

Burma in the Crosshairs of Global Capital: The Former Military Junta of Burma as a Rational Response to Neo-Imperialist Manipulation

Matthew Raphael Johnson
(published originally in 2005, revised 2016)

Some big neo-colonialist countries, who want to dominate and manipulate Myanmar, are trying to destroy the spirit of national solidarity in order to weaken the country and put it under their influence... Taking advantage of their superiority in science and technology, these big nations are trying to dominate the developing nations politically, economically, socially, and culturally (General Tan Shwe, 2001)

Preface

While editor of The Barnes Review, I began researching the truth about the news media's condemnation of the military government of Burma.¹ Usually, when the reports of human rights abuses are lurid and concern an enemy of the USA with oil, they're usually lies. "Johnson's Law" applies. This law, named for myself, states that "the more obscure a country, the more easily authorities can lie about it." This can also be re-formulated as "the more obscure the country, the more journalists and politicians feel free to lie about it" since so few can refute their claims. Even more, one can say "the more obscure a country, the easier it is for rumor to circulate with little refutation."

As a professional historian, I claim no expertise on Burma as a nation outside of these later 20th century issues. Certainly, more specialized study of Burma's history can add much to this essay. I took on this task due to the fact that no one else would. While no expert on Burma (while so few are), I am an expert in comparative government and nationalism.

Since I initially wrote most of the article in 2005, this CIA backed Aung San Suu Kyi has taken over as the chief executive of the country. Military rule has officially come to an end and the generals have voluntarily handed over power, as Pinochet did decades ago. Claiming that she will be "above the president," she, or more accurately, her corporate sponsors and the CIA, have already set about sending her opponents to prison.

As might be expected, it is only outside establishment sources that one will find any criticism of the party line. Tony Cartalucci has also been skeptical of endless media tirades against the military government. In fact, other than myself, he has been the only one publicly casting doubt in the familiar "color revolution" fraud in Asia and in this case, the Burmese "Saffron Revolution." Based in Thailand, he cites a report from the UK-based "Burma

1 The government has renamed the country "Myanmar." Like Kampuchea before in Cambodia, these renaming schemes are irritating and unnecessary. They never make the point that the government is trying to project and it leads to nothing but confusion. Both these "new" names are irritating to me and hence, I continue to use the older "Burma." "Kampuchea" never quite took in Cambodia, I'm happy to notice, though this might have something to do with it being Pol Pot's preferred name for his country.

Campaign” (part of the Soros empire) that states:

The National Endowment for Democracy has been at the forefront of our program efforts to promote democracy and improved human rights in Burma since 1996. We are providing \$2,500,000 in FY 2003 funding from the Burma earmark in the Foreign Operations legislation. The NED will use these funds to support Burmese and ethnic minority democracy-promoting organizations through a sub-grant program. The projects funded are designed to disseminate information inside Burma supportive of Burma’s democratic development, to create democratic infrastructures and institutions, to improve the collection of information on human rights abuses by the Burmese military and to build capacity to support the restoration of democracy when the appropriate political openings occur and the exiles/refugees return.

NGOs are merely forms of elite control. There is no major NGO that is not backed either by governments or corporate elites. Most often, it is both. More than anything else, “color revolutions” are about economics. The west is so deeply in debt that financing any imperialist venture is impossible. Hence, they create a nation's opposition and use that to strip the assets of the country. As the west fails catastrophically, its elite need to take the equity of the globe to buttress itself. Those who deny that this is just a newer form of imperialism are either incompetent or dishonest.

The truth is quite different. Dripping with oil and sitting atop trillions in gems and precious metals, Burma has been a target of global elites for decades. Under a military government that can only be called Social Nationalist, the country has done fairly well given its position and ongoing civil war with Islamic and other groups in the country. Economic growth in Burma has been steady and impressive under the circumstances.

Background: The Rhetorical Overkill of the World's Elite

It is regularly asserted that the military government in Burma is one of the most repressive in the world. Accusations fly about the “economic stagnation” of the country, its falsely purported involvement in the heroin trade, and its endless civil wars between ethnic separatists and the junta's highly experienced military. However, this article will show that all of this is largely an orchestrated hate campaign being run by the U.S. Department of State, the CIA, Israel and George Soros for the benefit of the global elite.

Aung San Suu Kyi's victory means that the banks and corporations of the western world now control the executive branch of government. Media reports now speak of the “rebirth” of Burma and claim that her recent economic growth can be attributed to this change of leadership.

George Soros' Open Society Institute said this about the junta in 2006:

Gross violations are part of a broader ongoing suppression of other fundamental freedoms. Today, the most basic of globally recognized civil and political rights are not respected by Burma's generals, despite the fact that Burma is signatory to several of the most important international human rights treaties. There is no freedom of expression. Even art exhibitions must be approved by military authorities. Beyond sports and romance magazines, the few independent

publications that survive are subject to severe censorship. The regime's Press Scrutiny Board orders article seven obliquely critical of official actions inked over or torn from offending issues, while state newspapers are filled with crudely virulent attacks on democratic forces (Burma: Country in Crisis; reprinted at Burma Campaign UK, 2006).

