

[Published as Charney, Michael W. (2009) 'Ludu Aung Than: Nu's Burma and the Cold War.' In: Goscha, Christopher and Ostermann, Christian, (eds.), *Imperial Retreat and the Cold War in South and Southeast Asia, 1945-1962*. Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center; Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 333-355].

## **“Ludu Aung Than: Nu’s Burma during the Cold War”**

**Michael W. Charney**

Scholarship on the 1948–1950 period tends to argue that the communists should have won in Burma and that it was only by a fluke that the U Nu government survived. If that is true, then one could also argue that the a major communist insurrection, the Guomindang (GMD) presence, and an invasion by the People’s Republic of China all should have drawn Burma into the Cold War and that it was only by a fluke that it escaped alignment. From 1962, the military takeover that occurred during that year, however, became the primary focus of research on Burma for decades. One impact of this has been that Nu’s impressions of and domestic activities during the Cold War per se have not received due treatment in the literature. As prime minister, it was his domestic policies in the fledgling Burmese government that help to explain the rise of military rule. Mary Callahan has recently offered a detailed analysis of the emergence of the Burmese national army, especially during the first decade or so of independence. As Callahan suggests, the army’s experience in the turbulent late 1940s, the fear of the extension of Cold War intervention over the GMD presence in northeastern Burma and as a possible adjunct to the Korean action, and the perceived failures on the part of the civil government to achieve national unity and stability in the 1950s led the military leadership to take matters into their own hands, beginning a project that continues to this day to remold Burmese into supporters of the state.<sup>1</sup>

Civilian leaders, or those who ran the government prior to 1962, however, also attempted to remold the Burmese during the Cold War and in reference to it. Foremost among these was the prime minister, “Thakin” and later “U” Nu. Nu’s role and seemingly obscure approaches to governance are sometimes given facile treatment, attributed to Buddhist

practice, an image that Nu then and later attempted to encourage. The shadow of military rule also left a clear mark on Nu's memories. Even his autobiography, *U Nu: Saturday's Son*, published in the 1970s, is far less revealing about his attitudes during the Cold War than his writings prior to 1958. In the 1970s, Nu engaged in numerous activities in a context other than that of the Cold War. His removal from office, his imprisonment and exile, and his efforts to gather antigovernment forces under his banner all occurred as part of a struggle against military rule and were treated with ambivalence by the major Cold War powers, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China. From that perspective, the dangers Burma faced during the Cold War faded from view and old allies in the 1950s, such as Ne Win, were now long-entrenched enemies. In this chapter, I seek to understand the ways in which the Nu government reacted to the Cold War in the 1950s, independently of the post-1962 Cold War context, under the shadow of the eventual military takeover.

#### External Influences

The greatest domestic threat to the Nu government came from the Communist Party of Burma. Since his student days in the 1930s, Marxist literature had played an important role in Nu's thinking. In the 1930s, Nu himself had participated in introducing Marxist literature to Burmese readers. Nu established a book club, called *Nagà-ni* (Red dragon), which published translations of important works from the West, including numerous Marxist works.<sup>2</sup> However, his postindependence perspectives on domestic communists were largely formulated during, and as a result of, the 1948–1950 crisis. The “White Flag” Burmese Communist Party under Than Tun had commenced its revolution, and sparked a larger civil war, on March 28, 1948.<sup>3</sup> After the initial outbreak of this insurrection, Nu attempted to shore up leftist support by uniting leftist forces with the government under the “Marxist League.” This plan involved the establishment of more intimate relations with Soviet bloc countries, the nationalization of some industries and land, including some land redistribution to the peasants, the formation of a people's army, a democratization of the government, and the creation of welfare programs, all directed toward the eventual goal of state socialism. The League would also disseminate Marxist literature, including the works of Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong, Karl Marx, Joseph Stalin, Josip Tito, and others. The

communists, who argued that the government had sold out to the British with the Nu–Attlee agreement and raised the specter of the removal of British financial and military support, however, rebuffed this plan.<sup>4</sup>

The Nu government very nearly collapsed. According to figures provided by Colonel Ba Than, a participant in the events (while a lieutenant -colonel), the condition of the Republican army was desperate, losing in one year 42 percent of its personnel through capture or mutiny, 45 percent of its equipment, and two-thirds of the country to seven insurgent groups. The army faced thirty thousand rebel soldiers. to which were added, in 1949, GMD forces who eventually numbered twelve thousand hardened veterans of the Chinese Civil War and well-trained local recruits. The situation was so dire, that the army resorted to conscripting mass numbers of levies, most of whom only received four hours of military training, while soldiers intended to serve as officers were whisked from the battlefield to training courses in Britain and then whisked back again upon their return from the airfield to the battlefield. The Burmese army reorganized and went on a counteroffensive in 1950.<sup>5</sup> A good measure of domestic order was thus achieved, sufficient to allow the Nu government to begin to focus on the task of rebuilding the country and working toward the establishment of a socialist state.<sup>6</sup>

During the worst years of the civil war and after, Nu toured the country, making whistle-stop speeches and appealing to the population for support and to state servants for ethical behavior and correct thinking. After the fighting, the task of ensuring lasting stability was next on the agenda, for as Nu observed, Burma had moved back from the precipice, but could easily find itself on the edge of collapse again.<sup>7</sup> Nu had made what was, at the time, a hasty declaration in July 1949, guaranteeing peace within one year. On July 19, 1950, the anniversary of that reasonably kept promise, Nu announced another one-year program, “From Peace to Stability,” which would seek not only to rebuild but to impress upon Burmese politicians and civil servants the need for proper acts and correct thinking. Nu and his ministers also sought ways to remold Burmese in such a way as to prevent a resurgence of antigovernment activities.<sup>8</sup> This would not be an easy task, for, as Nu stressed although the “backbone” of the insurgencies had been broken, the “problem of mopping up disorganised remnants of politicodacoit groups in many parts of the country,” still remained.<sup>9</sup>

