CONCLUSION

As indicated earlier, Burma is situated between the two big countries of East, India and China which are obviously more powerful than herself. This is also true that very little is heard or known about this country which remained for a long period a part of Indian empire. In spite of all this, Burma gradually acquired great importance not only for India but also for Southeast Asia and Singapore. The defence system of Southeast Asia rests to a great extent upon Burma. Any disturbing factor in the control of the Bay of Bengal is likely to imperil the security of India. The self-imposed isolation of Burma, some times puzzles the outside world. The Second World War increased the strategic importance of Burma. The great significance of 'Burma Road' and use of the port of Rangoon transfused this skeleton with life and blood. The closing of this road provoked protests not only from China but also from U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. It was used as a passage from Thailand to India and China to India.

It is also a fact that geographically, Burma is an isolated country. Over-land communication with India are difficult because of the mountains and the jungle covered ridges. The mountains play a very important role as they constitute frontiers and serve as a boundary which separates
Burma from China. It also makes a natural boundary with Burma's eastern neighbour, Thailand. In the border area of Burma and India live the Nagas who became a great source of trouble to the Indian government. The neutrality of the government of Burma is therefore necessary for India. In view of Indo-Pak hostility relations with Burma were more significant and important to India for several security reasons. Burma became important after the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan whose hostility towards India posed acute security problems. But by the emergence of Bangla Desh as a friendly state on the eastern border of India, this threat has been removed. The first and foremost effort of Burma is seeking a protective cradon of sympathetic states around her borders, just like that which Russia has managed to achieve in the Eastern Europe.

Burma's historical role begins with the great ruler called Anawrahta who founded the Burma's first national kingdom Pagan in 1044. Burma came under the British rule in the 19th century after the third war. Burma was administered as a province of India until 1937 when it became a separate colony. A wave of nationalism swept across Burma, when the congress party led by Gandhi and Nehru in India influenced their politicians. But real national aspiration came from
Burmese themselves when Burmese founded the "Young Men Buddhist Association" in 1908.

Many governmental reforms had taken place in Burma as a part of India. Minto-Morley and Montague-Chelmsford reports had also been introduced in Burma in the same manner as they were partially introduced in India. The Simon Commission of 1928 gave the report in favour of the separation of Burma from India, because Burma feared that this country might one day become a "vassal state" of India.

After the Japanese occupation in the Second World War, Burma declared herself an independent state, receiving recognition from all the axis power. But after the reoccupation by Britain, the actual administration of Burma was handed over to the Supreme-allied commander of Southeast Asia, Admiral Mountbatten, the NU-Attlee agreement recognised the republic of the Union of Burma as a fully independent sovereign state on January 4, 1948.

After gaining independence the new Union of Burma plunged into a civil war. But the rebels no longer stood as alternatives to the AFFP (Anti-Fascist People's Federation League) government under the leadership of Premier UNU. When AFFP party became divided into two, the situation became worse. Consequently UNU called Newin for premiership, who
was elected unopposed. The religious policy of UNU also provided a cause for the army. UNU government was a military administration.

But in the 1960 general election, UNU and its party won overwhelming victory for UNU and his party. But in March 1962, General Ne Win took over control and UNU was arrested. Power came in the hands of revolutionary Council which was formed under the chairmanship of General Ne Win. The General Ne Win regime was basically totalitarian. The Revolutionary Government is based on a system of socialist democracy and socialist economy.

Burma's relations with U.K. have been cordial with the Commonwealth countries of Asia, U.K.'s Government worked in the closest cooperation in foreign affairs. U.K. attended the Southwest Asia F.M.'s Conference in Colombo or the eve of the Geneva talks on Indo-China in 1954.

Unlike India, Burma left the British Commonwealth, because the Burmese leaders thought that Burma would not remain independent in Commonwealth. However, so many times, Burmese government accepted financial aid from the Commonwealth countries. The Commonwealth Conference of Delhi proposed conciliation of a "Karen" (a tribe) differences through Commonwealth mediation through a good offices committee of Commonwealth representatives in Rangoon. Though Burma is no
longer a member of Commonwealth, she has remained a very close friend of Commonwealth countries.

