Haxey, *Tory M.P*³;
5) V.J. Lintz, *Book between Two Wars*⁵

---

¹ Editor’s note: Published 1925 by The McMillan Company, New York.
² Editor’s note: Published November 1939 by The New Statesman and Nation, London.
³ Editor’s note: Published July 1939 by Victor Gollancz, Red Book Club.
⁴ Editor’s note: Published May 1938 by Victor Gollancz, Red Book Club.
⁵ Editor’s note: Published 1939 by Penguin Books. Konni Zilliacus (13 September 1894 – 6 July 1967) who used to the pseudonym “Vigilantes”(“watcher”) was a left-wing Labour Party politician in the United Kingdom born in Japan.
2. Moe Hein Zaw, Book Review

Co-authors: Thakin Hla Pe and U Ba Khaing
Translation: Ye Nyunt

"War and Communism" had been compiled in two parts — each by Thakins Hla Pe and U Ba Khaing. On his visit to Thakin Kodaw Hmaing, Thakin Hla Pe met Venerable U Panicca there. The monk asked him of his opinions about war. Thakin Hla Pe responded that he was committed to revealing his opinions about war to the public. In the foreword, he mentions that facts were gathered from the period when Russia was under the rule of the Tsar, and he believes that if the compilation gets into the hands of the peasants, workers and the rustic people, it will contribute to the endeavours for regaining independence.

U Ba Khaing also mentions that he intends to inform the people of the situation in the country, and his supreme aim is to help bring about an independent Burma. He refers to the books The Tragedy of Waste by Chase Stuart¹, War Aims written by C.H.D. Cole², Tory M.P., written by Simon Haxey³ and A Peoples’ History of England written by A.L. Morton⁴.

Review

Part-1 Thakin Hla Pe

Communism and the 1914-18 World War

Communists hate wars that induce rough behaviour in people while capitalists crave for wars that bring benefits to them. Averse to the fact that wars kill people and

¹ Editor’s note: Published 1925 by The McMillan Company, New York.
² Editor’s note: Published November 1939 by The New Statesman and Nation, London.
³ Editor’s note: Published July 1939 by Victor Gollancz.’ Red Book Club.
⁴ Editor’s note: Published May 1938 by Victor Gollancz.’ Red Book Club.
leave the poor starving, communists hold views different from capitalists. Communists believe that collective rule by the proletariat, as advocated in communism, will eliminate contradictions among different classes, and that it is of primary importance to get rid of class system to prevent wars. On the other hand, history has shown that wars caused downfall of despotism and monarchism, creating possibilities for emergence of new ruling systems. The author mentions events in Turkey and Russia as instances, reflecting the views of communists. He also deals with the ideology of Karl Marx, who first propounded communism. There are two kinds—wars that bring progress to the humans and wars that draw people backwards. Communists favour the former—wars that broke out before the downfall of capitalism that had existed along with capitalism.

**Revolution from one era to another**

French Revolution opened a new chapter in the world history. The capitalists' reformation efforts improved within the period from the French Revolution to Paris Commune (1789 to 1871), uprooting monarchism and imperialism and abolishing all control. Communists are obliged to support capitalists who rose up against the oppression of monarchs. Despite its primary aim of invading other countries, the French Revolution proved to have brought down monarchism.

**Two kinds of war**

The period between 1789 and 1871 saw the sowing of seed for revolutions. Without the downfall of monarchism, proletariat era or a communist nation will not come into being. Now there exists a mature seed to grow into such as era. The revolutions of the time exterminated the system of slavery and protected inalienable rights, and hence can be called just wars. It is justified that small national strove to emancipate from the oppression of the big nations. The author has cited instances by describing these events. Capitalists' claim that they fight wars for the defence of their nations and for the independence of small nation is only trickery.

**The current war**

It is claimed that England and France wage war against Germany so that they can defend the system of democratic ruling and the right of independence for small nations. In fact, try do not allow small nations to go independent, and they have divided
opinions among themselves. As capitalism has developed into colonialism, it can be said that the latter assumes the shape of the former. Colonialism emerged in 1900. Under capitalism, all industries fell into the hands of companies, large banks and cooperative societies. Capitalists, through their relations among themselves, expended territories for their own benefits and developed an administrative system to consolidate their economy. Under this administrative system, countries under them became impoverished. Although capitalists had wiped out monarchism, colonialism actually established an era of poverty for all small nations and the people belonging to the lowest class. The emergence of the capitalist era seems to be a development, but is an unfavourable system hampering the development of all nations. On the other hand, colonialism serves as a bridge, leading to another era. Hence, it is expected that the era of communism remains only at an arm’s length away. The author says that capitalism causes wars, and it and other perverse ideologies create a partition between the oppressing minority and the oppressed majority.

The Concomitant of capitalism

The communists realize that war is a concomitant of capitalism. Marx and Engel wrote about war, based on this conception. Wars are waged, as advocated in capitalism. The fact that wars are waged for the independence or defence of small nations is only a pretext. In fact, there is no hope at all for small nations, which are only in a position to fight by themselves for their own independence.

The instance of Belgium

The allied nations claimed during the World War in 1914 that German had upset the non-aligned position of Belgium. Warring nations would breach any promise, agreement or treaty. Germany declared wars, not for the sake of Belgium, but for the reoccupation of their former colonies and invasion of Turkey. France wished to take Alsace and Lorraine. In the present war, England and France claim they wage war for the sake of Poland. India and Burma, not yet set from slavery, realize well that their claim is absurd.

What did Tsars wage wars?

