

The Formulation of British Colonial Policy in Myanmar under Dyarchy

Sandar Win*, Thida Myint**

Abstract

Myanmar was inserted in the British India as province after the occupation of Myanmar by the British who were well-experienced with colonial administration. Dyarchy was granted to Myanmar on the 2nd January 1923 according to “the Government of India Act and it was 4 years later than that of India. Dyarchy signifies a ruling of both administrative bodies. On one hand, the administrative system operated by the ministers appointed by the Governor-General and on the other hand, the ministers elected by Myanmar people. Yet, entire authoritative power was held by Viceroy and British officials. Thus the colonialism practiced by the British was just ruling by disintegration of political unity. The British government avoided using the strategy of cracking down the opposition of the Myanmar indigenous tribes as political tactics. According to the colonial policy of Divide and Rule, the ministers appointed by the central Government of India and Governor-General, took charge of important departments such as internal affairs, finance and foreign affairs. Myanmar ministers were assigned only in the unimportant departments like public works. As to the indigenous people’s affairs, hilly regions of Kachin, Kayah, Chin and Shan were acknowledged as backward regions and they were excluded in the administration. Dyarchy was just a way of procrastination not to offer “Home Rule” to Myanmar people. For that policy, the leading GCBA association which was the most active and patriotic campaign against the exploited British colonial administration split into two. Another tactic of the English was that the problem of separation and anti-separation. The problem of separation and anti-separation of Myanmar from India became a strongly controversy among the whole Myanmar people. As a consequence, the united Myanmar political organization disintegrated and the claim for “Home Rule” which was the people’s desire of that period had to fade away. The colonial policies practiced by the English during the administration of Dyarchy which gave great assistance to the long lasting colonial administration.

Keywords: Dyarchy, Home Rule, Divide and Rule Policy

Introduction

Myanmar, after making three wars with British, was totally under the British Empire. After the 1st Anglo-Myanmar War (1824-26), British took Rakhine and Taninthari, which were under the rule of Myanmar. After, the Second Anglo-Myanmar War (1852), British could take Bago and Mookta regions. After the Third Anglo-Myanmar War (1885), British could take all the rest of Upper Myanmar. In this way, Myanmar was completely under the British government. Gradually, Myanmar had to experience the British Administrative System which changed step by step. Lord Dufferin, The Viceroy of India, on 1 January 1886, declared that Myanmar was cooperated to British Colonial Empire. Thus, Myanmar was the youngest province of the Indian Empire for the reason of administrative convenience and economic exploitation. When the 1st World War broke out, the Britain and her allied faced many problems, British sought support from her colonies. The Secretary of State for India E.S Montagu consoled the colonial countries to side with Britain and to participate in the World War. He also declared that India including Myanmar will be granted dominion status. But when the war was over, India was granted a higher administration and Myanmar was neglected. On 2 January 1923, Myanmar was given the Dyarchy administration which was

* Dr., Associate Professor, Department of History, Yangon University of Foreign Languages

** Dr., Lecturer, Department of History, Yangon University of Foreign Languages

introduced as a constitutional reform by Edwin Samuel Montagu (secretary of state for India, 1917-22) and Lord Chelmsford (viceroy of India, 1916-21).

Literature Review

There were many historical books on Colonial Administration of Myanmar which were written by Myanmar and English authors. Among these references, “A History of Modern Burma” by John F Cady, “Colonial Policy and Practice” by J.S Furnivall, “A History of Burma” by Dr Htin Aung, “Burma Constitution” by Dr Maung Maung and “1947 Constitution and Nationalities” by U Kyaw Win, U Mya Han, U Thein Hlaing are unique. These books give the information about the administration systems practiced by the colonialists and effects of the colonial administration on Myanmar people. Proceedings on Burma Round Table Conference shows the political conditions of 1931 in Myanmar under the British and it was published in 1932. It is very rare but useful evidence. Based on the facts from these invaluable references, this paper is attempted to explore the formation of British Colonial Policy during Dyarchy administration.

Aims of research

The aim of research is to contribute the colonial policy of the British during Dyarchy administration and to assess how the British formulate its colonial policy in Myanmar. This research highlights on how imperialists attempted to use their political tactics and formulas to disintegrate the unity of Myanmar and evaluate political needs of people in the period under surveying. By the principle of Dyarchy, Myanmar people got the first experience of constitutional reforms (limited measure of self-rule). It marked the first introduction of the democratic principle into the executive branch of the British administration of Myanmar.