Alongside Nu, U Thant emerged as the most important voice of the government's position for the general population. Thant was well prepared for the task. Prior to independence he had served in the Directorate of Information and as deputy director of public relations for the Pa Sa Ba La (PSBL) (also known to the West as the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League [AFPFL]) from September 1, 1947. After independence, Thant rose steadily up the ranks, first as deputy secretary of the Information Ministry (May 1, 1948), and then as director of broadcasting. Next, he was then given the task of writing a history of the PSBL. In 1949 he was appointed secretary of the Ministry of Information (September 1, 1949), a post he held until January 1954. This last posting included the task of managing the *New Times of Burma* and the *Burma Weekly Bulletin*. He also personally delivered commentaries on current events to the Burmese public through his own weekly radio program.<sup>10</sup> During 1949, Thant gained significant experience in appealing to the hearts of the population as he both wrote many of Nu's speeches and personally delivered other public speeches as well. According to June Bingham, Thant also later prided himself on becoming "something of an expert" in psychological warfare as a result of what he had learned from his responsibilities involved in censoring comic strips used for Soviet and U.S. propaganda.<sup>11</sup>

One important, although frequently ignored effort by Nu and Thant, was their use of, and moderate success with, the writing of a play for the government's own propaganda efforts. Although stubborn about some things, such as his attempts to get the government to commit to patronage of and identification with Buddhism despite intragovernmental criticism, Nu was more flexible when it came to literature and playwriting and was especially amenable to the use of a play to carry government propaganda to the public. Nu's own experience with fiction was not yet politicized. In the 1930s and 1940s, he had written several novels, all with nonpolitical themes, but they had helped to gain him literary credentials among the reading public. Thant, who became a charter member of the Burma Council on World Affairs<sup>12</sup> and who had already accumulated significant experience in reading and sometimes censoring Soviet and American propaganda, was also aware of the potential propaganda value of politicized literature.

On June 18, 1950, just after an attempt by Thein Pe Myint to introduce Marxist literature into the Rangoon University curriculum,<sup>13</sup> Thant brought a committee of important

writers and scholars of literature to Nu's house. This committee, aside from Nu and Thant, consisted of U Thein Han, U Nyana, U Myo Min, and Myoma hsaya Hein.<sup>14</sup> The writer and librarian (Rangoon University) Thein Han was director of textbook production and later chairman of the Burma Historical Commission. Writer, newspaper columnist, and film director (with the British Burma Film Company from the 1920s), Nyana had served as director of information in 1947 and held the post of director of film and stage from 1948–1951. Myo Min was professor of English (Rangoon University) and had served in the Japanese puppet regime as assistant secretary to the Foreign Office. Hsaya Hein had held a string of posts, serving as publicity officer in the Japanese puppet regime, deputy director of the Information Department in 1945, and beginning in 1948 was the publicity and distribution officer of the Burma Translation Society (later the Sarpay Beikman). All of these men thus had experience with public information and literature, and occupied important positions involving the dissemination of information to the public.<sup>15</sup>

The intention of the committee was, through the composition of a play, to draw public attention to the dangers of attempting to take power by force rather than through elections. Although communists would be among those made to appear to be in the wrong, they would not be the exclusive targets as the play was intended to be a warning to other individuals and political groups as well, including those who threatened to further encourage divisions within the PSBL. Nu was sometimes, but not always, careful to avoid targeting political parties per se, especially given the confusing ideological composition of the PSBL (and of the insurgencies), and concentrated instead on whether a group was in rebellion or not. As he had explained to the Burmese Parliament in the autumn of 1949:

We are suppressing the insurgents, not as Communists, White PVOs, M.N.D.O.s, or K.N.D.O.s., but as enemies of the Union who have broken the law by rising up in open revolt. There are many ways open to these [groups] to pursue their own programmes and policy lawfully and in a manner acceptable to the people.<sup>16</sup>

Apparently, Nyana's experience in writing movie scripts made him the ideal candidate for writing the play. Originally, the intention was to keep the play short, consisting of only three parts, probably to keep the simple message of the play clear to the audience. These parts were divided into three events, including the seizure of power by force of arms, and subsequent death by force of arms, of King Narathu (part one), and Baung-ga-sa Maung Maung (part two). The third part of the play would have the same message, but would cover the present period to give the play a modern context.<sup>17</sup>

After Nyana completed his version of the play, Thant and Thein Han read the manuscript and opened it up for discussion at another meeting at Nu's house on August 5, 1950. After reviewing the apparently disappointing text, the committee decided that three separate incidents in one play was distracting attention from the intended message. Instead, Nu would now write a play focused on a single incident.<sup>18</sup> Nu had experience with writing plays (*pyazat*), including one entitled *Yet Set-Pa-Be Kwè* (Oh, How Cruel), which portrayed the nationalist struggle against the British as well as the Indian landlords and moneylenders of the colonial period. The new play would focus instead on a young man who became a communist and how he came to regret his decision during the darkest hours of the civil war, particularly in 1949. The new play would be entitled *Ludu Aung Than* (frequently translated as *The People Win Through*).<sup>19</sup> Nu began writing the play in August 1950 during his free time, as his boat moved from town to town in the Irrawaddy Delta while he was away promoting the "From Peace to Stability" program mentioned above. Nu had completed the first two scenes by the time he returned to Rangoon and completed it in September. After incorporating revisions at yet another meeting at Nu's house, the manuscript was first submitted to the Executive Committee of the PSBL and then to the Council of Ministers, both of which required that changes be made to the manuscript. The play committee met twice more, on October 10 and November 4, 1950, and discussed word usage in the manuscript. They also agreed to name Nu as the sole author.<sup>20</sup>

Nu's play was entirely focused on the events of the two-year period between March 1948 and March 1950. *Ludu Aung Than* had thus now shifted from a morality tale, largely focused on the premodern period, to one squarely focused on the critical moments of the civil war that had almost toppled the state. As Thant explains, the purpose of the play was

to show the general population what happens when someone puts into action “evil plans to take national power by force without asking for it from the people by means of Democracy.”<sup>21</sup> In Nu’s hands, however, a wide variety of points were introduced, all reflecting the same kinds of things he was stating in his public addresses. Perhaps the most important among these was that the Burmese population should not be influenced by external, self-interested countries, particularly those aligned together in the two blocs, Soviet and Western, in the Cold War.