The ideology of Tsars in Russia appeared distinct as colonialism as they wished to
expand their territories to Persia, Manchuria and Mongolia. Russian people were distracted from their grievances by the attacks on Galicia, Ukraine, Armenia and Constantinople. Wars lead to increase in the number of slave countries, severe oppression and deprivation of independence. The author says national defence means efforts to be made for the advantage of one's own country. Despite their pretext of national defence, colonialists are engaged in acts that favour capitalists and damage the poor. Eventually, it has come to the situation of invading small countries and oppressing the poor. Thus, the author mentions the ploys of capitalists.

**Basel Declaration**

Socialists held a conference in Basel in 1912, issuing a declaration on war. It is mentioned in it that England, France and Germany were involved in the world War in 1914, and that these nations waged wars to seek their slave countries in the interests of the minority. It says the war was unjust. The declaration only serves as a reminder to the proletariat to rise up against the colonialists. When colonialists wage war, countries under them can take advantage of the situation to revolt. The author has cited the 1871 Paris Commune and the 1915 Russian Revolution as instances. National Defence groups in Germany and Russia are obliged to defend their nationals should enemies attack their countries. Karl Marx and Engel concurred with this view. They stood on the side of Germany when Napoleon III and the Tsar kept Germany down during the 1970-71 war. When Germany invaded some French territories, they denounced Germany, exhorting it to take care of the poor in the nation.

**Collapse of the "Second International"**

In 1921 in Besli, socialists declared that a proletariat revolution would emerge. This could happen by instigating hatred of the poor in the capitalists in connection with the European War. When the war broke out, members of the socialist democratic gang hampered efforts for the emergence of a revolution. This resulted from the former cooperation between the socialists and the capitalists, making the resolutions of the "Second International" meaningless. While these resolutions were effective, every socialists democratic group was split in two—those desiring revolution and those looking for opportunities. Such contradiction was taking place in England, Italy and Holland. The fact the communists are looking for opportunities reflects the sentiments of small
capitalists. Workers with capitalist's sentiments associated with the capitalists and deterred the rights of the poor. Functions of the socialists from 1800 to 1900 amounted to encouraging the opportunists and creating the poor’s reverence in them. When the war broke out, the opportunists mentioned "National Defence" as a ploy. Stealthy association of the opportunists with capitalists in the past became blatant cooperation at the outbreak of war. The author collectively presents the opportunists’ ploys and problems between the poor and the governments.

**Obligation of the communists**

Revolution was not far off when war broke out because the war would push the poor into depths of trouble and the poor would become more united. At that time, the rough behaviour of capitalists would come to the surface. While the poor were holding the upper hand, their scope must be broadened with nation-wide instigative activities. The author says mentioning of Paris Commune as an example in the Besli Declaration was an attempt to create a civil war. The Paris Commune failed because there was no strong base to establish communism at that time and capitalist sentiments were infused in the workers. These sentiments disappeared 50 years later.

**The right to prescription of self-rule (autonomy)**

In every country, aims of the communists can be achieved only when all oppressions are repelled. Communists must support the slave countries in their demanding for self-rule. This support should not be mistaken as engendering fragments of small nations, emergence of which means proximity to a world revolution. With the support of communists for forging greater unity among small nations, every country needs to demand the right to self-rule.

**War and workers**

The class the capitalists in Russian and the governments could not persuade is workers. When war broke out in 1914, only a few workers had a bias from the government owing to the rights given by the government. In Moscow, the government blamed workers’ conflict with the Germans on the workers. However, workers were nonchalant to the persuasion of capitalists. During 1912 and 1914, Russia was fraught with revolts. In 1913, 1,500,000 boycotters were suspended from work, and in 1914,
more than 2 million workers were involved in the boycotts which assumed the form of small battles against the government. The author has presented problems between workers and governments, communists’ dissemination of their propaganda, suppression of the governments, functions of the Russian parliament and domestic situation of Russia.

**Russian Social Democratic Party**

Opportunist sections of the Russian Social Democratic Party split from the main party and set up a National Defence Group. Such secession is appropriate for establishing a communist nation. The split-up of communists and the "No Monarchic Rule" group is similar to the split of socialists and the national defence group. Workers will not be organized together with communists for the workers revolution. The Social Democratic Party can be reinforced with the proletariat whose scope has been broadened. All the social parties in the world must follow suit. Communist parties should be clean without the inclusion of opportunists. It would take long to meet such a condition. When the Russian Communist Party followed the same track, opportunists attempted to persuade workers to unite with them and the capitalists. However, Russian workers did not part with the communists. During the war, social democratic ideology spread across the nation in Russia. This ideology originated in 1883. Thakin Hla Pe deals with each development in Russia.

**Mensheviks and Bolsheviks**

When a revolution involving small capitalists occurred, the Social Democratic Party members were divided in their ideological thoughts. It was a follow-up to the first time division. Capitalists became Mensheviks and members of the base class became Bolsheviks. Mensheviks were engaged in easy-going political functions encouraging capitalists and giving new life to workers groups while Bolsheviks were inciting workers to take part in the peasant’s revolution. At that time, workers were wavering between violent revolution and peaceful strike. Hence, having failed in their activities, Mensheviks eventually followed Bolsheviks. At the time of revolution, Mensheviks, assuming the name "liquidators", thwarted the activities of revolutionaries; Mensheviks wrote in a newspaper that the revolution was not successful. Genuine communists rebutted them in Pravda newspaper they had published. The author mentions that four-fifths of the
workers were influenced by communists. A comparison of articles carried in newspapers would show that liquidators have not truly served the interests of the poor. When war broke out in 1914, newspapers urged the people to defend their own nation.

**Part-2  U Ba Khaing**

**Why wars are waged**

Under this heading, Ba Khaing mentions why England and France went to war. These countries would give the reason that they went to war to defend their nations and not to let the system of democracy collapse in accordance with the common wish, and also to exterminate Hitler and Nazism. The 1914 war was targeted at Kaiser and belligerent Germans. The author believes that on the grounds of democracy and independence, given by them, small countries should be set free from their grip. Otherwise, there would be no country in the war to support England in its wars. Such a situation is to be blamed on England.