After independence, Burma became the member of the U.N. and other U.N. specialized agencies. Burma's role in the U.N. as an uncommitted, anti-colonial and underdeveloped nation is what one might expect of a newly independent Asian country. Though her basic political philosophy offers novelties, the readiness of her representatives to seek the fundamentals of a problem and to search for negotiated partial solutions without violation of adopted principles, are continuing hallmarks of her faith in the U.N. and instrument of the promotion of world peace and progress. In the U.N. Burma has tried her best to follow an independent policy, judging each case on the merits as it comes up on Korean War. On Korean War, Burma supported the U.N., but the cost of decision paid by Burma was heavy. Burma supported the resolution of unity for peace in the fifth session of the U.N. General Assembly. Burma has been active member and a beneficiary of the specialized agencies of the U.N.

Burma's role in the U.N. has been closely allied to that of other Arab and Afro-Asian nations. Burma supported the membership of U.N. for Communist China. U Thant of Burma, the former Secretary General of the U.N. also played a very
important role in solving many international problems. He maintained strict neutrality as an important dignitary of the U.N. While maintaining diplomatic relations with Russia and China, the Burmese Government supported U.N. action in Korea, and UNU also organized in Rangoon in 1953, the first session of Asian Socialist Conference, which Mr. Attlee attended. Burma's policy of non-alignment with power blocs often led its U.N. representatives into voting on both sides. Burmese Government brought the KMT problem before the U.N. Through the efforts of the U.N. Commission, this problem was solved. At last Burma had agreed to the ceasefire. On disarmament and control of nuclear weapons, Burmese position is that of a small nation, i.e., of having no responsibility in this area of international relations. Really, Burma is very silent spectator in the nuclear armament race as it can not hope to enter the nuclear club or influence its policies due to its economic backwardness and absence of scientific know-how.

Burma's foreign policy has been distinctly neutralist almost since independence. Burma presents an excellent example of how a small nation can enable it to maintain its independence in a world dominated by two rival power blocs and clashing ideologies. Burma is a major cosmopolitan centre in Southeast Asia. The Revolutionary council has balanced eastern
and western influences in Burma. Because Burma wants to avoid the agony of a Vietnam type "War of National Liberation." So Burma continues to maintain good economic relations with the West and participates in many international organisations. Burma also receives foreign aid from Western as well as communist nations.

The Burmese attitude towards Asian conflicts such as Vietnam, Kashmir, Malaysia, Indonesia, is that of peaceful settlement, on the basis of the 1954 Geneva accords and a new Geneva type conference. The attitude of Burma towards Laos and Cambodia is not very clear and definite. But soon these doubts vanished. Burma gave formal recognition to both states. Burma has been sympathetic towards Yugoslavia and Israel. Just recently Burma took a neutralist posture over Bangla-Desh but when Bangla-Desh emerged as a political reality, Burma was among the first few to accord recognition to it even at the risk of diplomatic rupture with Pakistan. Burma also greeted the recent Simla Agreement and believed that it contributed considerably to peace in Asia as a whole.

The testing aspect of Burma's foreign policy has been the manner in which the world-giants like China, Russia and U.S.A. remain friendly towards Burma. Burma is one of the Colombo powers who have come together in fields of cooperation
and development to expand the area of peace and economic progress.

It is remarkable that most of the Burmese in politics are firm supporters of their government's neutral policy, because it has permitted them to travel to Israel, to U.A.R. to the U.S.A., the Communist China, to the Soviet Union and to Japan and Western Europe as well as Afro-Asian countries. Burma plays a very successful and significant role of mediator between the U.S.A. and Communist China in the U.N. The relations with India, Pakistan, Ceylon and China have remained close and cordial. But it is quite clear that Burma's geographic contiguity with Communist China has always involved special consideration for the Burmese foreign policy makers. Her relations with Pakistan might receive a setback due to the circumstances referred to above.