Nu had been wary of the external repercussions of domestic events early on. As Maung Maung observes, the international reaction to his Marxist League plan made Nu realize that the “borderline between domestic affairs and foreign affairs has become extremely thin.”<sup>22</sup> More serious, however, were internal repercussions from external influences and events. The communist rebellion provided an early lesson, as Nu firmly believed then and later, that the Soviet Union had instigated it.<sup>23</sup> Although the Nu government would continue to wage war, like its military successors, against the communists at home, Nu believed that he could only succeed by isolating Burmese political forces from external influences. Nu saw the domestic implications of Cold War involvement as a serious threat to national stability, as involvement would bring infiltration and division. As Nu explained, “[T]here can be no infiltration either by communists or capitalists whoever they may be.”<sup>24</sup> In the new January 12, 1953 preface to the reprinting of his 1945 work, *Burma Under the Japanese*, Nu focused on the events of the Japanese occupation as a means of warning those at home and abroad of the internal dangers that his Burma faced. As opposed to the rather mundane preface of the first edition, which merely expressed a desire for historical accuracy, and a call to others to record their experiences as well, the new preface was political:

Beware of Pied Pipers!—This, as I look back on the past before the war and afterwards, seems to me the moral of this little book. Before the war so many Burmans were so ready to follow the seductive piping of the Japanese without realizing at all in what direction it was leading us.... Yet even now it seems that many of us have not learned the lesson. All over the world pipers are chanting new tunes that open up entrancing visions of imaginary wonderlands. These tunes find their way to Burma and men and

women who are deluded by them stir up trouble in various ways that would only bring ruin to the country. They are like foolish children who listen to their aunt rather than to their mother. So I hope these sketches of life in Burma under the Japanese will help to teach my countrymen not to follow in the train of these pied pipers, however seductively their tunes may strike the ear.<sup>25</sup>

Between the composition of the *Ludu Aung Than* (1950) and its first stage performance (1952), Thant further encouraged the regime to step up promotion of non-communist national unity in several ways. In 1951, Thant created the Bureau of Special Investigation, the Burmese version of the American Federal Bureau of Investigation.<sup>26</sup> For Nu, rebuilding the country required what he called “moral uplift,” especially in the economic, intellectual, and physical spheres, but these would take a considerable amount of time to reach fruition. In the meantime, he was not satisfied to sit by “with folded arms” while “termites” ate away at the moral pillars of the state. Warning the inspectors of the bureau that he was always keeping an eye on their own loyalty, and was satisfied thus far, he informed them that “your assignment to eradicate termites is one of the greatest tasks for the stability of the Union.”<sup>27</sup>

The bureau gave mettle to the Nu government’s attempts to keep civil servants and others in line. Corruption became the target of investigation, arrest, and imprisonment,<sup>28</sup> but so too did other activities. Initially, as Nu had outlined at the swearing-in ceremony for the investigators held on December 17, 1951, there were three target groups who could bring about moral decay: (1) government servants, including judges and members of the military; (2) politicians; and (3) merchants. Nu’s suggestion that the Bureau would cause “undesirable elements to disappear,” however, left a degree of vagueness that could possibly incorporate other groups, which indeed it soon did.<sup>29</sup> The Bureau of Special Investigation made heavy use of Section 5 of the Emergency Provisions Act, which was enacted the previous year on March 9, 1950. This act established vague terms under which anyone opposed to the government could be arrested and imprisoned with impunity. For example, under its provisions, anyone who hindered any aspect of government duties, who by their actions reduced respect for the government or caused soldiers or civil bureaucrats to be disloyal or otherwise not perform their duties properly,

did anything to cause panic among any group of people, or eroded public morality or conduct that undermined government stability could be imprisoned or arrested. The Emergency Provisions Act also gave the government the tool necessary to suppress domestic critics. The vaguest section of the document, for example, is section “e,” which makes it illegal to “spread false news, knowing, or having reason to believe that it is not true.”<sup>30</sup>

Section 5 of the Emergency Provisions Act would, during the Nu period and later under the Ne Win and other military governments up to the present, be the most commonly utilized act for the suppression of countergovernment views and activities. Not only opposition politicians,<sup>31</sup> but also writers, editors, and publishers found themselves imprisoned or threatened with imprisonment during this period, including some of Nu’s former associates and friends. Edward M. Law Yone, editor of the *Nation*, for example, had a close call when Nu, irritated by a critical article that Law Yone had just published, prepared to place him under arrest, although Thant intervened before the order could be issued.<sup>32</sup> One of the political prisoners during this period was Nu’s old friend, Ludu U Hla. Hla was a writer as well as the publisher of a leftist newspaper, the *Ludu Daily News*, and the owner of a leftist publishing house, Ludu-kyibwayay Press, both in Mandalay. During his three years in prison, from 1953/1954 to 1956 (Hla on separate occasions provides two different years for the commencement of his imprisonment by the Nu regime), Hla took notes and wrote some nine books, including *The Caged Ones* and *The Victim*, on his experiences and those of other prisoners.<sup>33</sup> Hla and other political prisoners were treated better than ordinary criminals, but prevented from seeing their families and, more importantly, from publishing. Years later, after his own arrest and release under the military regime, Nu would visit Hla to apologize, claiming that his imprisonment was decided by Thant, but he could do nothing at the time.<sup>34</sup> In any event, the Nu regime steadily attempted to silence criticism in the press.

Thant had also founded the Dimogareisi Pyan-pwa-ye Athin or Dimogareisi Binnya Byan-bwa-ye Athin (known to the West as the Society for the Extension of Democratic Ideals) in July 1950 (although 1951 is frequently mistakenly mentioned as the start date). Eventually opening up an official building on Bogyoke Aung-gyaw Street in downtown Rangoon, the society was open to anyone and aimed to avoid connection with any

political party. The stated purpose of this society was, as its title indicates, to promote the interests of democracy in Burma. To do so, it had two chief aims: (1) to spread general knowledge of democracy (among the Burmese) and (2) to instill in Burma conventional democratic procedures. Efforts that were directed toward the first goal included the publication of texts that furthered its aims.<sup>35</sup> One wonders whether the close coincidence of timing for creation of the society and the initiation of the play-writing project were connected. In any case, in early 1951, the completed manuscript for *Ludu Aung Than* was first submitted for print publication to this society, apparently its first publication endeavor.<sup>36</sup> A year later, in August 1952, the society published an English translation made by U Khin Zaw, with assistance from Peter Murray and J. S. Furnivall.<sup>37</sup> The society would also later cooperate with the Congress for Cultural Freedom in holding the Cultural Freedom in Asia conference on February 17–20, 1955, and the publication of a volume of the proceedings in 1956. This conference, which included a wide range of writers and intellectuals from across Asia, including Mochtar Lubis, would debate the impact of communism, Western influence, and intellectual freedom in the region.<sup>38</sup>