**The root-causes of wars**

The fact that capitalists suffered losses led to wars. Were Germany to win the war over Russia and France, it would rally greater strength and turn its target at the British Empire. Another factor is the England cooperated with Germany and Italy to prevent the spread of Russian communism, but Germany has become stronger from this cooperation, and gained a position to harm England. England is also committed to fighting any strong country when it comes to invading its colonial countries. When wars break out on whichever grounds, capitalists benefit from them while the poor perish. Capitalists accumulate profits from sales of weapons, garments, foodstuffs and military ware. That is why capitalists favour wars and the poor dislike them. Small countries helped the British in the Boer War in southern African and the 1914 war.

**The 1914 war**

U Ba Khaing has mentioned that England fought the 1914 war in its interests. Because of its colonial countries, it has accumulated wealth from transport, trade and other businesses. In1900. England invested money in small countries and gained profits from them. Rivalling England, Germany and America have come to be engaged in trade.
America, not a colonialist country, just had to be concerned about the threat of Germany. England and France have occupied small countries that are not militarily strong. Italy and Germany have also annexed some small countries, the number of which is not greater than that of England and France. Hence, England is concerned that Germany might expand its empire by attacking colonial countries under the British and other small countries. England was faced with difficulty in Bowels War in Africa, and so it wished to forge allied countries in Europe. Based on this aim, it went into consultation with Germany, but failed. France also wished to forge alliance with any of England and Germany, and finally, it became an ally of England at the latter’s proposal. From then onwards, France and England shared benefits from their colonial countries. Following Germany’s interference with the colonies of the two countries, Congo in African was forfeited to Germany. England prepared for war against Germany as it believed that Germany would interfere in its affairs. However, newspapers mentioned that England fought Germany for military reasons, not for unfounded hatred. On the other hand, capitalists were well off, making profits from spreading war news, disbursing war costs, and dealing in weapons. England entered into treaty with France to suppress Germany. Again in 1907, England signed a treaty with Russia in preparing for war against Germany. Its plan was suspended owing to the workers’ riots in the nation. In 1914, the world war broke out, stemming from the assassination of Austrian Prince Ferdinand. The root-cause behind this was the rivalry between England and Germany, which was also not on good terms with France and Russia. Before 1914, British Parliament discussed whether England should be involved in the event of a war in Europe. However, when Germany attacked France, England helped defend France on the grounds that Germany posed a threat to its empire. In fact, England, France and Belgium had a secret agreement to attack Germany even if it did not start.

The end of the world war

Towards the end of the war in January 1918, US President Wilson led negotiation to conclude the war, based on 14 reasons. Just as countries with the mere intention of expending territory accepted the proposal England pretended to agree with Wilson as its citizens willed. Despite its initial refusal, Germany was compelled to follow suit because all countries partial to it admitted defeat. Later, not following Wilson’s reconciliation,
Germany suffered losses. The author mentions the 14 reasons Wilson put forward. Allied countries too were overwhelmed with greed and took their shares of German territories by dividing them, after signing Versailles Treaty. Displeased with the allied countries, Germany responded with another attack.

**Russia**

Russian military officers and soldiers were demoralized when Russia lost the war against Germany. The author mentions three causes by which Russia lost the war: (1) Russian soldiers were defiant as they were reluctant to fight, (2) The domestic economy collapsed as workers demanded extremely high wages from the employers, and (3) Rail transport could no longer be controlled. The author believed that the spread of communism following the victory of rebellion against the government plays a great role. Capitalist countries were concerned that communism might dominate all countries. Workers had the same concern that the poor might get more united while rioting against the government. And they would protest against all the aims of the poor at disintegrating workers associations. When action for war was decided by vote, those not in favoured of war won and showed strength by suspending their work. Against this decision, the government was engaged in providing military aid, and so, workers staged boycotts. In this way, workers were said to have brought the war to an end.

**China and Japan affairs**

England, which aimed at colonialism and benefits of capitalists, was aided by America, Russia, Italy, Japan and France in its war against Germany. But the war ended without a clear-cut victory over Germany. As America and Russia stay away from the current war, England is concerned that India and countries in Africa and by the Arabian Sea would do the same. England helped Japan when the latter invaded China. England gave the reason that it helped Japan least communism might spread in China. In return, Japan helped England to gain benefits from China.

**Germany**

Thought Germany was enfeebled by the world war, it was now gained a position to resist the entire world. When Germany invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia, England helped it. Thus, Germany has rallied greater strength. Concerning the aid it gave to
Germany, England said that communism would have spread if Russia had occupied Germany.

**Italy**

When Italy attacked Abyssinia, the League of Nations planned to take action against Italy. The plan failed and Abyssinia fell under Italy as England was lax in its involvement. The reason given by England was that if Italian people rebelled against the government, the rebellion might infect Germany and entire Europe. Another reason had to do with racial problem. In other word, England neglected the affair of Italy in consideration of its own welfare.

**Domestic war in Spain**

The aim of England was totally with France and Italy to oppose Germany. When battles broke out in Spain between the government that espoused communism and rebels controlled by Maj-Gen Franco, England helped the rebels. It planned to help Italy when the latter invaded Abyssinia, but the plan failed. Problems arose between the Spanish government and England because of England's transport of weapons to the rebels. The author has mentioned England's interference in the domestic affairs of Spain.

**Arms reduction**

England, together with other countries, participated in the endeavours for arms reduction. Opposed by the Parliamentary Members, England again ceased its participation. Despite arms reduction talks, owners of arms depots threw out innuendoes against peace activities. Later, England was engaged in military affairs and activities benefiting the government, going against peace objectives. In Britain, most of the MPs, who are capitalists and businessmen, are manipulating the parliament. As arms reduction it against their interests, the Parliament disproved of the peace activities.