Formation of Dyarchy administration

Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, or Dyarchy (Dy-two; dual, archy-rule: Dyarchy means an administrative system jointly governed by two sides. In other words it a system of joint administration by ministers directly appointed by the council, elected by the people, this system was invented by Sir. Leonel Curtis.) was inaugurated in Myanmar on 1st January 1923 (Maung 1959: 17). Considerable correspondence ensued regarding the form of constitution and it was not till 1921 that it was decided to bring Myanmar within the preview of the Government of India Act 1919, on a line with other provinces (Memoranda 1930: 7).

Myanmar had to wait for two years because she was not only a province apart, she was also educationally backward (Harvey 1964: 78). Meanwhile great dissatisfaction was caused in Myanmar by the delay and by the belief that a similar measure of advance was to be granted than was already in force at the time in India in the shape of Dyarchy. Two deputations were sent to England, political agitation was intensified, organized boycott was freely used and demands of the extremists rose from Dyarchy to “Dominion Home Rule”. Myanmar was constituted a Governor’s province with a reformed legislative council and Dyarchy system similar to that obtaining in other provinces of India with effect from the 2 January 1923 (Memoranda 1930: 7).

The Dyarchy was the dual rule consisted of Governor who was appointed by the British government and the representatives who were elected by the Myanmar people. In fact, the real power was in the hands of the Governor and the English officials. The Governor also had the Veto power. The Myanmar minister administered only the unessential department. It is clear

that Dyarchy was only a political trick of British. In 1923, the new form of government was established in Myanmar. But the Shan States, Kayah and the Tribal hills were excluded from its operation. They were directly controlled by Governor. It is clear that the British played the Divide and Rule Policy upon the Myanmar nationalities (Hall 1968: 826).

Thus, Shan States, Chin Hills, Kachin Hills Tracts, Kayin and Tribal Hills were grouped together as Backward Tracts and were kept aside of the Dyarchy administrative jurisdictions (Memoranda 1930: 35). On this plan the Governor was given an Executive Council comprising two members nominated by the Governor, two ministers selected from among the members of the legislative council, which was enlarged and transformed (Furnivall 1948:159-160). In this system the jurisdiction of the government had been divided into two jurisdictions: Central Subjects and Provincial Subjects. The Indian government took responsibility for the Central Subject while Myanmar government had taken the Provincial Subjects. Again, Provincial Subjects were divided into two Subjects. They were Reserve Subject and Transferred Subjects (Win, Han, Hlaing 1968: 20).

The governor had directly handled Reserved Subjects. The Reserve Subjects were Prisons, Land Revenue, Stamps, Labour, Public Works Department (irrigation Branch), Provincial Marine, Police, Factories, Boilers, General Administration, Law and Justice, Government Press, Local Fund Audit, Archaeology. The Transferred Subjects were forests, Excise and Opium, Registration, Co-operative, Civil Medical, Public Work, Roads and Building Branch, Fisheries, Public Health, Agriculture, Veterinary, Industries, Education. The Reserved Subjects were Prisons, Land Revenue, Stamps, Labour, Public Works Department (irrigation Branch), Provincial Marine, Police, Factories, Boilers, Government Press, Local Fund Audit, and Archaeology (Memoranda 1930: 35).

The Legislative Council had the right to remove the two ministers by non-confident motion. The tenure of office of the advisory council of governor was five years and members of Legislative council was three years (Maung 1959: 17). The Reserve Subjects, comprising defense, law and order, finance and revenue were administered by the two members, the other functions, sometimes, comprehensively described as nation-building were administered by two ministers (Furnivall 1948:150-160). The first Governor was Sir Harcourt Butler who ruled Myanmar from 1923 to 1927 under the Dyarchy Administration (Yin 1957: 60). The Governor of Myanmar was assigned by His Majesty of the King of England after consultation with the Governor General of India. The Governor of Myanmar and the Councilors were appointed by the King vide the Royal Warrant. The Governor and two of his councilors had to administer the Reserve Subjects. These officials must possess at least 12 years' service in India as government servants. The Transferred Subjects were administered by two Ministers nominated by the legislative council. These unelected persons would serve only for six months (RAB 1923: 13-14). The administrative power was sub-divided into two separate categories. The government was entrusted to a governor with an Executive Council of two members in charge of Reserved Subject and two ministers, responsible to the legislature, in charge of Transferred Subjects. The Transferred departments included education, public health, forest and excise (Hall 1968: 150). There were 47 departments left without handing them over to the Myanmar (Donnison 1953: 55). These departments were very important for the British. They all kept under the direct control of the Governor General of the Government of India (The New light of Myanmar 14/07/1977, 17). Myanmar Ministers were given charge of the Departments of Education, Public Health, Forestry and District council. Out of these Forestry and Education were given charge to the two elected ministers (Memoranda 1930: 28).