Although the Society for the Extension of Democratic Ideals issued a pamphlet version of the play, Thant and Nu's *Ludu Aung Than* committee hoped for wider media reach. This came first in the form of a one act per week show on Burmese radio.<sup>39</sup> The first public performance occurred in the United States when the Pasadena Playhouse in California performed *Ludu Aung Than* under the title of "The People Win Through" in early 1952, with Burmese dignitaries (part of the Burmese Education Mission that was on a tour of the United States at the time) in attendance, although it is not clear if they relied upon Khin Zaw's or another translation.<sup>40</sup> The Nu government had not successfully utilized film, a potentially powerful form of media, for communicating to the people. In the 1950s, Burma had about 150 cinemas. Although about one-third of these were located in Rangoon, "[a]lmost no little market town is so remote or old-fashioned but it has its cinema, run from some rickety, salvaged Fourteenth Army power plant."<sup>41</sup> Domestic film companies such as A1 Film, Aungzeya Film, and British Burma Film, literally "churned out" large numbers of films designed as light entertainment, for Burma's film industry had not yet been politicized or under tight government control. This began to change in 1952. Nu appointed Thant as the chairman of the Burma Film Board, which selected

Burmese films for the Burmese version of the Academy Awards.<sup>42</sup> The *Ludu Aung Than* play committee had discussed shooting and distributing a film version of the play to reach the general Burmese population and even an English-language version for world distribution.<sup>43</sup> This seems to have been preempted by the Americans. In 1953, the Cascade Pictures Corporation of America made a film version of this play, filming it in Burma with an all-Burmese cast.<sup>44</sup> The attempt to introduce this film version of *Ludu Aung Than*, with its heavily politicized theme, thus may have come as a shock to Burmese audiences. This film appears to have been poorly received by some Burmese, which in one case, leading to the torching of a theater running the film.<sup>45</sup>

### Neutralism

The Nu government declared neutrality as its official foreign policy at the beginning of the 1950s. Nu had foreshadowed this declaration on July 19, 1950, when he explained that “[i]n the present circumstances of our Union, it is simply impossible for us to join a particular power bloc and fight the opposing bloc....”<sup>46</sup> This observation reflected more than the weary state of the Nu government and its armed forces, but also the Nu government’s belief that it would be impossible to isolate its domestic enemies from external influences if it turned to alignment. Simultaneously, the fact that many political and politically mobilized ethnic groups had aligned (or sought to do so) with one of the two Cold War blocs, meant that any alignment on the part of the government might add further fuel to the ongoing civil war at home.<sup>47</sup>

External events would also further encourage a neutralist stance. The UN reaction to the Korean War temporarily assured the Nu government that it could count on the former’s support if foreign intervention occurred. However, when the UN soon appeared to be acting not as a neutral force, but rather in the interests of American Cold War policies, expectations diminished.<sup>48</sup> As Nu explained before Parliament on September 5, 1950 on the subject of the Korean situation,

Take a glance at our geographic position...We are hemmed in like a tender gourd among the cactus. We cannot move an inch. If we act irresponsibly like some half-baked politicians...and thrust the Union of Burma into the

arms of one bloc, the other bloc will not be content to look on with folded arms. Oh, no!<sup>49</sup>

The example of Nehru's announcement of a non-aligned foreign policy for Burma's gargantuan neighbor, India, also provided confidence that neutralism was an alternative to alignment.<sup>50</sup>

The Nu government was mainly concerned with China, which was its most immediate foreign threat, especially given the war against communists at home. The continuing presence within Burma's borders of GMD troops, and suspected American support of them, also raised the specter of PRC intervention (a development later nearly realized).<sup>51</sup> By maintaining strict neutrality in the Cold War, external communist intervention, especially from the PRC could be avoided. Thant appears to have shared this perspective. Commenting on the Vietnam War in 1965, Thant suggested that if South Vietnam had not allowed a substantial American military presence, it could have followed Burma's model for suppressing the communist insurgency, for unlike the Viet Cong case, in Burma "there has not been a single instance of outside help to the Burmese Communists."<sup>52</sup> Nu believed that he could maintain the balance between the suppression of communists at home and good relations with the PRC on the basis of national experience. The PRC, he argued, where communists had emerged in a different context, could be dealt with. As Nu explained:

[Our] viewpoint is different from that of most of those who are anti-Communist. As we do not like Communism, we do not want to see the spread of this creed into our territories. We have, therefore, been doing our best to prevent such a contingency here. But, it is far from our intention to meddle in their [PRC] affairs. They have chosen communism in order to suit their own circumstances.<sup>53</sup>

Due to his interest in preventing external intervention, Nu interpreted the Cold War mainly in terms of the standoff between the PRC and the United States. Nu saw this standoff as essentially a diplomatic impasse, the end of which he could help negotiate. As he explained, "We feel that as neutralists in power politics we ought to do something to enable both America and China to achieve their ends without resorting to a bloody

warfare.”<sup>54</sup> Some insight into Nu’s expectations can be gained from reference to a popular Western book promoted by Nu during and after his student days. The Nagà-ni book club, mentioned above, published more than Marxist works. The first work that Nu translated for the book club, for example, was Dale Carnegie’s *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, which offered readers a more “politic” approach to their dealings with other people, from management style to the wording of correspondence. Most of all, it urged readers to avoid conflict and take a positive, rather than a negative, approach to motivating people and getting what one wanted.<sup>55</sup> Nagà-ni published some eight thousand copies of Nu’s Burmese translation, under the title of *Meitta-bala-tiga*, in 1938. Nu’s translation was not published again until 1949, after independence, and during the worst period of the communist and Karen insurgencies. New editions published in that year and in 1950 numbered some twenty-five thousand and three thousand copies, respectively, being sold alongside uncertain numbers of English editions published in Bombay. In 1953, Nu’s translation would be reprinted in thirty thousand copies, totaling more than the number of copies published in 1949 and 1950 combined.<sup>56</sup> *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, whether influencing or sharing Nu’s approach to politics, certainly reflected the kind of political tactics followed by Nu the politician and premier. Nu would be extremely cautious in his choice of words, especially when they might offend or force the other party to ignore his intended message. As Nu declared in Parliament in 1948, “There is no Karen-Burman problem, but only the problems of good men versus bad men.”<sup>57</sup> Nu’s somewhat naive public statements of American and Chinese misunderstandings could just as easily have been drawn from Carnegie’s book. In December 1954, for example, when Nu met with Chou Enlai in Beijing, he informed the Chinese leader that