The foreign policy of Burma is one of the positive neutrality even in the desperate times. Burmese Government realises that it is the correct foreign policy for his country to make friends abroad and no enemies. The non-alignment with power blocs, and the policy of neutrality is defensive.
Burma stayed out from SEATO, because it never believed that the defence organisation like SEATO will be successful. The formation of SEATO increases the possibilities of conflict instead of peace and security. Owing to her aloofness from any military alliance, she enjoys the worldwide confidence because of her neutralist stand. As an outcome of her neutralist policy, Burma is receiving no sizeable economic aid from the two countries that might have provided it.

In spite of her relationship with China, she has no soft corner for communism at home. Burma is worried about the possible expansionist character of Chinese communism and profoundly unsettling effect it would have on the approaches of Burma's frontiers. It is also deeply concerned about the continued infiltration of Indians and Chinese across the borders of Yunnan.

Inspite of the Communist rebellion at home, Burma's relations with Communist China have remained cordial since the time of the founding of the PRC. Burma recognised the People's Republic of China and agreed to establish diplomatic relations with her. The expansion of the Burma-China friendship association in Rangoon in the autumn of 1953 symbolised the beginning of new developments in Sino-Burmese relations.
In March, more trade contracts were signed by which Peking began to export industrial installations and equipment to Burma.

Burma's relations with China have always been guided by the five principles of co-existence which enjoin good relations between states with differing political and social systems on the basis of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and settlement of dispute between nations by peaceful means, scrupulous observance of these principles has enabled Burma and China to conclude a permanent boundary settlement and promotion of friendly relations. At Bandung Chou En Lai made a specific pledge that Peking would never violate Burma's frontiers. Although, border trouble finally flared up when a large number of Chinese communist troops penetrated into an extensive area inside Burma, but this problem soon got pacified due to constant efforts by Burma since then a peaceful boundary settlement has been concluded to their mutual satisfaction.

The Government of the Union of Burma and the Government of the People's Republic of China genuinely desired to maintain everlasting peace and cordial friendship between
the Union of Burma and the People's Republic of China. In 1961 a treaty of friendship was at last concluded between the two countries in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence jointly initiated by the two countries.

A rift in Burma-China relations precipitated by the Chinese in 1967 was perhaps a manifestation of Peking's frustration over failing to become politically or economically dominant in Burma. Rangoon signed the Test Ban Treaty of 1963, Peking opposed it, Burma has recognised an Indian territory claimed by China in the Sino-Indian border dispute. Burma favoured the formation of Malaysia which China attacked it as a neo-colonialist plot and supported Indonesia's "confrontation policy."

Burma has maintained neutrality where as China has been vehemently anti-U.S. and Pro-NLF and North Vietnam, Rangoon maintains cordial relations with Moscow with which Peking is engaged in a bitter ideological dispute. Finally, Burma has maintained neutrality on the Laotian issue, while China supports the Pathet Lao. So the Sino-Burmese relations sank to the lowest point at the middle of the year over the riotous behaviour of the Pro-Peking Chinese living in Burma.
It is difficult to explain Peking's aim in supporting cultural Revolution to Burma. Its "Red Guard" diplomacy may have been an unintended aspect of its own chaotic internal revolutionary situation. Peking's aim may have been to force Newin to accept Communist participation in a united front government. Perhaps China believed Burma was so weakened economically and divided politically that its government could easily be toppled.

A marked sign of the improvement of relations after 1967 is in evidence. Both nations had agreed sometime in 1970 to send back their ambassadors to their posts. Because Burma was anxious to improve its trade and financial situation by acquiring abundant supplies of cheap Chinese goods. Since then relations between Burma and China have continued to improve. Burma has been notably successful in diminishing Chinese and other foreign influences.