"Johnson's Law" is very important here since so few speak the majority language. How can this be verified? There are many political parties in Burma, some supporting the government and others opposing it. It is not a one party government. The U.S. State Department has this to say in its "human rights" report on Burma in January of 1998:

The government's longstanding severe repression of human rights continued during the year. Citizens continued to live subject at any time and without appeal to the arbitrary and sometimes brutal dictates of the military dictatorship. Citizens do not have the right to change their government. The SLORC has given no sign of a willingness to cede its hold on absolute power. There continue to be credible reports, particularly in ethnic minority-dominated areas, that soldiers committed serious human rights abuses, including extrajudicial killings and rape. Disappearances continued, and members of the security forces beat and otherwise abused detainees. Prison conditions remained harsh. Arbitrary arrests and detentions continued for expression of dissenting political views. Many hundreds—if not more—political prisoners remained in prison, including approximately 31 parliamentarians elected in 1990. Since May 1996, at least 340 persons have been arrested and imprisoned for political reasons, and may remain in prison at year's end. The judiciary is subject to executive influence, and the government infringes on citizens' rights to privacy (Department of State, 1998).

Human Rights Watch made a statement on August 20, 2004, to the Development Committee of the European Union that included this hyperbolic opening paragraph:

The human rights situation in Burma remains appalling. Burma is the textbook example of a police state. Government informants and spies are omnipresent. Average Burmese people are afraid to speak to foreigners except in the most superficial of manners for fear of being hauled in later for questioning or worse. There is no freedom of speech, assembly or association. State TV and radio are merely a crude propaganda tool of the regime, merely recounting what the top generals did on any given day. To read the English language New Light of Myanmar is to understand what George Orwell feared when he wrote 1984 (HRW, 2004).

Amnesty International (AI), in its 1999 country report for Burma, had this to say about its human rights situation:

More than 1,200 political prisoners arrested in previous years, including 89 prisoners of conscience and hundreds of possible prisoners of conscience, remained in prison throughout the year. Hundreds of people were arrested for

political reasons. Political prisoners were tortured and ill-treated, and held in conditions that amounted to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Members of ethnic minorities continued to suffer human rights violations, including extrajudicial executions, torture, ill treatment during forced portering and other forms of forced labor and forcible relocations. Six political prisoners were sentenced to death. No executions were known to have taken place (AI, 1999).

The International Crisis Group has been spearheading the intellectual and journalistic assault on Burma. In 2001, the ICG states in its very title: “The Military Regime’s View of the World.” One chapter is titled “Paranoia.” They wrote this statement in 1999:

During four decades of military rule, Myanmar’s leaders have grown increasingly inward-looking and alienated. They are driven by an obsession with national sovereignty to seek almost total autonomy from international influences. The hallmark of a foreign policy driven by insecurity has been self-reliance. Since 1962, military leaders have insisted that Myanmar, as much as possible, do things its own way and rely on its own resources. They perceive their country and its problems to be not only unique, but also essentially unfathomable to outsiders. They also exhibit a clear lack of understanding of international affairs and the motivations, and values of other nations (ICG, 1999: 1).

One might forgive the former military government if they are a bit suspicious of the west and its motives. Gen. Maung Aye states in response to all this,

Seen from our perspective, security entails non-interference in internal affairs and freedom from external pressures. Security is synonymous with the basic right to choose freely one’s own political, economic and social systems and to determine one’s future at one’s pace and in accordance with cherished values and ideals (Quoted in the ICG report above, 1-2).

This is explicitly called “paranoia” by the ICG and is echoed by AI and Soros. African governments were saying almost identical things in the 1960s to the cheers of the left. Suddenly, colonialism is chic. In their “Recommendations,” the world’s elite, speaking through ICG, say that they will “Encourage a debate with all political groups on how the country might improve its economy without exposing itself to the feared side-effects of globalisation” (3). In other words, try to convince them that globalization has nothing to do with free trade. They are speaking of manipulating these “ignorant peasants.” Is this too harsh? Another “Recommendation” says that they must “Improve availability in Burmese and minority languages of texts that might assist in developing a diverse, tolerant society and a democratic political system and improve understanding of international systems.” In a condescending attitude from these corporate liberals, we hear that these military leaders are mentally ill and too ignorant to be taken seriously:

Paranoid thinking – a simplistic belief system that leads the person to perceive a world of enemies and to interpret all new information in a way that confirms that image – is evident in frequent claims [from the state] that Western powers (neo-

colonialists) are trying to destabilise the country and exercise economic and cultural hegemony.²

Speaking of the military's distrust of the west. They write: “These reactions, coupled with consistent rhetoric over four decades, suggest a real psychological distortion.” Throughout the report, there is a sense that the government and population as a whole are too ignorant to understand the complexities of international politics and they, the world's corporate elite, must teach them. Strangely, these very arrogant statements have not been denounced as “racist” by the left. It is very difficult to read this report, so condescending and arrogant – it shows a very different side of the corporate elite. The left will use racism if the group in question does not serve it.