Under the diarchy arrangement only those members of the Governor's Council of Ministers in charge of the Transferred Subjects were responsible to the legislative council.

Defence and external relations together with currency and coinage, communications and transportation control, income tax and civil and criminal law were the concern of the Central Indian Government at New Delhi. The Governor alone could legislate for the Peripheral Scheduled Areas of Myanmar (Kayah, the Shan state, Kachin, and Chin tribal area). He was also empowered to Veto legislation, to forbid the Legislative Council from considering Reserved Subjects and to certify any essential expenditure (Cady 1958: 242-243). The Governor's control of financial policy severely limited any discretionary power which ministers in charge of Transferred Subject could exercise (Leach 1935: 40, 42). Therefore, under the Dyarchy arrangement, there were 102 administrative subjects, of which 47 were directly controlled by the Central Indian Government, 33 were controlled by the Governor and the remaining 22 were governed by the two responsible ministers with the consent of Governor (Hall 1968: 628). So, it is clear that the Myanmar ministers were treated as the puppet ministers by the British.

In accordance with the Dyarchy constitution, there were 103 seats in Legislative Council of Myanmar. The British government had allotted the seats as follows: 58 of the 80 elected members of the Legislative Council were chosen in general constituencies. Fifteen were elected communally (8 Indians, 5 Kayins, 1 Anglo-Indian and 1 British) while the remaining 7 represented various business groups and the university. An additional 23, including 2 ex-officio members of the executive council and one member to represent labour were nominated by the Governor (Cady 1958: 242-243).

Those ordinary electoral constituencies were carefully adopted and out of that two categories, one for the townships and the other for villages were also adopted (Memoranda 1930: 244-250). The 21 candidates were nominated for the townships. The towns with a population which was over 20000 were nominated as township election centers (Thant 1961: 35). The candidate must be a Government servant, be 25 years old, must be revenue payer, must be a Government employee fit to be able to stand for the house rent. These regulations were stated in Indian Government Civil Act Section 9 (A). The qualifications of the voters were (1) must be eighteen years (2) must be National of the country under British rule (3) must not be abnormal (4) could be either sex (5) Parliamentary elections too were allowed to stand as candidates (Memoranda 1930: 254). It was the first experience of the electoral law for Myanmar.

After the Dyarchy Administration was established Local Government also developed. The Indian Government's opinion was to elect the Municipal Committee with non-government officials. For the village administration they omitted the suggestion of the Indian Government to appoint village headman with government officials and to form village committee (Gazetteer 1923: 880).

All the villages of Myanmar were administered by the Rural Self Government Act of 1921. The Village Committee had to furnish all the cases as forwarded by the District Council and Township Committee. The village headman was the chairman and the village committees were empowered to justify the small matters of Civil Court Cases. The village committee could also suggest and advise the affairs of general administration. For rural areas, the municipalities and the district council took care of the administration (Furnivall 1948: 159). These two organizations were established and were known as rural area administrative committee. It was placed under the Education Minister. According to Rural Self Government Act of 1921, 28 District Councils were established for the village regions. The Municipal Committees and District Councils were governing bodies entitled with self-administrative power. The Governor, however had the right to intervene in the matter. (RAB 1931-1932: 31-32)

Advisory Boards were established in 1924. In this Advisory Boards the minister of local government was the Chairman. As for the committee members, six of the nominees were from the legislative council, another four were nominated by the minister. The duties and responsibilities of the committee was to advise the minister of local government on the administrative affairs submitted by the regional organizations (Memoranda 1930: 424).