The first contact between India and Burma started merely twenty five centuries ago when Buddhism began to spread its message of love, peace and right conduct beyond the confines of India. Burma is not only close neighbour of India in Southeast Asia, but also has connection with India since ancient times. The migration of Indians into Burma is as old as the history of these two countries which goes back to pre-historic age.
The Burmese policy of Burmization affected Indians very much. Burmization of services is another such measure. Under the immigration policy of Burma, thousands of Indians have been forced out of business and so out of the country. Indian leaders became silent because they wanted to continue friendship between Burma and India. Both the countries did not want to snap the bonds of mutual friendship. The representatives of both the countries kept their heads cool and showed a spirit of negotiation to settle this problem. In fact, the Burmization programme has been one sided and partial. It has not applied with equal force against the people of Communist countries like China.

The frontier relations between India and Burma have been without any events. The Indo-Burmese Boundary Commission had been formed in terms of boundary agreement.

Both the countries, after their independence, have followed the policy of non-alignment and neutrality. It is a well known fact that Nehru and UNU were principal architects of the policy of the non-alignment for the new nations. Burmese leaders looked to India and the Indian leaders with admiration. Some observers even go to the extent of saying, "Burma's foreign policy is nearly a duplication or carbon copy of India's foreign policy." But this observation is
wrong because Burma does not follow India in all respects. For example the membership of the Commonwealth. In view of happy relations between both countries a treaty of friendship was signed between them in 1951. The treaty was firm and has lasting foundation for brotherly relations between the two countries. Indian leaders tried their best to establish extensive diplomatic relations with Burma to strengthen the economic and commercial contacts with her.

The military coup in Burma shocked and surprised India but she welcomed the declarations by the Revolutionary Council with regard to domestic policies. There are many international problems which India and Burma faced together, when the Chinese volunteers entered into the Korean War, both the countries in the U.N. charged North Korea of aggression against South Korea. Both the countries did not believe in collective defence arrangements such as SEATO. On the Hungarian problem also, Burma and India disagreed in the U.N. India and Burma sincerely desired to avoid war and to maintain their solidarity with Asian and Afro-Asian world.

The Gandhian tradition of non-violence and the ancient Buddhist principle of "Ahimsa" has been reflected
in the Burmese foreign policy. Being a "Buffer State" Burma is highly conscious of her position in Southeast Asia. The Chinese threat has been worrying India as well as Burma. As regards the border disputes, it is the opinion of the Burmese leaders that the time is not ripe for any firm move in regard to the border dispute. Both the countries accepted Nehru's principles of "Panchsheela". The public opinion of Asia has been awakened now to the "creeping yellow peril of China." The aggressive posture of China has posed a danger for the neighbouring countries, more particularly India and Burma. The era of Hindi-Chini and Burmese-Chini Bhai Bhai came to an abrupt end due to aggressive and expansionist designs of China and some misunderstanding existing on vital border issues.

India and Burma remain as peaceful co-existing neighbours with mutual good will and trust. In Sino-Indian border dispute, Burma was sympathetic towards India and Burma appealed to Indian and Chinese to stop from any action over the present fighting between India and China.

General Ne Win and Mrs. Indra Gandhi scanned the world scene from the Asian angle. Both India and Burma wanted political settlement of the Vietnamese question within the frame work of Geneva Agreement.
Thus we see that both the countries have a great similarity of ideas, beliefs and interests. The aims and objectives of their policies are also similar. Burma and India can constitute the corner-stone of regional cooperation in economic, political and cultural fields. The emergence of Bangla Desh in this region as a free, democratic, socialist and secular republic, friendly to both India and Burma, would provide an additional link in the long chain of friendly and peace-loving states in this region. The quick recognition of Bangladesh by India and Burma augurs well for the future of this region. Burma is fortunately conscious of the fact that it is a tiny country, still in the process of development and therefore it should not hazard any estrangement with any of his big neighbours. It also realises the fact that it is not destined to play any effective role in the event of a clash of giants. A policy of aloofness is therefore considered best in the prevailing circumstances. However, as an independent sovereign state it is bound to express its view on trans-national issues without antagonising any big power or without irritating any neighbour. Small countries, usually play a very vital role in the U.N.O. in resolving bigger issues facing the member countries. Burma has also played such a role successfully. Due its neutral position and uncommitted stance, it has tried to mediate between bigger nations with certain amount of success.