The ICG lists these corporations as its main supporters: APCO Worldwide Inc., Atlas Copco AB, BG Group plc, Chevron, Edelman UK, Equinox Partners, HSBC Holdings plc MetLife, Shell, Yapı Merkezi Construction and Industry Inc. Among its foundation support can be found: Adessium Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Global Dialogue, Henry Luce Foundation, Humanity United, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Open Society Foundations, Open Society Initiative for West Africa, Ploughshares Fund, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Tinker Foundation, Inc. Looking at similar lists from Amnesty International, there is no question that these groups are simply the “activist” arm of the corporate elite and cannot be seriously disconnected from it.³

There are literally hundreds of organizations dedicated to spreading such propaganda about Burma. However, the Burmese government and scholars sympathetic to the military government have not been silent. Though it received no attention in the media, a major academic conference was called in Rangoon, the capital of Burma, under the auspices of the Burmese Foreign Service. It was entitled “Seminar on the Understanding of Myanmar,” and it dealt specifically with the economic situation as well as the human rights record of the military government. The seminar was called precisely to debunk many of the myths the western press and academic establishment had been parroting for years. Many of the facts and statistics come from this conference, but the paper does not totally reply upon it.

The “Color Revolution” Script

The reporting and academic lecturing are at a very low level of sophistication in the Color Revolution scheme. The usage of western ideological labels, the assumption of linear history and a single standard of “human rights” that is identical to liberalism are all aspects of this manipulation of reality. All is forced into the western liberal categorical schema. The monstrous amounts of money that the elites put into this make it impossible for academics and writers to resist, so they parrot the line, soon believing it themselves. The truth is that politics is never so simple, never so neatly divided and liberalism is not identical to “human rights.” Cartalucci wrote as early as 2011:

-
- 2 This is not the definition of paranoia. The term comes from the Greek “para” that is, “in excess of” and “nous” or reason. It refers to the state of mind of the author of this very passage: the demand that the world conform to one's ideological categories. It is the pathological condition where these categories take on a life of their own and filter all information, leaving only facts that conform to them. The authors of that piece most certainly qualify. The Burmese army, on the other hand, have done nothing other than to recount the facts.
 - 3 This list can be found almost without alteration among the major NGOs that are involved in “color revolutions” around the globe. This removes any doubt that the elite of the elite are involved in destroying these societies. Disagreement at this point comes from dishonesty only.

Aung San Suu Kyi has been leading the Myanmar "pro-democracy" opposition for over a decade and has garnered support from every globalist cadre, think-tank, and organization imaginable. In addition to the now fully discredited Nobel Peace Prize, she was also a finalist in the Chatham House Prize 2011, and not surprisingly a benefactor of corporate-funded, duplicitous "pro-bono" legal service Freedom Now. Aung San Suu Kyi herself, was born into an immensely wealthy and politically well connected family. She studied abroad, worked for the UN in New York City, and received a Ph.D from the University of London before returning to Myanmar to lead the "pro-democracy" movement. Whatever her convictions may really be, the West has fully hijacked her movement as a means of removing the current military junta and replacing it with one more conducive to their corporate agenda, which most assuredly has nothing to do with "democracy for the people."

The western "color revolution" scheme is really the imposition of a simplistic morality play onto complex political events. As with all of these schemes, there is a "good guy." This is usually a lovable leader (such as Nelson Mandela) that receives nothing but positive media coverage. Any negative views are squashed or explained away. They are granted a super-human status. This also includes the movement they head. These movements are always and without exception organized and granted their ideological platform by western corporate elites. Their protest signs are often in English and they are comprised almost exclusively of upper middle class youth.

The "good guys" are always peaceful and the "regime" or "ruling party" always engages in irrational actions to destroy them. In Ukraine, for example, it was said that "snipers" were shooting protesters "at random" during the protests of 2014. This, of course, makes no sense from the government's point of view. The gunmen have been shown to be from the NGOs themselves. It would make no sense to shoot random protesters since a) it would be totally ineffective in such a mass-riot situation b) it would be sure to receive the harshest condemnation in the western press and c) might destroy the government's domestic support.

In Syria, to use another example, the absurd story of the government's use of chemical weapons in their own capital city while they were winning was particularly silly and has long been discredited. However, "experts" in academia and journalism continue to recycle this old yarn as truth.

If there is a "good guy," there must also be a "bad guy." In this case, it is a military government that, in English, had the acronym of SLORC. Straight out of Hollywood, like ISIS, it is the typically harsh sounding "bad guy name." The bad guys from Milosevic to Qaddafi, are incapable of goodness and are irredeemably evil.

One aspect of the "color revolution" nonsense is that once the new regime has been installed, it usually drops out of the news quickly. This is because the new regime exists to keep order while western bankers strip the nation of its assets and reduce it to a highly specialized raw materials exporter. Western-sponsored "revolutions" have, without fail, ended in misery and destruction: South Africa, Egypt, Yugoslavia, the USSR, Libya and South Africa are just five examples, and Burma will soon join them. They all ended in the same pit of disintegration.

The "color revolutions" therefore, only concern the stripping of a nation's assets. "Privatization" is little more than the transfer of ownership from local authorities to global elites,

who then liquidate these forms and take whatever equity has been invested. The state sector has performed well in Burma. Its purpose is to maintain a populist course that keeps land from being concentrated in banks or other corporate owners. That is what “democracy” means in the west and non-western societies, Russia included, see “democracy” as an economic rather than as a political category.