**League of Nations**

U Ba Khaing also deals with the League of Nations. Despite its membership including all nations of the world, it did not have the power to effectively prevent unjust issues relating to the economy, politics and finance. Representatives to the League are told to follow the majority decisions, and so are compelled to deceive their nations. The
author says small countries have contributed to the formation of the association, which is actually influenced by big countries.

**Countries under England**

There are numerous countries in Europe, Africa and Asia under the British rule. The British Parliament controlled the governors-general who administered these colonial countries. Capitalist MPs of Britain actually hold the right to make decisions in the affairs of these countries. Citizens of the small nations are deprived of this right. Their control on Burma and India is still worse. When protests are staged against the British government, the power to quell them is given to the governors-general who do not practice democracy. This shows the fact that English are willing to act for their own benefit only. The colonialism of England caused wars in which many poor persons were killed. When these wars ended, soldiers were left jobless. Soldiers were so demoralized that they were not willing to fight in wars. For this some countries have decided not to assist in wars. The declaration of England on the English-German War is not satisfactory to Burma.

**Whom do the wars benefit?**

Wars have left people dead and wounded and their limbs lost. These victims include the poor and some of the middle class. Those belonging to the upper class are free of these troubles and live in luxury.

**Conservative party**

The ruling party in England is Conservative Party. Of the 600 MPs, 400 are Conservative Party members, who are wealthy. They can bear a lot of money in the elections and charity. Without being a capitalist, one cannot be a conservative Party member. As 181 MPs are directors of large companies wars that bring benefits to them are favourable to them. Among the MPs are landlords. All these MPs pay attention only to their welfare.

**Colonialism**

English established East-India Company in India to seek economic gains. Extending trade with China, England made profits from sales to tea.
China

Unable to restrain their greed English brought opium to China, leading to a war between the two countries. England annexed Hong Kong and had the right to trade at five port towns. After the second English-Chinese war, the English got the right to trade along the Yangtze. The author blames the English for Chinese becoming opium-eaters.

Egypt

Egypt, under the rule to Turkey, was persuaded by French and English to dig Suez Canal. Egypt had to pay a lot of interest on the loans it obtained for digging the canal. Imposing of high taxes on the Egyptian people caused internal unrest, Taking advantage of this, English occupied Egypt, which had to contribute two-thirds of the war cost when England attacked Sudan. Merchants of England made profits from growing cotton in Sudan.

Southern Africa

British merchants also enhanced their wealth from southern Africa and along the West sea Coast. They bought tribal people to grow sugarcane, and re-sold them as slaves to sugar makers. About 40 million slaves died on the way. Under the order issued in 1807 banning slave trade, sugarcane framers had to release them while receiving compensation from the English. The farmers made money more from receiving compensation then selling sugar. Hence, the English moved to areas where non-slave trading order was not effective. Many British companies appeared because Africa yielded Mountain toddy-palm (fruit), cocoa, gold and minerals.

Uganda and Kenya

In 1886, England and Germany planned to share the Eastern Africa. With the reason to prevent slave trade, they brought in soldiers and occupied Uganda and Kenya. They sent missionaries first, followed by military forces. The British encroached on all the best land, leaving the rest to the indigenous people. They levied high taxes, and those who could not afford to pay taxes became slaves.

Capitalism

The author blamed the disintegration of Burmese people on capitalism. According
to comments of Karl Marx, there cannot be a capitalist in Burma. There cannot be capitalists in slave countries. The author has provided examples of the perverse mind of the capitalists. In England, capitalists of different classes such as industrialists, landlords and mayors attempted to consolidate their wealth by commuting workers and farmers. At that time, Karl Marx and Engel posed a hindrance to their rapacious acts.

Rebellion of the poor

In England, landlord’s kept slaves for the last 1,000 years. If necessary, the slaves had to serve in the military, Small landlords also had to serve as slaves who were regarded by big landlords as their assets. Around 1500, there was a law against unemployment. A person found jobless was punished. In the second time, his ear was cut, and in the third, he would be killed. In 1547, those unemployed were sued. The person who brought the case to the court had to own them as slaves. Bullied by their masters, slaves demanded rights. In Ireland, slaves who were bullied put up fights, resulting in many deaths.

Conflicts in villages

Conflicts arose between the employer and workers in towns and the landlords and farmers in villages. Big landlords wished to take unjustly the land owned by small landlords. Workers were about to rebel against the employer as their wages were slashed and costs for food and house rentals went up. Lacking in food, the poor went hunting in the rich men’s forests. As a result, the rich men prevented them from their hunting, followed by conflicts between them. The parliament enacted law to punish hunters and to hand down death sentence on workers who rebelled against the employers. Leaders of the farmers were punished for opposing the landlords. Hence, the lower class proposed rights, rejected by the parliament. When it rejected for the second time, the poor decided to stage protests. Soldiers were kept ready to suppress demonstrators. Demands for rights were rejected lest the poor might have the chance to represent at the Parliament. Thus, the poor still remained in slavery. People where seekers of economic gains from the England were present became poorer. Capitalists were concerned that the proletariat might rule the country in Russia. Not to let such a probable case infect other countries, England, France and America thought out plans in cooperation. Americans pretended to be fair, but in fact were torturing Africans. English
and French were concerned about the possible spread of Russian Communism to other countries. Hence, they sent delegates to Germany and Italy for persuasion.

**Lackeys of capitalists**

Capitalists have the power to attract followers, tantalizing them with benefits. In Ireland, capitalists awarded medals and titles to the people just to cause splits among themselves. Those honoured by the capitalists suppressed the others just to please the capitalists. The same occurred in small countries under the rule of England, France and Holland. Capitalists get together in cases of wars and economic activities while the poor were disintegrated. The author also refers to the commerce of capitalists' countries, their oppression of the countries under them, Americas' propagation of their propaganda, interference of Americans in the 1914 war, post-war situation in various countries and the League of Nations manipulated by England and France.