[t]he Americans are very generous and brave.... The Chinese people are also very generous and brave. We do not want these two esteemed countries confronting each other with bitterness and hostility. As a friend of both we want these two countries to be on the friendliest of terms.... I will exert my utmost to bring about an understanding between the two countries.<sup>58</sup>

Five months later, in May 1955, Nu told an American audience in Washington, DC, the following:

Like all peoples, the Chinese have some good traits and some bad traits. Similarly, the Americans have some good traits and some bad traits. Let the Americans pick out the good Chinese traits and not concentrate on their bad traits: similarly, let the Chinese pick out the good American traits and not dwell only on the bad American traits.<sup>59</sup>

Despite Nu's efforts to separate domestic and international communists by abstaining from open Cold War alignment, his *Ludu Aung Than*, already an American-produced play and movie, also found its way into anticommunist efforts in the West that sought to identify Burma as one of the countries facing the communist threat. If Nu were not cooperating with America in the Cold War, he could be made to appear so. For the United States, Burma in 1950 and later was one of the "dominoes" that would be certain to fall to the communists if the latter were not stopped in Indochina.<sup>60</sup> The Nu government's struggle against the communist insurrection provided evidence that could lend itself to Western propaganda. Some anonymous pamphlets, such as "Those Fickle Communists!" (1952), almost certainly sanctioned by the Nu government and published in both Burmese and in English translation in Rangoon during the period, were obvious candidates.<sup>61</sup>

More nuanced treatment was required in the recharacterization of *Ludu Aung Than* from a work broadly on national unity into one specifically on the threat of international communism. Nevertheless, changes slowly crept into the work's various incarnations as they were presented to the outside world. One of those leading this effort was Edward Hunter. Hunter was a journalist and former OSS man, best known for coining the term "brainwashing" in several books on the PRC, the communist threat to the "free world," and communist propaganda techniques.<sup>62</sup> Hunter traveled from country to country, wherever a communist threat was apparent, writing books that would make Western readers aware of the dire situation that they faced from Soviet aggression.<sup>63</sup> Hunter was a proponent of the thesis that the non-communist world was also losing the Cold War on

the basis of territorial and population loss to communism since 1945, as he testified in Congress before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 13, 1958.<sup>64</sup>

Khin Zaw's 1952 English translation of Nu's play came into Hunter's possession. In his lengthy introduction to the publication of this translation in 1957, Hunter promoted Nu as a defender of democracy in the face of international communist aggression. In his *The Continuing Revolt: The Black Book of Red China*, which he wrote in 1958 for International Research on Communist Techniques Incorporated and The Committee of One Million (Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations), Hunter would go on to suggest the roots of this problem. As he explained, "Burma, the first Asian country to recognize Red China ... was rewarded with uninterrupted guerrilla warfare." Hunter argued, in contradiction to the public statements of Nu and other members of his cabinet, that PRC clandestine aid continued to feed the insurrections in Burma and that in addition to propaganda, the PRC was exporting both opium and heroin through Chinese communities in Southeast Asia "with the same objective of breaking down resistance."<sup>65</sup>

Hunter felt that Nu had been "goaded" by the PRC's role in supporting the insurrections into writing *Ludu Aung Than*. The theme of the play was characterized in 1958 by Hunter, in *The Continuing Revolt*, as taking a harder line against communism than it actually had, describing it as "exposing the foreign allegiance of the leaders in his country's Red Revolt."<sup>66</sup> Thant had lent some weight to this characterization in his revised introduction for Khin Zaw's translation of *Ludu Aung Than*. In his original Burmese-language introduction to the play, intended for Burmese audiences alone, Thant had said nothing about communists. The relevant paragraph in Thant's original Burmese note reads as follows:

[Thant:] The main aim in writing this play was that we wanted to reveal the wrongs that occur because of evil plans to take national power by force without asking for it from the people by means of Democracy.<sup>67</sup>

In Thant's English translation, presumably intended for international audiences only, he explained that:

[Thant:] The People Win Through shows what actually happens when Burmese Communists decide to stage an insurrection.<sup>68</sup>

Hunter added to this word play in his own 1957 introduction to the play. In frequent references to Nu's umbrella political organization, the PSBL, known to the West as the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League, for example, Hunter dropped both "Anti-Fascist" and perhaps the too leftist-sounding "People's," and abbreviated it to simply the "Freedom League."<sup>70</sup> Another curious change that may have occurred was in the title of the film. According to Hunter, the film version was not entitled with the positive *Ludu Aung Than* (or the English translation, *The People Win Through*), but simply with the negative-sounding *Rebellion*.<sup>71</sup> Perhaps, for the producers of the film, *The People Win Through* had leftist connotations. Whether the change in title actually occurred, or whether the film had both a Burmese language and an English language title is unclear. Nevertheless, Burmese who saw the film in Burma remember it as being entitled (or it may popularly have been known as) *Ludu Aung Than*.<sup>72</sup> Thus, by reading Khin Zaw's English translation of *Ludu Aung Than* (and Hunter's lengthy introduction), attending English-language performances of the play in Pasadena, California, or, possibly, by viewing screenings of the movie version, American audiences could be satisfied that Nu and democracy in Burma were on the frontlines of the Cold War, staving off international communist aggression.

#### Buddhism and Anti-Communism

By the time that Hunter had written his introduction in 1957, the Burmese-language publication of *Ludu Aung Than* had been introduced into middle schools. Although Hunter suggested that "this was the age group to which Communists make their most calculated appeals," the play was actually circulating among an adult audience as well. For those not inclined to read, the movie version continued to be shown throughout Burma, sometimes on roadsides, and there were even cartoon versions illustrated by U Bagale.<sup>73</sup> *Ludu Aung Than's* desired impact, however, had not been achieved, as indicated in the elections a year earlier. In 1956, communist-oriented parties won a far larger percentage of the votes than expected and Nu resigned himself to cleaning up his

party, leaving the prime minister post to U Ba Swe. Although Nu briefly reassumed leadership in 1957, he found that he could no longer hold the government together in the face of both continuing insurgencies in the countryside and a disintegrating political situation in Rangoon. In 1958, matters worsened when a split occurred in the PSBL into the “stable” PSBL under Ba Swe and the “clean” PSBL under Nu. In the autumn of that year, at Nu’s request, General Ne Win was constitutionally selected as the new prime minister, inaugurating a military caretaker government that ruled Burma from November 1, 1958 to February 6, 1960. After Nu stepped down as prime minister, he devoted his time, again, to the attempt to straighten out the PSBL.