The Successes of the Military Government

Burma has looked to China and Russia for investment and trade at the expense of the US and her allies. At the same time, Burma is potentially very wealthy: loaded with natural resources, oil, a strategic position and fertile soil. The strong role of the state, among other things, keeps foreign multinationals at bay. In a 2015 article in Forbes, we read:

Indeed Myanmar’s wealth of natural resources, its youthful, inexpensive workforce and its strategic location between Asia’s two rising powers, India and China, have captivated foreign investors. Within a year of the start of reforms, foreign investment in the country’s energy, transportation, tourism, retail, and telecommunications industries has surged by over 40%. Last year saw a 150% leap, reaching a peak of some \$3.5 billion (Zehorai, 2015).

Burma is primarily an agricultural economy. Roughly 75 percent of the population of 45 million is engaged in agricultural pursuits of farming, livestock breeding and fishing. For irrigation purposes, the Burmese military government has constructed over 100 dams since 1991, with several dozen more on the way. As the civil wars began to peter out as the 1990s wore on, agricultural investment rapidly increased. With this, the military government has substantially liberalized trade and introduced market reforms within the country. From 1988 to 1992, the number of acres tilled went from 20 million to 28 million and the methods used have become more efficient.

Even more striking, unlike the West, where farming is dominated by the state and huge farm conglomerates, Burma has maintained, as a matter of policy, the predominance of the family farm. Roughly each farming family cultivates about 10 acres. Landlordism is largely unknown. Today, Burma is largely self-sufficient in food and her economic policy should be more closely followed by the U.S. agricultural policy makers, dominated by major firms such as Archer-Daniels-Midland and ConAgra. The military government’s greatest economic victory might well be in maintaining this decentralized form of landownership.

In terms of industry, the government of Burma has decided that the best policy is to maintain local control over industrial inputs. Therefore, the government, instead of relying heavily on foreign loans, has itself seeded the industrial ground by setting up 18 industrial regions where both the state and local industrialists have been able to work together to build a modern infrastructure. The increases in agricultural production have helped very much in bringing this sort of autarky about.

George Soros began his anti-government agitation in response to the nationalist government’s decisions in this regard. The policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank have been flouted by the government of Myanmar, and, as in the cases of Belarus and Malaysia, economic growth has been increasing steadily. As of 2000, GDP growth has been roughly 5 percent yearly, which is certainly respectable, but is likely understated due to much unofficial trade and investment common within the Third World. Therefore, a solid guess

might be more along the lines of 8 percent GDP growth yearly. GDP growth in 2011 was 6%, and it reached 9% over the next two years. Burma's economic performance has been substantial.⁴

The unemployment rate is a respectable 5 percent. Unfortunately, the Burmese government is struggling with inflation, currently running at about 20 percent yearly. Hence, when Forbes writes that “The flood of foreign investment, consumption and exports has produced record growth: an average of 8% over the past two years,” they are writing from pure ignorance. This was the normal rate of growth under the military government as well.

From 1999 to 2004, GDP growth averaged 12%. In 2004, gross capital formation was at 24.3%. Burma is frustrating because there are so many gaps in the record. Income distribution and poverty has a blank record in the World Bank's chart. Life expectancy was 60 20 years ago, but is now 66. Unemployment averages 3% during this time. While patchy, fixed capital formation has increased impressively during this time reaching a high of 29% in 2003 and a low of 6.1% in 2001. Many years do not have data reported.

Burma is one of the few states that has accepted the “import substitution” model of development. International capitalism fought the existence of import substitution due to the fact that it removed substantial markets. The development of local industry is subsidized by the state so as to minimize dependence upon foreign sources of production and importantly, capitalization.

Popular in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s, international financial institutions did their best to force these countries open rather than see market share go to local (and smaller) units of production. Roughly 70 percent of Burmese industry is controlled by local and small firms. This fact is another reason why the “international community” has come down so hard on Burma in particular.

Today, only a handful of the world's Third World populations practice import substitution. The rejection of this method of capitalization is required by the IMF as a condition for receiving loans and other forms of assistance. The vision behind import substitution and the state's financing of infrastructure and capitalization is to prevent the country from being a colony of China, Japan or South Korea, never mind the predatory policies of American and British capitalists.

For the military government, it is clear, sovereignty means what it says. A formal political independence means nothing if your nation is little more than a place where the more advanced economies come for their raw materials. The point of maintaining a state directed economy is to maintain sovereignty. Japan, Taiwan and South Korea developed very similar models in their rise to First World status; there is no difficulty in Burma doing the very same thing. Many reading this might object to the massive role of state institutions in the development of the economy. Gen. Ne Win, one of the architects of Burma's Nationalist Socialism said,

Burma regained political independence on 4 January 1948. Although Burma became politically independent, the economy of the country was not in the hands of the Burmese. The wholesale business and financial business were all in hands of foreigners. The Burmese had only a little share in retail business. An independent nation may be politically independent but its independence is not complete if we cannot decide for ourselves economic matters and if we cannot control it ourselves. If its economy is not strong, there is the danger of being controlled and manipulated by others as freely as they like. When did we remove this danger? It was at the advent of the Revolutionary Council in 1962 (cited in

4 All statistics come from the World Bank's very useful interactive database.

Taylor, 2015: 506)

It should be noted that Burma is a country surrounded by economically powerful neighbors such as China, Malaysia, India, Korea and Taiwan. All of these countries either border Burma or are only a short distance away. Burma is clearly an attractive country for the extraction of raw materials, which is a surefire method for the development of dependency.