**Future of the Burmese**

When the 1914 World war broke out, the English raised money for war costs by holding gambling games in Burma. In Burma, people sang songs, praying for the victory of allied forces, and monks were offered food and made to pray for the war victory. It was because of the people’s hope that Burma would enjoy something beneficial. People who served in the British army hoped that they would be maintained in a position after the war. When the war ended, all the forces were demobilized. When it was heard on November 11, 1918, that Germany had surrendered, the Burmese were delighted. In India, Gandhi led in assisting England with manpower and finance. People in India had hoped that they would be granted Home Rome when the British won the war. Later, Indian leaders were repentant of their assistance to British because more countries fell under the British rule. Each country had to strive for its own independence. Because the British are focusing only on their welfare, small countries are compelled to seek any means to liberate themselves from the colonialists.

**Assessment**

This book “War and Communism” has presented causes of wars, change of ideologies from one era to another, relations of these ideologies with wars, contradiction
of developing ideologies conceived by the people and those of the capitalists, and the
wish of the poor to adopt communism while rejecting capitalism. By reading this book,
the people will be infirmed of the ploys of the capitalists and the colonialists, aimed only
at enhancing their welfare. Thought the authors have presented facts thoroughly, it is
difficult to understand them because of the lack of correlation between them. However, it
can be said that it is a publication beneficial to readers who would be informed of the
world’s political situations and wars. It is a book that should be thorough read as it has
dealt with situations in small countries under the colonialists. The reader can compare
them with the situation in Burma.
V. Excerpts from the debate in the House of Representatives of the Burmese Parliament on February 23, 1940


1. The resolution put before the House:

Ba Thi’s resolution which was passed (p. 419)
(a) That this House associates itself with the world-wide abhorrence of the aggressive and ruthless Governments in and outside Europe and declares its complete sympathy with the oppressed and weaker nations which are now at the mercy of a few powerful and aggressive states and cannot, unaided, maintain their territorial integrity and independence.
(b) That this House, however, regrets that the British Government has made Burma a participant in the war between Great Britain and Germany without the consent of the Burma and have further, in complete disregard of Burmese opinion passed laws and adopted measures curtailing the powers and activities of the Burma Government.
(c) That this House is of opinion that Government should convey to the British Government, that in consonance with the avowed aims of the present war, it is essential in order to secure the cooperation of the Burmese people that the principles of democracy with adequate safeguards for the preservation of the rights and interests of the minorities, be immediately applied to Burma and her policy be guided by her people and that Burma should be recognised as an independent nation entitled to frame her own constitution and further that suitable action should be taken in so far as it is possible in the immediate present to give effect to that principle in regard to the present governance of Burma.

The amendment which was rejected (p. 416)
Paragraph a) was the same:
(b) This House calls upon the British Government through the Burmese Government to implement in Burma their declared aims in the present war by immediately recognising Burma as an independent nation with the right to frame her own constitution and giving effect to this recognition as far as practicable in the present governance of Burma.
This House dissociates itself from the action of the British Government in declaring Burma a participant in the present war between Great Britain and Germany without the consent of the Burmese people.

This House is opposed to the present war measures and actions taken in Burma which have deprived the Burma Government as well as the people of vital constitutional rights and powers.

2. Two speeches, one by a member of the Freedom, another by a British (pp. 383-388)

U KUN (Bassein Town): Mr. Speaker, the House has been treated by Mr. Ganga Singh to a stream of eloquence which I cannot hope to excel. However, Mr. Ganga Singh is known to his colleagues affectionately and more familiarly as ganja and that is why I suppose he was pretty long in his speech (Laughter). I have the honour to presume, Sir, that you as a veteran politician with whom I had the honour to work together in the old days would agree with me when I say that it is and has all along been the aim and object of responsible politicians in Burma worthy of the name to fight for the absolute freedom of Burma from bondage since the inception of practical politics in Burma. The motions before the House to-day envisage practically the same idea and we should not quarrel merely because that idea is expressed in different wordings.

I presume also that my hon’ble friends, U Ba Thi, U Tun Aung, Dr. Ba Maw and U Ba Hlaing are swayed by the same idea and I am happy to note that even the Myochit Party, as indicated by my, hon’ble friend U Tint, M.H.R. (Bassein District East), say that they are one with us on this question. (The Hon’ble U Saw: Yes.) I am glad that my hon’ble friend, U Saw, has endorsed that it is the view of the Myochit Party. I presume also, Sir, that this not the time when we should try and show to the country that one is better than the other in the mere choice of phraseology. As all of us are fighting for the same end, let us sink all our little differences, if any, and not let our personal egos take the stage.

So far as my limited intelligence goes, Burma has not really been ever conquered. It is the doctrine of Khanti parami (virtue of patience) practised and observed in Burma which has brought Burma to this state. The Burmese Kings adopting this worthy virtue as enjoined by the Buddhistic doctrine allowed all and sundry to come and trade in Burma and gave foreigners more facilities than they should enjoy. The more privileges they get the more they want to have. I would like to charge the old Burmese Kings with lack of foresight and imagination. They should.
have visualised the possibility that greed would play an important part in such matters as except with rahandas, or saints of the Buddhist Order such things as Sondha (desire), Dawtha (anger), Baya (fear of danger), Mawha (illusions) would exist in every individual and every race. Some may be able to withstand the onslaughts of these a little. Such people are not considered to be properly fit for this work-a-day world.