Under Dyarchy Administrative system next to the governor, divisional commissioners were the highest permanent executive officers. There were five divisional commissioners for lower Myanmar and three divisional commissioners for upper Myanmar. Altogether there were eight divisional commissioners in Myanmar proper. These divisional commissioners were responsible to the governor for collection of their respective divisions (RAB 1923: 17). They were appointed by the Burma Commission. Under them there were 40 deputy commissioners. Except for Yangon these deputy commissioners had to take the duty of divisional magistrates. In addition, they had to take responsibility of collectors, registers, and assistant commissioners of income tax. Under them sub-divisional commissioners, extra assistant commissioners and township officers were appointed. These officers had the duty to conduct the functions of judicial, executive and taxation within the jurisdiction of Dyarchy system (Sein 1938: 76).

The governor and his advisory council took the responsibility to administer the hilly regions and undeveloped areas. To govern these regions, frontier service assistant commissioners were appointed. The governor, in 1924, set up an advisory committee for local administration. Next, the minister of local administration had appointed four officers to take charge of Circle Boards, District Council and Municipal Council (Memoranda 1930: 551-552). It is clear that the British systematically controlled the whole country by use their administrative method of divide and rule policy.

Thus, it is visible that by Dyarchy administration system the whole administration structure had been divided into three major sectors, first were direct control of the British government in Myanmar, second under direct control of the government of Myanmar and the third under administration of minister from elected bodies of the legislative council. In the dual-administrative rule of Dyarchy, the ministers appointed by the viceroy took one side and the minister elected by Myanmar people took the other for the rule. In fact, Dyarchy administrative system was just apolitical trick of colonists not to offer the Home Rule which was the desire of the Myanmar people. It was nothing but that bureaucratic administration was disguised as parliament administration. Despite dual administrative rule, the entire power was in the hands of the viceroy and British government and Veto power to reject all the administrative authority was also in the hands of viceroy. Hill regions were also administered by the viceroy only as backward tracts. Due to the Dyarchy administrative system, the united GCBA disintegrated. The British with their hope to fulfill their interest prescribed the electoral law to segregate the members of the legislature in accordance with racial basis. And then introduction of communal representatives under Dyarchy system amounted to employment of Divide and Rule policy.

Effects of Diarchy administration on political unity of Myanmar

The British government brought constitutional changes to Myanmar in 1923 just as she did to India vide the 1919 Indian Government Act. The governor had control over the central administration. The department of defense, foreign affairs, immigration, income tax and communication were controlled by the Indian Government (Memoranda 1930: 7). The aim and object of the Dyarchy administration was to place certain government department in the hands of elected representatives (Donnison 1953: 287).

The 9th conference of GCBA in October 1921 had boycotted Dyarchy administrative system to be provided to Myanmar by the British and the conference decided to demand for Home Rule. To establish Dyarchy administration an election for formation of legislative council should have to hold for 79 seats out of 103 seats in November 1922. The election for legislative council divided the GCBA into two factions (Brief History of movement 1970: 407). Since then among the executive members of the GCBA there was the split of personalities. Some of them wanted not to accept the Dyarchy system. They boycotted the election to be held for implementation of Dyarchy system in the country and those who had desired to compete as candidate in the fourth coming election. At the all Myanmar GCBA conference at Jubilee Hall on 17 and 18 June 1922 it was discussed on election issue and decided to boycott the forth coming election (Lay Maung 1961: 228-230).

The GCBA, decided in June 1922 to stand aloof from elections to the new district council constituted under the Burma Rural Self Government Act, 1921, and this led to a split in the party. One section known as 21party (1. U Ba Pe, 2. U Pu, 3. M.A Maung Gyi, 4. U Thein Maung, 5. U Maung Gyi, 6. U Sein, 7. U Thin Maung, 8. U Tin Wai, 9. Dr Ba Yin, 10. U Ba Hlaing, 11. U Thein Maung, 12. U Ba Galay, 13. U Maung Maunhg Ohn Khaing, 14. U Ko Ko, 15. U San Lin, 16. U Ba Oo, 17. U Tun, 18. U Sein Ba, 19. U Ko Ko Gyi, 20. U Maung Gyi, 21. U Maung Nge.) decided to contest. The election to legislative council in November 1922, and in this measure of co-operation received the support of a large proportion of the intelligentsia of the country. The leaders of the GCBA or Hlaing-Pu-Kyaw GCBA (U Chit Hlaing, U Pu and U Tun Aung Kyaw) on the other hand set themselves to organize non-cooperation in the villages by promises of Home Rule, which was generally understood to mean the restoration of the Myanmar dynasty and the obligation of taxes. Their efforts were largely directed towards undermining the authority of village headmen as the representatives of government in direct touch with the people; and nationalist societies under the name of Wunthanu (Associations sprung up in a number of district). The monks are now begun to take a prominent part in politics and their association known as "The General Council of Sangha Sametgis" (Hall 1968: 742).