It bears noticing that the question of dependency is a major one among members of the junta. If Burma was to open its markets to foreign capital to any great extent, not only would the economy quickly become the domain of foreign powers, but also domestically, the development of large, concentrated forms of capital would be encouraged. Therefore, the stress on local control of business and small family farms necessitates a policy of keeping the predatory global capitalist powers at bay.

The connection between foreign capital penetration and the destruction of smaller and more local forms of production has been demonstrated in the Latin American case in the 1980s when import substitution was abandoned. Today, much of Latin America is drowning in debt and sinking even further into Third World status.

Another major area of development is local infrastructure. Here again, the state has taken a major role in its development. A modern economy cannot function outside of basic infrastructural mechanisms like railroads, bridges and highways. However, the public construction of houses and hospitals is also proceeding apace under military control.

Unfortunately, decades of war with local tribesmen have retarded development in many out-of-the-way rural districts. Since those wars were won by the Burmese military (making it, by the way, one of the most battle hardened and experienced in the world), the economy has been increasingly opened since 1990. There is good reason to hold that much of Burma's rejection of the outside world was because the generals realized that western aid would benefit their opponents. The wars needed to be won before reforms can be successfully implemented nationwide.

The literacy rate rose to 91 percent in 2003, up from roughly 70 percent a decade before. The number of universities has risen from 32 to 150 since 1988. Ironically, it is within the university sector where the bulk of the opposition to the military government originates. The percentage of children in elementary education is about 93 percent as of last year, with a retention rate of about 60 percent, which is a first class figure for a struggling Third World nation.

Contrary to the State department and other western actors, the Burmese state has been a success in developing the country. From 1999 to 2004, GDP growth averaged 12%. In 2004, gross capital formation was at 24.3%, showing a tremendous growth in economic life (WTO, 2014). Most of this has been from small and medium sized industries. This not only improves economic fortunes but also maintains a social equality needed for social cohesion. The World Trade Organization agrees:

Around 99% of Myanmar's 43,275 registered enterprises are SMEs. Most registered SMEs, (63%) are in the food and beverage industry (Table 3.14). In addition, there is a large share of unregistered informal SMEs; for example, SMEs in trade and services are usually not registered. The authorities estimate that over 80% of all businesses in Myanmar are informal, most are family-owned or self-employed (WTO, 2014).

This remains one of the most important indicators of development. GDP and the GINI index all have their place, but the growth of small business and the existence of many small landholders is absolutely essential for any legitimate government to exist or any social stability to be had for long. Freedom comes from security. The military government has insisted that SMEs should be dominant and have structured their regulatory code accordingly. Now with the “democratic forces” running things the smallholders will be destroyed as Burma becomes opened to international investment. Responding to the demand for “competitiveness,” wages will fall and companies will consolidate.

Human Rights, Drugs and Pretentiousness

Part of the reason for the Burmese obsession with territorial integrity is that Burma is a country divided into 14 states, each state following roughly ethnic lines. Therefore, the system in Rangoon is understandably concerned about secessionist tendencies. Thus, the state has curtailed the sort of political protests that might lead to secession and has accused the American CIA of fomenting political unrest in Myanmar’s ethnic territories. Again, Burma was the creation of British imperialism; the current government merely inherited it.

Concerning the human rights situation in Burma, several specific charges are common. The first is the use of child soldiers. This has been quiet as of late, when it was learned by groups such as Amnesty International that Burma does not even have a draft, such as Israel or Russia do. The minimum age to enlist in the Burmese armed forces, like the rest of the world, is 18. There was little the “human rights” groups could do about this, and the issue was quietly dropped. However, it should be noted that many of the narco-terrorist operations within Burma’s borders, as well as the ethnic insurgencies (often financed by outside powers) only recently quieted down, do in fact use child soldiers.

Many of the original accusations of the use of children in wartime derived from army deserters in Thailand. When a narco-terror squad took an entire hospital hostage, its leaders were two 10-year-old twins, Johnny and Luther Htoo (Win, 2004). However, some of the Burmese military’s responses to many terror assaults against the country were not received at Western capitals in the same manner that George W. Bush’s responses were received in the United States, for example. Burma, in spite of her three decade war on narco-terror, is still not given even the slightest credit for being a partner in this worthy endeavor.

Another major and slanderous accusation hurled against Burma is that it sanctions and encourages forced labor. What the Soros-funded non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the college-girl airheads do not realize is that in 2001-2002, the government in Rangoon invited a high-level delegation of the ILO (the UN convention against forced labor) to Burma to conduct investigations concerning this practice. The group was called a Technical Cooperation Mission and was led by Ninian Stephen, the former governor general of Australia. The mission found no evidence of forced labor (Win, 2004).