By this time, Nu seems to have decided that the only solution for national unity was by focusing on a connection between religion and politics. Nu thus attempted to conclude a long-term effort on his part to identify the state with Buddhism, by campaigning to make Buddhism the state religion of Burma. Throughout his rule, Nu, in cooperation with many of his ministers and members of Parliament, introduced legislation and initiated other efforts that would provide for government patronage of Buddhism, introduce Buddhist education into the schools, and ensure Buddhist orthodoxy. His most famous role in promoting Buddhism was in sponsoring in Burma the Sixth World Council of Buddhism.<sup>74</sup> Some members of his government were critical of the expense. Thant, for example, was an important critic of the extravagant expenses of Nu’s Buddhist program, arguing on one occasion that the artificial cave that Nu planned to build for the Sixth World Buddhist Synod was too expensive and he also opposed Nu’s attempts to make Buddhism the state religion.<sup>75</sup>

Making Buddhism the state religion appealed to Burma’s rural communities, the main focus of communist propaganda. As Taylor observes, Nu and many other leaders of the PSBL believed that bolstering Buddhism among the general population would help to create an obstacle to communist victory. The Buddhist *sangha* (organization of monks) itself had initiated an anti-communist program as early as 1945, arguing that the communists were “anti-religious.”<sup>76</sup> Nu’s approach had significant appeal for monks and the rural population and it pressured the communists into taking greater care in defending their stand on Buddhism. As Taylor points out, Aung San and “the Communist founders of the AFO” sought to separate religion from politics.<sup>77</sup> Early attacks on Buddhism and

religion by communist leaders, including Thein Pe Myint (who had resigned from the party in March 1948), Maung Maung Hein, and Zauktho Thaug Tin, however, were rescinded prior to the party's turn-about on religion in March 1952, and rebuked in the new "Party Line on Religion" dated March 10, 1952.<sup>78</sup> The new party line separated individual choice from the kind of state indoctrination of religion now underway in Nu's programs. Buddhism, it was argued, like other religions, was being used as an instrument by capitalists to "suppress agitation" or "human emotions that would ordinarily erupt." In the people's government that would be established in Burma once the communists had won power, definition of the division between, and clarification of, the roles and place of religion and the state in people's lives would take place. Religion, for example, would be excluded from the Constitution and left to individual choice. Buddhist monasteries and mission schools would focus on teaching religion, while education would be left to the public schools. Religion, however, would eventually die out, on its own, not through state suppression. The publication of this document, as part of the "secret documents captured from important Communist cells" in the *Nation* on March 17, 1953 came under the heading "BCP Lays Down Party Line in Regard to Religion—'Don't Kill; Let Die.'"<sup>79</sup>

From 1958 to 1960, Ne Win's caretaker government followed the Nu government's lead in arresting critics and publishing mass propaganda directed against domestic communists. Reflecting Nu's initiatives, these efforts by the military connected the struggle against domestic communists with the preservation of Buddhism. In 1959, for example, the Amery Psychological Warfare Directorate published the essay titled "Dhammantaraya—Dhamma in Danger" in the *Burma Weekly Bulletin* and in the form of millions of separate pamphlets, which accused communists of looting religious temples, burning pagodas, and directing Marx's slogan of religion as the opium of the masses at Buddhism, calling Buddha the single greatest enemy to the people. In short, it stressed the reasons why communists posed a danger to Burmese Buddhism.<sup>80</sup> Reportedly, this sparked "spontaneous" meetings in almost five hundred towns, attended by eighty thousand monks and nearly five million lay people, that issued denunciations of Burmese communists.<sup>81</sup> This mass mobilization likely aided Nu's "clean" PSBL in the 1960 election, which it won; a constitutional amendment making Buddhism the official religion was passed on August 26, 1961.<sup>82</sup>

## Conclusion

What made Burma's experiences during the early years of the Cold War unique was the prominent place held by writers in Burmese society. Nu was not only prime minister and the country's preeminent lay supporter of Buddhism, but also a writer. Prior to and during his rule, his publications were read by ordinary Burmese, taught in schools to Burmese teenagers, and, as we have seen, even performed on the silver screen. It is more than an interesting sidelight to the Asian theater of the Cold War that, during an ongoing civil war, a prime minister and his chief ministers would devote so much personal energy to producing a play to present their position to the population. It indicates that Nu and his allies took the place of literature, and Nu's credentials as a writer, seriously, and early on realized the importance of propaganda, carefully organized and cautiously worded, as a means of shoring up public support. At a time when many other Southeast Asian leaders of postindependence regimes relied heavily on external allies, such as Ngo Dinh Diem, and neglected building up national solidarity, Nu's regime mobilized itself surprisingly quickly to forge national unity and to avoid alignment with either the Western or the communist blocs (on Ngo Dinh Diem, see Edward Miller's contribution to this volume).

The defense of Burmese neutralism and attempts to keep Burmese domestic affairs free from foreign influence would shift from civilian leaders to the army. In 1957, Thant moved on to become Burma's permanent representative at the UN where he continued to keep Burma out of foreign entanglements until 1961, when he became the acting secretary general for the UN. He would then break his connections with Burma until his death in 1974. During the tenure of the brief military caretaker regime and from 1962 to 1967 after the military coup, Ne Win continued to attempt to isolate Burma's communists from their nearest likely support by maintaining good relations with China. This effort included a visit by Ne Win to China that ended with the conclusion of the border agreement on January 28, 1960, closing a long effort by the Nu government.<sup>83</sup> This cordiality would be broken when the PRC, undergoing the Cultural Revolution, would publicly interfere with Burma's Chinese population, frightening the military regime into repression.