By the end of tenure of office of the elected members of the legislative council in 1925 a new election was held. The 21 members GCBA which had changed its name to nationalist party again changed its name to be People's Party and entered the election. The numbers of voters in the second election was ten percent more than that of first election. Out of the election People's Party won 30 seats, Home Rule League of U Pu won 2 seats, and Golden Valley Party of Sir. J.A Maung Gyi won 20 seats. Because of the common objectives the People's Party, the Home Rule League and the Swaraj Party incorporated (Encyclopedia III 1956: 129).

The members who at the 1925 elections described themselves as independents were in a clear majority in that council. One of the ministers selected was an independent, and the other member who stood at the elections as a Nationalist and after election became an independent. (Memoranda 1930: 30) The third election for members of legislative council was held in Myanmar in November 1928. Out of the election the People's Party won 40 seat and the Golden Valley Party won 12 seats. In this election 25 percent of the people casted their votes (Lay Maung 1961: 310-311). Thus most energetic political organization of Myanmar was collapsed into split groups.

Dyarchy had worked against a proper party system because while many civil servants were nominally subordinate to the Myanmar minister in the Executive Council, some civil servants were nominated members of the Legislative Council and were thus in a position to vote against the ministerial policies which they might later be required to administer (Taylor 2005: 153). The opposition of Myanmar against the Dyarchy system granted by the British colonial government grew up day by day. It led the British Colonial government to form Sir

John Simon led Indian Statutory Commission or Simon Commission on 26 November 1927, to make survey Dyarchy administrative system (RISC, Vol.I, 1930: XVI). Simon Commission came to Myanmar on 29 January 1929 and started their investigation. U Chit Hlaing led GCBA decided to boycott the commission. Swaraj Party and other political awaken parties in Myanmar did the same action. But there were some few parties which supported the Commission (Cady 1958: 248-249).

To cooperate with the Simon Commission, the Burma Legislative Council had selected the (Seven) ministers of Legislative Council to organize the Committee (Tin 1966: 235). The committee members were- 1. U Aung Thin (chairman), 2. U Ba Shin (member), 3. U Ba U (member), 4. Mr. Eusoof (member), 5. Sra Shwe Ba (member), 6. Mr. Campagnac, 7. Mr. Rafi (member). It had travelled by rail and by water, considerable distances and had taken the opportunity of seeing what it could both of the village life and of the industrial enterprises of that country, the oilfields, the great port of Yangon, the former capital Mandalay, and some other towns in the Ayeyarwaddy valley (RISC, Vol. I 1930: 77).

The recommendations of the Simon Commission were published in May 1930 (Taylor 2005: 156). If the report of Simon Commission was studied it could be seen that although it favoured the separation of Myanmar from India, no advice was given for new administrative system to be introduced to Myanmar. Both India and Myanmar thus rejected the Simon Commission's report. The British authorities, therefore, had to take great care to prevent the unity of Indian and Myanmar nationalist forces. The British on their part considered that by separating Myanmar from India it would be easier for them to govern the countries and prolong their rule in both countries (Than 1974: 189). The Commission have given special consideration to the problem of Myanmar, and have recorded a unanimous opinion that Myanmar should be separated from India forthwith (the Recommendation 1930: 305)

The future political status of Myanmar was treated as a question of minor concern by the first India Round Table Conference, which met at London from 12 November 1930, to 19 January 1931. Myanmar was represented by four members of the Legislative Council, U Ba Pe, U Aung Thin, U Maung Maung Ohn Ghine, and Oscar de Glanville (Cady 1958: 322-323).

The separation of Myanmar from India was regarded and was therefore no longer open to discussion. The question of the new constitution of separated Myanmar could be approached later through a special Myanmar Round Table Conference as suggested previously in full committee or by sending another special commission to Myanmar (Cady 1958: 334).