Our Burmese Kings ignoring this possibility or rather probability went on being kind and charitable towards all foreigners in accordance with the Buddhistic ideal of being charitably inclined towards creatures of every race, creed, caste and class. The consequence of this kindness and charitableness to all and sundry is Burma's being taken way from the hands of the Burmese people by practically a sleight of hand trick.

My hon'ble friends, the members of the Nepyidaw Party, might be able to enlighten you further on this point, I hope. So far as rumours go, there is among the Burmese a saying “U Gaung lain htoke-min-set-pyoke” i.e., “owing to U Gaung’s treachery the line of Kings got cut off”. This saying has its origin in the fact that owing to palace intrigues the young Burmese King Thebaw was abducted or kidnapped away and Burma was lost to the Burmese peoples. My friends of the Nepyidaw Party may have a better knowledge than me of these facts and occurrences. Rumour has it that one U Ba Than, a younger brother of the late U Ba Too, C.I.E., was brought tip in a steamer to Mandalay and dressed like a Burmese Prince in order to represent the Nyaungyan Prince whom the Kinwun Mingyi U Gaung wanted to be the then King of Burma in place of the late King Thebaw, as King Thebaw was then following the advice of the Taingda Mingyi in preference to his. In consequence of that King Thebaw was captured and bundled off to India and placed in confinement in Ratnagiri till his death. U Gaung, the Kinwun Mingyi, was bluffed, I presume by the British. Therefore, there was really no war for annexation. What was given out to be war was because a few patriotic Burmans unable to see that Burma should pass into the hands of foreigners massed themselves into bands and fought and they later became known as dacoit gangs and this state of affairs continued for a few years. This is the real account of the annexation of Burma.

The Hon'ble the SPEAKER: Of Upper Burma.

U KUN: Yes, Upper Burma - which I am ashamed to say is sordid one from almost every point of view. I hope all the speeches made in this debate will be sent to the British
This is just a meagre account of how Burma came to pass finally into the hands of the English. As regards our friends the Europeans and die Indians in this House, I would like it to be known that we harbour no feeling of enmity or ill-will towards them. As a Burman Buddhist, I am a strong believer in the doctrine of *Karma* (luck) which comprises both the past and present *Karina*. I do not, however, profess to be such a holy man who has renounced all worldly desires that I can look on with indifference our being trodden under foot all the time.

Now, when Germany attacked Poland, Britain declared through some members of her Cabinet that the “rule of violence must cease and that the perpetual menace to the freedom of nations, great or small, must be removed“ and that “Britain has taken up the challenge and is fighting that all peoples may be free.“ They were statements by Mr. Anthony Eden, British Secretary of State for the Dominions, and by Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, British Secretary of State for the Colonies. Therefore, believing in the declarations by members of the British Cabinet, we have been led to presume that they are out in this war with an altruistic motive.

I will not at this stage go into the stories or rumours of how the Bombay-Burmah Trading Corporation failing in its object to get what it wanted out of Burma according to her own terms and ideas was in a way responsible for getting Burma into the clutches of the British with a few flimsy reasons to back them up.

We have, therefore, in good faith started the propaganda for the freedom of Burma from bondage. It is our own lookout. That was how we came to found the Burma Freedom Bloc. When after the formation of the Burma Freedom Bloc, we forwarded our demands to His Excellency the Governor and the members of the present Burma Cabinet excluding the Hon’ble Captain U Aye, the Judicial Minister, who came into office later, what did the- so-called lovers of the Burmese peoples and Burma as comprised in the present Cabinet do? It. is now history. If you look at the Burma Premier’s communication to the Governor dated the 12th October, 1939, you will sec what it is. And the Governor took care to answer it only and not the country’s demand as put forth by the Burma Freedom Bloc. As the time at our disposal is short, I hope we shall not take up the time of the House longer than is absolutely necessary and have this matter not only discussed here hut decided and the decision sent on to the British Government. Those who try to lengthen the debate unnecessarily will not be serving the peoples of Burma but might even be the spies of those who do not want Burma to get freedom. Whether it should be the restoration of monarchical Government as desired by the *Nepyidaw* Party or democracy as envisaged by the
Americans or the British or. Dictatorships as those in Germany, or Italy or even of Bolshevism as in Russia, it is for the Burmese people to decide for themselves (Hear, hear). If the British declaration that all peoples should be free is to be credited, it follows that those peoples should have a tight to decide their own form of Government. That is all I have to say en this subject.

Mr. L. P. S. B0URNE (Burma Chamber of Commerce):

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a certain air of unreality about this motion. It seems to me that war and war aims are being made an opportunity for the expression of Burmese opinion on the question of constitutional advance. The speeches we have heard are not only unreal but display some confused thinking. Nevertheless, I propose to speak on the resolution as it stands and to say first of all that I have a great deal of sympathy with much that has been said in this House in the course of the debate, but we have to take facts as they are and look at things from a realistic point of view. The first part of Ba Thi’s resolution, I feel sure, will receive the full support of the whole House and in fact it has received the support of all those speakers who have taken part up till now. The ‘war in which the Allies are engaged is one in which the first aim is to break and destroy those powers of evil which seek to dominate the world and to impose on those weaker than themselves the tyrannous rule of force and ruthless brutality. There is no shadow of doubt to which side world opinion generally leans. Never was there a time when a cause was so overwhelmingly right and the opposing forces so essentially evil. Burma too has not been slow to express her abhorrence of those acts of cruelty and violence which at last compelled the democracies of the West to take up arms in defence of the weak and in fact, of all humanity. Speakers to-day have expressed their view in no uncertain terms. Now, Sir, there is something radically inconsistent in the remainder of the resolution which insists that to secure the co-operation of the Burmese people in the Empire's war effort, it is first necessary to make a bargain. They say “Give us immediately our full independence and our fullest co-operation is assured, but withhold our right to full self-Government and we will not help to win this war.“ To my mind it is incredible that co-operation at such a time and in such a struggle can be made conditional. The issues at stake are so vast and of such paramount importance that there is no room for bargaining. I wonder if those who share the same views as the hon’ble mover have ever paused to consider what would be the fate of Burma in the event of the unthinkable disaster of the defeat of the democracies. Burma’s political independence which is within reasonable distance
would be lost for ever. Does anyone imagine that with the protection of the British Empire gone there would be the slightest chance of Burma being allowed to develop her own political genius in peace and quietude? In a world given over to the brutal forces of tyranny and military aggression to the powers of evil and religious persecution how could a small defenceless nation like Burma stand? Those who have read “Mein Kampf“ must know what would be in store for Burma in the event of a German victory.