The question of drug trafficking is another matter of grave interest. It is stated regularly that Burma engages in this practice, or at least that specific military personnel do. It is common enough among the anti-Burma crowd, but the charges are deliberately vague. Again, many pertinent details are left out. To begin, British colonial rule tolerated and profited from poppy cultivation and deliberately set up opium dens in the major cities at a huge profit to themselves.

Therefore, when Burma achieved independence in 1948, there was already an entrenched drug culture in the country. Making matters worse, the anti-communist Chinese forces, driven

out by Mao the same year, placed themselves in the northern mountains, also giving themselves over to drug dealing to support their efforts. Furthermore, many of the ethnic insurgencies were not ethnic at all, but ethnicity was used as a cover for the true interest of the war, namely the existence of narco-terror squads who became fabulously wealthy.

Some of these still exist today, and some of them are actually the source of the “human rights abuse” stories the Western press accepts without a scintilla of criticism. As if this was not enough, the Chinese-supported Burmese Communist Party has funded its own insurgency with opium and heroin money. Clearly, the government had its hands full with the drug problem, and, indeed, this major issue hampered the development of certain rights for many in the population, specifically ethnic minorities.

The Burmese military had this to say about the drug trade:

The Kokang and Wa regions, the main poppy cultivation and production areas, were under the domination of the Burma Communist Party (BCP) from the late 1960s until 1989. It was only in March and April 1989 that Kokang and Wa national groups split with the BCP and revolted against them. Joining hands with the government, they eventually succeeded in liberating these areas from the stranglehold of the BCP.

The most significant events and milestones in the history of drugs are the peace agreements reached between the government and the major insurgent groups in early 1990s and the unconditional surrender of Khun Sa and his Mong Tai Army in January 1996. Up to the present, altogether 27 armed groups have made peace and are working their differences out under government sponsorship in all-round regional development projects on an unprecedented scale. They chose to abandon armed struggle and joined hands with the government in launching development programs in these far-flung areas to catch up with the mainstream of the country.

So far, this statement has not been contradicted by any major Western writer since it was released. Unfortunately, Burma is in a relatively similar situation to Colombia or Peru in this respect, except for the fact that the Burmese army is more disciplined than those in Latin America. Michael Collins Piper had this to say about Burma in his 1997 article in *The Spotlight*:

Myanmar’s real war on drugs, not alleged human rights violations, has made it a target of the globalists. The Asian nation’s assertion of its sovereignty is threatening the multi-billion drug trade run by its former colonial master. It is no coincidence that none other than George Soros should lead the assault against Myanmar. Apart from being the master destabilizer of currencies, Soros also leads the assault in the United States and elsewhere to legalize drugs. (September 15, 1997, 3).

CL Booth, writing in the *British Guardian* newspaper in 1978 said,

Burma is no Ethiopia or Cambodia. Its rulers are basically decent men. Ne Win is personally squeamish about shedding blood. ... This kind of regime will continue as long as one can foresee. One either comes to terms with it and tries to influence it, or one abdicates (quoted from Talor, 2015: 463)

Other foreign visitors said this about the military in their relationship to ethnic areas:

Battalions in action have the strictest instructions to cooperate with the local population, to buy their supplies from them, and to protect them from retaliation. The Burma army does not have a reputation of a marauder within its own country. Discipline is strict and on the whole behaviour toward the ethnic groups is very good (ibid).

In fact, in a recent speech before a major conference on Burma in the U.S., Burmese Ambassador U Linn Myiang claimed that the government had reduced the production of opium to nearly a quarter of what it was six years ago. This was brought about through both positive and negative sanctions. In addition, these figures have been officially accepted by both the United States and the United Nations, according to the ambassador. Furthermore, the US, under the Carter Administration, sent numerous armored helicopters to Burma to assist in their drug war (Taylor, 2015: 433).

Who is Behind the War Against Burma?⁵

The State Department, to a great extent the creator of the “Pro-Democracy” movement, issued its 2015 Investment Climate Statement from the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. The primary concern, as to be expected, is that reform must begin with “non-discrimination” in investment, meaning that foreign capital is to be treated as if it were domestic. They decry all laws that give the state the power to screen MNC involvement in the Burmese economy and demand full free trade to take its place. Most of all, State rejects all government desires to control “strategic” sectors such as oil and natural gas (State, 19). Finally, the report rejects the possibility that state-owned enterprises should compete with MNCs once invested in the country. Since small business is the norm in the country, without the state, only foreign capital has the pockets, credit and knowledge to begin consolidating sectors of the economy. It would mean a total takeover of Burma.

Aung San Suu Kyi has great influence over the rebel organizations in the Shan state and the powerful network of the country's Buddhist monks. This is important because the Shan hosts a large portion of a recently completed oil pipeline with China, the Kyaukphyu Line. Her visit to China in 2015 certainly touched on this issue and, since her victory seemed a fait accompli, made their accommodations with her for the sake of the free flow of oil (Korybko, 2015).

William Engdahl has written at the time the pipeline deal was approved,

What the Myanmar-China pipelines will allow is routing of oil and gas from Africa (Sudan among other sources) and the Middle East (Iran, Saudi Arabia) independent of dependence on the vulnerable chokepoint of the Malacca Strait. Myanmar becomes China's “bridge” linking Bangladesh and countries westward to the China mainland independent of any possible future moves by Washington to control the strait (Engdahl, 2007).