The Nu regime and democracy (as understood by Nu) failed in Burma, as Mary Callahan has argued, because of the problem of governability. The Nu regime "was in no position"

to build a state in the face of both the immediate problems of the civil war and much older traditions of frontier autonomy.<sup>84</sup> As demonstrated elsewhere in terms of democratic and military institution building<sup>85</sup> and the emergence of Cold War culture, as discussed in this chapter, the Nu regime's reactions to this hostile environment left a lasting political heritage. Of the fourteen years of Burmese independence until the final 1962 military coup that installed military rule up to the present, the 1950–1957 period witnessed the emergence of some of the principal approaches that Burma would apply to dealing with, both through foreign diplomacy and representations to the people, the Cold War. These approaches included efforts by the government to adopt “neutralism,” never quite clearly defined; tight government control of the press and critics; a close connection between the state and Buddhism especially in reference to suppressing the enduring (whether real or, as was the case in the late 1980s, at best overblown and at worst largely imagined) domestic communist insurgency; and a massive reliance on propaganda directed against external influences. Many of these approaches have proved equally useful in suppressing the National League for Democracy in the post–Cold War era. While the military governments since 1962 have taken these and other approaches to greater lengths than their pre-1962 predecessors, some of the more important of these approaches owe their origins to the ways in which the Nu regime attempted to survive the Cold War and its domestic consequences.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Mary P. Callahan, *Making Enemies: War and State Building in Burma* (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2004): 221–22.

<sup>2</sup> The book club sold such publications from the western corner of the Scott Market (today, *Bogyoke-ze*) making it easily accessible to most Rangoon readers. Personal communication, U Thaw Kaung. The book club drew the attention of British police who urged the Ba Maw administration in 1938 to ban the sale of such books in order to prevent the circulation of Marxist ideas and, in Ba Maw's mind, to preserve the influence of British colonial propaganda. Robert H. Taylor, *Marxism and Resistance in Burma, 1942–1945: Thein Pe Myint's Wartime Traveler* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1984), 70.

<sup>3</sup> ù Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win* (Rangoon: Religious Affairs Department Press, 1969): 201. The Communist Party had split in 1946, into a minority “Red Flag” group that rebelled at that time and a mainstream Stalinist, “White Flag” group under Than Tun. The current reference refers to the latter.

<sup>4</sup> ù Maung Maung, *Burma in the Family of Nations* (Amsterdam: Djambatan, 1956): 133.

<sup>5</sup> ù Ba Than, *The Roots of the Revolution: A Brief History of the Defence Services of the Union of Burma and the Ideals for Which They Stand* (Rangoon: Director of Information, 1962): 67, 69; Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, 222, 228.

<sup>6</sup> Edward M. Law Yone and David J. Mandelbaum, “Pacification in Burma,” *Far Eastern Survey* 19, no. 17 (11 October 1950), 182.

- <sup>7</sup> Û Nu, “Our Policy and Programme,” speech delivered on 19 July 1950, in Û Nu, *From Peace to Stability* (Rangoon: Ministry of Information, Government of the Union of Burma, 1951), 83–84.
- <sup>8</sup> Û Nu, “Our Policy and Programme,” 82.
- <sup>9</sup> Û Nu, “From Peace to Stability,” speech delivered in October and November 1950 in Rangoon, Moulmein, and Mandalay, in Û Nu, *From Peace to Stability* (Rangoon: Ministry of Information, Government of the Union of Burma, 1951), 110.
- <sup>10</sup> June Bingham, *U Thant: The Search for Peace* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1966): 168–170.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 170, 174.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.
- <sup>13</sup> In an episode usually referred to in the secondary literature only by John F. Cady, the writer, former Communist Party of Burma member, and supporter of the Nu government, Thein Pe Myint, pushed for the Nu government to realize the aims of the constitution, the creation a socialist state in Burma. In early June 1950, arguing that this goal necessitated preparing the ground among those undergoing university education, Thein Pe Myint proposed in the Council of Rangoon University a Communization of the school’s curriculum. Thein Pe Myint’s proposal included using as textbooks English translations of some of the books Nu had earlier proposed as part of the Marxist League plan, as well as G.V. Plekhanov’s *Materialist Concept of History*. No one seconded the motion and a special committee, including Thein Pe Myint, was created to study the curriculum instead. In September 1950, when students voted to ban political parties from the university campus, they also rejected Thein Pe Myint’s proposed “Marxist curriculum.” John F. Cady, *A History of Modern Burma* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1958): 611.
- <sup>14</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 77.
- <sup>15</sup> Background information comes from WWB, 41, 44, 105, 119.
- <sup>16</sup> Û Nu, “Bullets versus Ballots, Speech delivered in Parliament on 28 September 1949,” in Nu, *From Peace to Stability*, 15.
- <sup>17</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 77.
- <sup>18</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 77.
- <sup>19</sup> Hugh Tinker, *The Union of Burma: A Study of the First Years of Independence* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956): 182.
- <sup>20</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 78.
- <sup>21</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 78.
- <sup>22</sup> Maung Maung, *Burma in the Family of Nations*, 134.
- <sup>23</sup> Û Nu, *U Nu: Saturday’s Son*, translated by Û Law Yone and edited by Û Kyaw Win (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975): 276.
- <sup>24</sup> Û Nu, *For World Peace and Progress* (Rangoon: Ministry of Information, Union of Burma, 1954): 4–5.
- <sup>25</sup> Û Nu, *Burma Under the Japanese: Pictures and Portraits* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1954): ix.
- <sup>26</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 170, 182.
- <sup>27</sup> Û Nu, *Translation of the Hon’ble Prime Minister’s Speech Delivered Before the Officers of the Bureau of Special Investigation on Saturday, the 17th October 1953* (Rangoon: Superintendent, Government Printing and Stationery, Burma, 1953): 1–2.
- <sup>28</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 170, 182.
- <sup>29</sup> Û Nu, “Speech Delivered at the Swearing in Ceremony of Members of the Bureau of Special Investigation on 17th December 1951,” in Nu, *Burma Looks Ahead* (Rangoon: Superintendent, Government Printing and Stationery, Burma, 1953): 23, 25.
- <sup>30</sup> The translation for this act comes from the Burma Lawyers Council website ([http://www.geocities.com/blc\\_dc/epa\\_e.html](http://www.geocities.com/blc_dc/epa_e.html)).
- <sup>31</sup> Mary P. Callahan, “Democracy in Burma: The Lessons of History,” *NBR Analysis* 9, no. 3 (1998), 12.
- <sup>32</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 181.
- <sup>33</sup> Ludu Û Hla, *The Victim*, translated by Than Tun & Kathleen Forbes (Mandalay: Kyipwayay Press, 1973); *idem*, *The Caged Ones*, translated by Sein Tu (Bangkok: Orchid Press, 1998).
- <sup>34</sup> Personal communication, U Thaw Kaung.
- <sup>35</sup> “Ludu Aung Than hnín Dimogareisi Byán-bwà-yè Athin,” in Û Nu, *Ludu Aung Than Pyazat* (Rangoon: Dimoga-yei-si-pinya-byán-pwà-yè-haung, 1958): vii.
- <sup>36</sup> Thant, “Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún,” 78.
- <sup>37</sup> U Thant, “Introduction,” in U Nu, *The People Win Through*, translated by U Khin Zaw (Rangoon: Society for the Extension of Democratic Ideals, 1952): ii.