Let us suppose for a moment that Burma instead of being 8,000 miles away from the seat of the war was situated on the fringe of the war zone in imminent danger of invasion by Germany. What would be the reaction then of those who now make co-operation a bargaining counter? To my mind whether Burma is far removed at the moment from the threat of the horrors of war or whether she were in constant dread of immediate invasion the answer must be the same.

Let this be made quite clear. The successful issue of this war is of as great importance and a defeat of the Western democracies as great a disaster of Burma as for any other unit of the British Empire and for that matter, for the whole world. And let this also be clear. He who is not prepared to stand by the right, and fight for it, is shirking a grave responsibility and this must strike at the very root of Burma’s claim for freedom. For how can the responsibility of freedom - the responsibility of full self-government - be granted to one who puts his sense of duty in one scale and his bargainings, heavily loaded, in the other? That right is on the side of the democracies is admitted by nine-tenths of the world. Nothing would so antagonise opinion - world opinion - nothing would be so damning to Burma’s cause, as hesitation in the present danger to support the right without reservation.

Let me now touch briefly on the constitutional position. Among those matters which under the British Constitution are left to the discretion of the Crown is the power to conduct relations with Foreign States and to make war or peace. Section 2 (1) of the Government of Burma Act, 1935, reads -

All rights authority and jurisdiction heretofore belonging to His Majesty the King, Emperor of India, which appertain or are incidental to the government of his territories in Burma are exercisable by His Majesty except as may be otherwise provided for in this Act.

The position is quite clear. The prerogative power to make war so far as Burma is concerned is with the Crown. It was not a time in September last to enter into a political
controversy with the leaders of Burmese opinion. His Majesty the King had every right to assume the loyal co-operation of all his subjects here in Burma and not least of these members of this House each one of whom has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty.

Burma’s security depends on the might of the British Empire, on those vast resources of wealth and material, on the strength of the military and air forces and above all on the might of the British Navy. It is not sufficiently appreciated here in Burma that beyond payment for the modest internal defences of Burma, Burma contributes nothing to the vast expense of the protective might of the Empire which is ever ready to come to her assistance in case of need. Let it be remembered that Burma spends on national defence only 17 per cent of her national revenue at a time when other nations and other units of the Empire are paying far more for their protection. It is probably not fully realised that the total revenues of Burma for one year from all sources would only pay for the British expenditure on the war for two days (Hear, hear). Is it any wonder that His Majesty’s Government must view with same surprise the failure to assess true values and to see things in proper perspective? The constitutional advance of Burma is a matter far removed from the major issue which confronts us to-day and that is the successful prosecution and conclusion of the war. The constitutional question is no new one, His Majesty’s Government’s policy has been made quite clear, His Majesty’s Government has its responsibilities - not least to those voiceless millions in the towns and villages of Burma whose political education is of the scantiest; whose main desire is to live in peace and security and to carry out their daily tasks without let or hindrance (Hear, hear). It is His Majesty’s Government’s duty to protect their interests, to prevent them becoming pawns in the political game. Political parties of all shades of opinion claim to speak and act for the good of the Burmese people, hut there is no quick and easy road to economic prosperity for the masses, the path is hard and hilly. The cry on all sides for political freedom is formless. A catchword which yet is regarded as the panacea for all evils. It is strange but true that the attainment of political freedom by the revolt of the people against constituted authority has so often led to their complete enslavement. We have two examples in the world to-day. Hitler in the name of freedom for the people led his notional socialists to a victory which has given to Germany a tyranny of autocratic power which the world has seldom seen. The Russian revolution conceived and carried cut with all the panoply of a people’s war and with all the fervour of political idealism has brought to Russia the enslavement of the people to the autocratic will of a brutal oligarchy. Is Burma to follow that road?
U BA HLAING: What about Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill? (Laughter). . .

Mr. L. P. S. BOURNE: Well, I do not know whether U Ba Hlaing considers Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill as members of a brutal oligarchy. I think his comparison is a little wild.

It must be remembered that under our much abused constitution the Burmese people have as great a measure of individual liberty and personal freedom as anywhere in the world - liberty of speech and action, justice and personal security. Let us compare our lot with others that we know - in Germany, Russia and even in Japan. A few weeks ago a Japanese Member of the Diet had the temerity to criticise the policy of his Government in China. He was hounded from the House. Yet here in this House we can discuss the greatest constitutional and political issues without fear of expulsion. I need only instance to-day’s debate.