Therefore, it is clear that the rise of Aung San Suu Kyi has everything to do with Washington's geopolitical demand that leverage be placed on China. Her control of military

5 The author would like to thank the late Michael Collins Piper for much of this information.

forces rebelling against the Burmese state mean that China has to now listen to a highly impressionable, western-educated leader financed largely by the National Institute for Democracy (ibid). What began as a victory for China has now turned into a defeat.

If Burma were any other Third World country, the college girl airheads with their protest signs would be looking for another target. For anyone to truly know the Burmese situation concerning drug terror, regional violence, ethnic succession and the legacy of colonial exploitation, it would seem that the leftist protesters would be demonstrating in favor of the government, especially if it resided in Africa. What is special about Burma?

To begin to answer this question, one needs to look to the perennial player in the global intelligence scene, the Israeli Mossad and the politics of an operative named Andrew Evered Allen of San Francisco and Marin County, California. Allen is significant because he is a board member, as well as the founder, of an organization called the Burma Foundation. It also happens that Allen has long-standing involvement in CIA intrigues.

Also within this cast of characters is the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), which is a federal organization designed to subvert any government which Soros and his likes do not approve. The NED is closely related to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, as the NED's founder, Carl Gershman, was on the board of the ADL. Therefore, there is an immediate connection between Andrew Allen, George Soros, the ADL and the federal government of the United States under the auspices of the NED, which has, in Michael Collins Piper's words, a "multilayered" global presence.

Allen's CIA connection came out in various depositions in a civil court case that took place in the early 1990s against Liberty Lobby, a populist publishing institution in Washington, D.C. In Allen's case, he bragged in recorded court depositions about his role in Burma as well as in Afghanistan where he ran supplies to the CIA-funded, anti-Soviet guerrillas who were being directed in the field by Israel's Mossad. Therefore, the Burma Foundation as well as the NED has a CIA connection of indisputable repute.

For the record, Allen was also the key operative in the destruction of the Institute for Historical Review, an organization that was the world leader in the investigation and publishing of Revisionist (authentic) history until its violent end in 1993. Many of the ethnic insurgencies were not ethnic at all, but ethnicity was used as a cover for the true interest of the war, namely the existence of narco-terror squads which became fabulously wealthy.

The CIA, in its authoritative fact book for 1994, made the claim that Burma, at that time, was the world's most prolific promoter of the heroin and opium trades. In Burma, that was controlled by the Shan United Army, the major beneficiary for Burmese heroin. The commander was the infamous Khun Sa, who fought a bitter civil war with the Burmese government, and specifically, the anti-drug, nationalist government that took power in 1988. It should be noted that it was this United Army that used its far-flung drug connections to make the allegations about "human rights" abuses of the Burmese government.

Michael Collins Piper writes further about the odd intrigues of CIA agent Allen: "In fact, Allen revealed that his ties to the so-called "Free Burma" movement go the whole way to the top. Allen admitted that when the Burmese rebel opposition leader (whom Allen described as the "democratically elected" prime minister) came to the United States, "he stayed with me." According to Allen, "He was visiting the United States to go and speak at the UN and on his way there he had stopped in the bay area." When asked how the Burmese radical leader just happened to stop off at Allen's house, of all the locations in the hotel-rich tourist town of San Francisco, Allen said, "Somebody called me and said 'Could he stay with you along with the finance

minister?’ so they did.”

Who was it that called Allen and arranged for the foreign dignitaries to stay at the Allen home? Allen chirped, “I can’t remember.” When asked why the supposedly forgotten individual or agency called on Allen for his services, the covert operative responded sarcastically, “They knew I had a house with an extra room or two.”

When asked if he was surprised that he had such high-level international dignitaries staying at his home, Allen commented, “No, I was honored,” and then added that the Burmese finance minister “was later killed.” Therefore, it is undeniable that the Burmese domestic opposition is a creature of the CIA. They would have no contact with or knowledge of Andrew Allen if it were any other way.

Therefore, the darling of the jet set the world over, “democracy activist” Aung San Suu Kyi, is in prison not because she “threatens” the military establishment with her “democratic” rhetoric, but because she is part of a CIA-Mossad cabal to destabilize the Burmese government for the sake of the drug trade. It should be repeated that Soros is a leading advocate for the legalization of heroin in America, meaning that if the military regime in Burma were to collapse, the opium and heroin trade would continue apace, with massive profits accruing to whoever controlled this “opposition,” which in this case is the CIA and Soros.

In 2011, Tony Cartalucci wrote:

Having been a British colony for 124 years and the perpetual target of attempted recolonization ever since its independence from Britain in 1948, Myanmar, still called by its imperialist label "Burma" by the Western corporate media has gone through extreme lengths to remain a sovereign nation-state. The US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and British intelligence have been raising, funding, and arming narco-defacto states throughout Myanmar for decades while US government organizations including the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) and its numerous subsidiaries, along with private, corporate-funded foundations have been funding political opposition to Myanmar's ruling government both inside the nation and abroad for nearly as long.