- <sup>38</sup> The proceedings were published in *Report of the Rangoon Conference on Cultural Freedom in Asia* (Rangoon: Congress of Cultural Freedom, 1956).
- <sup>39</sup> Edward Hunter, "Introduction," in *The People Win Through: a play by U Nu*, with a long biographical introduction by Edward Hunter (New York: Taplinger Publishing Co., 1957): 50.
- <sup>40</sup> Hunter, "Introduction," 50; Personal communication, U Thaw Kaung.
- <sup>41</sup> Tinker, *The Union of Burma*, 183.
- <sup>42</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 170.
- <sup>43</sup> Thant, "Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún," 78.
- <sup>44</sup> Hunter, "Introduction," 50. The efforts to turn the play into a film are discussed at length in Michael W. Charney, "U Nu, China, and the "Burmese" Cold War: Propaganda in Burma in the 1950s," forthcoming.
- <sup>45</sup> Richard Butwell, *U Nu of Burma* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969): 81; Personal communication from Jon Fernquist November 2004.
- <sup>46</sup> Û Nu, *From Peace to Stability* (Rangoon: Superintendent, Government Printing and Stationery, Burma, 1951): 189.
- <sup>47</sup> Robert H. Taylor, *Foreign and Domestic Consequences of the KMT Intervention in Burma* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program, 1973): 1.
- <sup>48</sup> Taylor, *The State in Burma*, 262.
- <sup>49</sup> Nu, *From Peace to Stability*, 102.
- <sup>50</sup> Taylor, *The State in Burma*, 263.
- <sup>51</sup> Taylor, *The State in Burma*, 263.
- <sup>52</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 38.
- <sup>53</sup> Û Nu, *For World Peace and Progress* (Rangoon: Ministry of Information, Union of Burma, 1954): 2.
- <sup>54</sup> Nu, *For World Peace and Progress*, 3.
- <sup>55</sup> Alongside Nu's translation, one can still find numerous cheap edition copies of Carnegie's original work that must have circulated during the period. Just recently, I obtained a copy of Dale Carnegie, *How to Win Friends & Influence People*, 16th Indian edition (Bombay: D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., n.d.), from a book mat in downtown Yangon (Rangoon).
- <sup>56</sup> Û Nu (trans.), *Meitta-bala-tiga* (Rangoon: Burma Translation Society, 1954).
- <sup>57</sup> Nu, *From Peace to Stability*, 70.
- <sup>58</sup> Quoted in Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, 238.
- <sup>59</sup> Quoted in Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, 238.
- <sup>60</sup> Michael Yahuda, *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific, 1945–1995* (London: Routledge, 1996): 128, 130.
- <sup>61</sup> *Those Fickle Communists!* Translation of a pamphlet published by Myanma Mandaing Press, June 1952 (Rangoon: Burma Union Press, 1952).
- <sup>62</sup> Edward Hunter, *Brain-washing in Red China: The Calculated Destruction of Men's minds*, revised, expanded edition (New York: Vanguard Press, 1953).
- <sup>63</sup> See, for example, Edward Hunter, *The Past and Present: A Year in Afghanistan* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958).
- <sup>64</sup> House Committee on Un-American Activities, *Communist Psychological Warfare (Brainwashing)*, consultation with Edward Hunter, 85th Cong., 2d sess., March 13, 1958 (Committee Print), <http://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/globalism/Congress.htm>.
- <sup>65</sup> Edward Hunter, *The Continuing Revolt: The Black Book on Red China* (New York: The Bookmailer, 1958): 15, 17.
- <sup>66</sup> Hunter, *The Continuing Revolt*, 15.
- <sup>67</sup> Thant, "Pyazat-baw-bauk-la-poún," 78.
- <sup>68</sup> Hunter, "Introduction," 49; Thant, "Introduction," ii.
- <sup>70</sup> See, for example, Hunter, "Introduction," 23, 40, 41, 43, 46.
- <sup>71</sup> Hunter, "Introduction," 50.
- <sup>72</sup> Tin Than Oo, "No Desire to Relapse into Miserable Life of the Past," 1.
- <sup>73</sup> Hunter, "Introduction," 50; Tin Than Oo, "No Desire to Relapse into Miserable Life of the Past," *New Light of Myanmar* (1 September 2003): 1.
- <sup>74</sup> Tinker, *The Union of Burma*, 167–177; Taylor, *The State in Burma*, 288–290.
- <sup>75</sup> Bingham, *U Thant*, 181, 199.
- <sup>76</sup> Robert H. Taylor, *The State in Burma* (London: C. Hurst & Co., 1987): 288.

---

<sup>77</sup> Taylor, *The State in Burma*, 288.

<sup>78</sup> “Party-line on Religion,” 10 March 1952, in Klaus Fleischmann (ed.), *Documents on Communism in Burma 1945–1977* (Hamburg, 1989): 129; WWB, 114.

<sup>79</sup> “Party-line on Religion,” 10 March 1952, 129–131.

<sup>80</sup> Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, 267–269; 271–272; Ba Than, *The Roots of the Revolution*, 71

<sup>81</sup> Ba Than, *The Roots of the Revolution*, 71.

<sup>82</sup> E. Michael Mendelson, *Sangha and State in Burma: A Study of Monastic Sectarianism and Leadership*, edited by John P. Ferguson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975): 350.

<sup>83</sup> Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, 267–269; 271–272; Ba Than, *The Roots of the Revolution*, 71.

<sup>84</sup> Callahan, “Democracy in Burma,” 15.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 5–26.