The hon’ble mover has stated that the principles of democracy with adequate safeguards for the preservation of the rights and interest of the minorities be immediately applied to Burma and her policy be guided by her people. The constitution which Burma has been asked to work fulfils all those conditions. It is a constitution based on the most successful form of democratic government that the world has ever seen. It need not be rigid for ever. Changes will and must come in response to national needs and temperament. It has had three years of trial - what is three years in the constitutional history of a nation? What is three years in the administrative experience of its leaders? I say without any hesitation that so soon as His Majesty’s Government feels that the fortunes of the peoples of Burma, majorities and minorities alike, are safe in the hands of responsible and experienced statesmen there will be no delay in the further transfer of political power. What is the position to-day? A country torn with political strife divided into a multitude of groups and parties whose members’ allegiance is as unstable as the wind. A growing disunity of mind and purpose. A coalition Government which with the best will in the world is unable to devote whole time to the business of governing be use of obstructive and subversive tactics from outside and the continuous need for compromise within. I hope and believe that no one will question my sincerity when I say that we and our community in Burma give place to none in our desire for Burma’s prosperity and its economic and political progress. Looking at things, as it were from outside the political arena, we are firmly convinced that the only hope of political progress lies in an honest attempt to work, the present constitution, so that the development of the final form of responsible and democratic government most suitable for
Burma may in time be forged on the anvil of experience. It was thus the British Constitution grew and developed and it was this that our Dominions built the structure of their own particular forms of democratic government.

I associate myself entirely with the first part of the resolution but equally strongly oppose the intention and the implications of the remaining section. I also entirely oppose the amendments of U Tun Aung. (Applause)
V. Appendices

A SHORT INFORMATION on the MAKING of the BOOK REPORTS

CHosen BOOKS from the bibliography will be provided on a lending basis by the manager [or for people in Myanmar through the Myanmar Book Centre in Yangon (55 Baho Road; telephone 221-271, 212-409)];

TWO REPORTS on each book by different persons are accepted.

LENGTH: 8000 to 12000 words (plus special space, if desired);

LANGUAGE of PUBLICATION: English; manuscripts in Myanmar language will be translated;

CRITERIA (must not slavishly be observed):

1. Biographical information about the author/translator and other contributors;

2. Information about the non-Myanmar sources used in the book; (if the book is a translation, the original English version will be provided, too, if possible;)

3. Summary of the book’s contents;

4. Information about the special aim and intended impact of the book at the time of publication;

5. How are foreign terms and concepts translated or transformed into the Myanmar language and the Myanmar context? (May be omitted!)

6. Personal assessment by the reviewer of the book, its impact on later times and its meaning for today

DEADLINE of DELIVERY of the REPORT: December 31, 2005 (the deadline can be extended);

DELIVERY of the REPORTS DRAFTED: Directly to the manager of the project by email or through the Myanmar Book Centre.

COMMENTS and EDITING: The reports will be commented upon by another person. The reviewer may react on the comments and answer the questions asked as he or she likes. The responsibility for the final editing of the reports is with the project manager.

REWARD: As a financial reward, each reviewer will receive 50 US $ at the time of submitting the book report and 30 US $ after the final editing.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS like recollections of elder people who remember the impact of Nagani on their life and essays on subjects related to the Club (Nagani Song, Nagani Magazine, the role of literature in disseminating knowledge in Myanmar etc.) are very much appreciated.

Hans-Bernd Zöllner (Manager of the Nagani Project)
University of Hamburg - Asian-Africa-Institute
Tel.: 0049-(0)40-8317961- habezett@t-online.de
B - INFORMATION about COMMENTARIES on BOOK REPORTS

1. The commentaries asked for shall serve two aims

(1) First (and most important): To start a dialogue on Myanmar's intellectual and literary heritage between interested people inside and outside of Myanmar;

4. Second (and important, too): To check the clarity of the report with regards to the intended publication.

Therefore, the commentator should be interested in Burma affairs and in the general topic of the respective book but must not know much about its specific content.

2. Length of each commentary: Must not exceed the space of this paper.

3. Some hints that may be useful to observe in writing a commentary:

   1. Are there any questions that are brought up by reading the report?
   2. If yes, what kind of questions do arise?
   3. Are the criteria listed in the “Short information on the making of book reports” (see attachment) met by the book report?
   4. What information on the book report do I find interesting/exciting or unnecessary/redundant?
   5. Is there anything that I would recommend to the author of the report?

4. Delivery of the commentary: It would be appreciated if the commentaries could be sent by email to the above mentioned email address. If the author of the report chooses to react on the commentary, the commentator will be informed.

5. Affairs to come: The publishing of the reports is intended to be the first stage of the Nagani project. All participants will be informed about the development of the project and are invited to participate in future deliberations and activities. Questions and recommendations are very much appreciated.
MYANMAR LITERATURE PROJECT

starting with an investigation into the NAGANI BOOK CLUB

The project's

**Working Papers**

are published by

the **Department for Southeast Asian Studies** of **Passau University**

Already Published:

No. 10:1, An Introduction into the Nagani Book Club

No. 10:1.1, Additional Material on Nagani

No. 10:2, Thein Pe, Saya Lun and Member of Parliament

No. 10,3: Ba Hein, *The World of Capitalists*

No. 10,4: Thein Pe, *Students’ Boycotter*

No. 10,5: Ba Khaing, *Political History of Burma*

No. 10,6: Nu, *Gandalarit*

No. 10,7: Mogyo, *José Rizal*

No 10,100: Papers Presented at the Burma Studies Conference, Singapore 2006

----------------

Some Nagani Books

were scanned and are available on CD.

For details contact

habezett@t-online.de

----------------

All Working Papers published until now are available at

http://www.zoellner-online.org/mlp.htm

and at the Online Burma Library

INVITATION

Readers are invited to participate in the project by

- writing **comments and criticisms** on the contents of this and other volumes of this series;
- contributing **essays** on Burmese/Myanmar literature as a medium between the international world and Burmese society;
- providing **material** that sheds more light on the Nagani Book Club, its context and impact on Burmese intellectual and literary life;
- offering **assistance** as translators and commentators of book reports.

For contributions and questions, please contact:

Dr. Hans-Bernd Zöllner
University of Hamburg and Passau
Riemenschneiderstieg 14
D 22607 Hamburg
GERMANY
Tel: 0049-40-8317961
Fax: 0049-40-84051735
Mail: habezett@t-online.de