He states further:

Far from a critical report of foreign meddling in Myanmar, the report concludes that the millions of dollars and extensive networks created to overthrow the government of Myanmar are insufficient and that more help should be lent. While Suu Kyi is portrayed as a saintly "beacon of freedom" or "Burma's first lady of freedom" as TIME magazine once called her, she is in fact merely another Wall Street-London creation, a puppet misleading people into the political bear-traps of neo-imperialism (op cit).

There is absolutely no reason to believe the Saffron Revolution will end in any way different from the previous “color revolutions” in the recent past.

Conclusion

In the 1962, the Social nationalist ideology of the Burmese military stated the following concerning their economic philosophy:

Fraudulent practices, profit motive, easy living, parasitism, shirking and selfishness must be eradicated. We must so educate the people that to earn one's living by one's own labour and to see dignity in one's own work comes into vogue. We must educate, lead by example and guide the people away from the base notion that it is beneath one's dignity to work by the sweat of one's brow. Attempts must be made by various correct methods to do away with bogus acts of charity and social work for vainglorious show, bogus piety and hypocritical religiosity, etc., as well as to foster and applaud bona fide belief and practice of personal morals as taught by ethics (sic) and traditions of every religion and culture. We will resort to education, literature, fine arts, theatre and cinema, etc., to bring into vogue the concept that to serve others' interests is to serve one's own (BRC, 1962, sections 16-17).

However, such views are difficult to impose on a poor country, a victim of earlier British imperialism, while surrounded by powers quite interested in destroying any sense of socialism, nationalism or traditionalism of any kind. Moving to the present era, this is shown in Ramon Glazov's views on the "popular protests" which eventually led to the ending of military rule:

For years, the IMF has been pushing developing countries to kill fuel subsidies designed to lower the price of petrol (and hence transportation, and hence most consumer goods). So when the IMF sent a delegation to Myanmar in 2007, the Burmese government decided to impress their shock doctrine sahibs by chopping those pesky free-lunch subsidies. The price per gallon doubled immediately, from \$1.40 to \$2.80. This, in a country where most people earn about \$2 a day. Myanmar's biggest demonstrations since '88 – the first where government troops attacked monks – weren't sparked by Aung San Suu Kyi's three house arrests (Glazov, 2011) .

In politics, nothing is ever what it seems. The uninformed are engaging in a bit of sacrifice-less moral back patting, but the facts of the case tell a different story. The story is that of a drug-soaked, exploited colony of the Masonic and drug-dealing British empire rising up after World War II to independence, only to find itself loaded with ethnic strife, drug terror and an impoverished rural population.

Therefore, the government's position, at least since 1988, has been to nurture the domestic economy through local channels to serve local needs, that is, to keep the country from being a colony of the dynamic powerhouse of China or of Japan. The success of the Burmese nationalist regime is the reason why the international orchestra of deceit, drugs and death screeches for its destruction. Its future is now in the hands of Aung San Suu Kyi. This does not bode well for the country.

Bibliography

Piper, Michael Collins (1997) Burma's War on Drugs. The Spotlight

Cartalucci , Tony (2011) BBC Behind Aung San Suu Kyi Propaganda Flick. LDR

Thein, Myat (2004) Economic Development of Myanmar. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

Revolutionary Council of Burma (1962) Towards Socialism in Our Own Burmese Way.

Published by the Information Department for the Revolutionary Council

http://www.burmalibrary.org/docs/The_Burmese_Way_to_Socialism.htm

Heritage Foundation. Burma. Economic Freedom Index, 2016

<http://www.heritage.org/index/country/burma>

Zehorai, Itai (2015)The Rebirth Of Burma. Forbes

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesinternational/2015/01/09/the-rebirth-of-burma/#10423cc64f57>

Myanmar's Growth Momentum Strong, but Maintaining Stability Is Key, IMF Survey.

September 18, 2015

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2015/CAR091815A.htm>

ICG (2001) Myanmar: The Military Regime's View of the World. ICG Asia Report N° 28, 7

December 2001

Central Bank of Myanmar. The Republic of the Union of Myanmar

<http://www.cbm.gov.mm/content/central-bank-myanmar>

Myanmar's Ruling Junta Is Selling State's Assets. The New York Times Online, March 7 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/08/world/asia/08myanmar.html?_r=0

Glazov, R (2011) Burmese Daze: Making Sense of Myanmar's Mess. The Exiled

<http://exiledonline.com/vanity-fair-profiles-the-exile/>

World Trade Organization. Report of the Secretariat (2014). Myanmar. Trade Policy Review.

Trade Policy Review Body, Document No. WT/TPR/S/293

Engdahl, W (2007) Myanmar's "Saffron Revolution": The Geopolitics behind the Protest

Movement. Center for Research on Globalisation

Korybko, Andrew. Myanmar Post Elections Scenarios: "Cold Peace Before A Hot War" Oriental

Review, October 2015

U.S. Department of State 2015 Investment Climate Statement, May 2015

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/241712.pdf>

Win, Kyaw (2004) Human Rights in Myanmar by Professor. Understanding Myanmar

Taylor, Robert (2015) General Ne Win: A Political Biography. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies