



People by nature universally optimistic



At the country level, optimism is highest in Ireland, Brazil, Denmark, and New Zealand and lowest in Zimbabwe, Egypt, Haiti and Bulgaria. The United States ranks number 10 on the list of optimistic countries.

KANSAS CITY, 25 May — Despite calamities from economic recessions, wars and famine to a flu epidemic afflicting the Earth, a new study from the University of Kansas and Gallup indicates that humans are by nature optimistic. The study, to be presented 24 May, 2009, at the annual meeting of the Association for Psychological Science in San Francisco, found optimism to be universal and borderless.

Data from the Gallup World Poll drove the findings, with adults in more than 140 countries providing a representative sample of 95 percent of the world's population. The sample included more than 150,000 adults.—Internet

Mockingbirds in fickle climates sing fancier tunes

Northern Mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*). A large-scale study of mockingbirds in diverse habitats reveals that species in more variable climate also sing more complex tunes.



RALEIGH, 25 May — Why are some birds simple singers and others vocal virtuosos? Researchers at the National Evolutionary Synthesis Center (NESCent), the Cornell Lab of Ornithology, and McGill University suspect that inconsistent climates may play a role.

A large-scale study of mockingbirds in diverse habitats reveals that species in more variable climates also sing more complex tunes. "As environments become more variable or unpredictable, song displays become more elaborate," said Carlos Botero, a postdoctoral researcher at NESCent in Durham, NC. NESCent is an NSF-funded collaborative research center operated by Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State University.—Internet

Trial against American citizen Mr. John William Yettaw, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma Ma continues for sixth day

NAY PYI TAW, 25 May — The trial against American citizen Mr. John William Yettaw, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma Ma continued at the court of Yangon North District for the sixth day today.

The court heard the statement of prosecution witness Police Lt-Col Zaw Min Aung in connection with the Criminal Case No 47/2009.

Cross-examined by U Nyan Win, Lawyer of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, prosecution witness Police Lt-Col Zaw Min Aung said the restricting sections 148 (c), 157, 158, 159 (a), 159 (b) and 160 that he stated during the previous hearing are prescribed in the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Myanmar. As Daw Aung San Suu Kyi violated the restriction and prohibition order, lawsuit was filed against her. Though he stated that receiving a foreigner, conversing with him and providing food to him are within the right of a person according to the section 159 (a) concerning the question that if there is no definition of those words, definition of the right and definition of the personal right in the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Myanmar, he would say they are prescribed in the law. As she is restricted for personal security under section 160, she violated the provision on legal protection to be provided for her in connection with the security of correspondence and other means of communication.

Asked by U Hla Myo Myint, Lawyer of Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma Ma (a) Ange Lay, Prosecution witness Lt-Col Zaw Min Aung in connection with Criminal Case filed against Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma Ma (a) Ange Lay, said in his statement that he did not consider that Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma Ma (a) Ange Lay are ordinary citizens who don't understand the procedure of the government; but he knew that they are living in a house with a person who is under restrictions. Asked whether they can understand the details of the prohibition order and the restriction order imposed on Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, he replied they can understand these orders as they share a house with a person who is under the prohibition and restriction orders.

When cross-examined by U Nyan Win, the lawyer of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Police Col Win Naing Tun, the witness called in for the second time, stated that, regarding the foreigner entering the house on 30 November, 2008, if no one asked what things were left, it was reported to our superior officers according to the 4 December 2008 statement by Dr Tin Myo Win; that the intrusion was not stated exactly and in full detail at that time; that the four people, including Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, were being sued for breaking the prohibition order not to contact people outside by letter or by phone if they were not being sued for corresponding with people outside; that they were being sued for receiving letters from outside and contacting people outside by letter; that there was systematic receiving and keeping of the book given by Mr John William Yettaw when he entered the house for the first time if the things confiscated from the house of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi were the things left by Mr John William Yettaw of his own accord; and that, if the entry of the foreigner into the house of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi on 30 November 2008 and on 3 May 2009 was illegal, he entered the house secretly and illegally.

When cross-examined by U Hla Myo Myint, the lawyer of Daw Khin Khin Win and Ma Win Ma

Ma, Police Col Win Naing Tun stated that, if there had not yet been any report about Mr John William Yettaw's intrusion of the house, he was being sued not for house intrusion but in accordance with an immigration act.

When cross-examined by U Nyan Win, the lawyer of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Police Captain Sa Kyaw Win, the witness called in for the second time, stated that, in having to carry out the order of superior officers, it was true that a police officer had the right to act and had to act only in accordance with the law.

When cross-examined by U Nyan Win, the lawyer of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Police Captain Tin Zaw Tun stated that it was true if he led searching the house of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi on the morning of 7 May; it was also true that there had not yet been any First Information Report on that day; and that, if the statement that Daw Aung San Suu Kyi took responsibility for the things entrusted to her meant taking responsibility as an entrusted person and not for the case, it meant that she took responsibility for the things left by Mr John William Yettaw and the things given by him as presents.

Of the persecution witnesses, the remaining ones were questioned in accordance with the provisions enumerated in Section 256 of the Criminal Law.

In his statement, Investigating Officer Police Captain Than Soe of the Special Branch said that he was a police captain (investigator) from the prosecution division of the Special Branch; that on 11 May, Bahan Police Station was assigned duties to investigate the case as (Crime) 301/09 in connection with Section 22 of the Law to Safeguard the State Against the Dangers of Those Desiring to Cause Subversive Acts and Section 109 of Criminal Law; that he started to question some witnesses in relation to the case the same day; that the following day that is 12 May; he questioned some police member witnesses and chairmen of Ward Peace and Development Councils concerned; that the same day Police Captain Maung Maung Myint handed over the items he had seized from Mr John William Yettaw along with the search form, and Police Captain Tin Zaw Tun, the evidences he had seized from Daw Aung San Suu Kyi along with the search form, and the search warrant to search her house and the report to confirm the warrant and he accepted the items; that on 13 May, he questioned the witnesses in connection with the search of the room of Beauty Land Hotel (2) where Mr John William Yettaw had put up, and received the search form and exhibits handed over by Police Captain Sa Kyaw Win; that on 14 May, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Daw Khin Khin Win, Ma Win Ma Ma and Mr John William Yettaw were arrested, and under the lawsuit No. 263/2009 filed by Bahan Police Station, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, under Section 22 of the Law to Safeguard the State Against the Dangers of Those Desiring to Cause Subversive Acts, and Daw Khin Khin Win, Ma Win Ma Ma and Mr John William Yettaw, under Section 22 of the Law to Safeguard the State Against the Dangers of Those Desiring to Cause Subversive Acts and Section 109 of Criminal Law, were sued at the court of Yangon North District.

The district law officer submitted that 15 of the 23 prosecution witnesses in connection with criminal case No. 47/2009 of Yangon North District Court had been questioned, and so the remaining eight prosecution witnesses would not be questioned.

Hearings will be continued at 10 am on 26 May, it is learnt.—MNA