The Special Myanmar Round Table Conference set in London from 27 November to 12 January 1932. It was made up of 33 persons in all, 9 members of Parliament, 12 Myanmar and 2 representatives each from 6 minority groups, Indian, Kayin, Chinese, Shan, Anglo-Indians and British. Six of the Myanmar representatives were selected from separationist in the Legislative Council and five were anti-separationist, partly from outside the council. But GCBA, led by U Soe Thein, rejected to attend, and boycotted the Myanmar Round Table Conference (Table Conference 1932: 76-78).

The delegations mainly discussed the problem of pro-separation and anti-separation in Myanmar Round Table Conference at London but failed. After the London Conference, the problem led to dispute among the Myanmar people. When the Myanmar representatives came back to Myanmar the question among the Sangha and citizen (Lay Maung 1961: 168).

The main problem of the Round Table Conference was the problem of pro-separation of or unity (anti-separation). As no arrangement was reached in the meeting, the problem of pro-separation and anti-separation became a controversy among the people of the whole of Myanmar. After the end of the Round Table Conference, the progressive spirit for national

unity nearly diminished due to the problem of pro-separation and anti-separation (Tin 1975: 82-83).

Myanmar political organization differ in their opinion whether to be a part of India or to get separated from it. Some Myanmar politicians wished to be separation. Some wished to be a part of India. There were also politicians who formed the Home Rule League for “Home Rule” (Cady 1958: 289).

Dyarchy began its fourteen years’ span in Myanmar in an atmosphere of agitation that went right down to village level. Because of the worse impact of Dyarchy Administration, Myanmar citizens had no desire to continue the rule of Dyarchy. Myanmar nationalities wanted “Home Rule”. The problem of pro-separation and anti-separation was only a British political trick to split among the Myanmar political leaders. Myanmar had originally been a province of India for reasons of administrative convenience and economic exploitation. Nationalism in India and Myanmar combined to override administrative convenience. The formulation of British Colonial policy in Myanmar that they considered that by separating Myanmar from India, it would be easier for them to govern these countries and prolong their rule in both countries. Thus, the British capitalists acted to disorganize the Myanmar nationalist leaders who were struggling for Myanmar independence, with the pro-separation and anti-separation problems. Thus, the viceroy and the government of India continued to look after the interest of Indian capital in Myanmar after separation was completed on 1st April 1937.

Findings

It is found that Myanmar was placed as a state of India after falling under British rule. Myanmar was ruled in the administrative system like that of India. The British Government granted Myanmar with Dyarchy administration, instead of “Home Rule” demanded Myanmar people. Under the Dyarchy administration, Myanmar people suffered severely from, the exploitation of the British imperialist, and their dependents of Chinese, Indian capitalist, and oppressions of the bureaucrat officers of various levels. The Myanmar people became natural with the national spirits day by day, with the agitation of the Myochit Wunthanus (nationalists). The British Government avoided the direct suppression of Myanmar opposition against their rule, but they usually employed the political tactics to create antagonisms between the Myanmar nationals in indirect ways to oppress their activities. Lured with the senior government positions to divide the Wunthanus (nationalists) and attempted to prolong the colonial rule.

Misled by the imperialist diplomacy, the problem of pro or anti-separation became prominent in the Myanmar political arena since 1930-31. It was the time when the independence movement led by National Congress Party was gaining momentum in India. Myanmar Wunthanus and Sanghas (monks) who had opened political eyes began to go along with the movements in India. Therefore, the British were concerned about that the Myanmar nationalists and Indian nationalists may have combined in the struggle for independence and attempted to separate Myanmar from India. Though much-criticized, it signified a breakthrough in British Myanmar government and was the forerunner of Myanmar’s full provincial autonomy (1935) and independence (1948).

Conclusion

YMBA and GCBA made attempts to enliven patriotic spirit as the first opposition against the colonist by Myanmar people. When British were confronted with united organization, patriotic activities, political consciousness, and political activities, they cracked down the circumstances using their new administrative system. In the recommendation of Simon Commission which was the survey of the new Dyarchy administrative system, it was stated that Myanmar was not yet worth the Home Rule and it was to be granted a new administrative system. One step higher than the Dyarchy parting from India. Due to the controversy on the Dyarchy administrative system, the united political organization also had to disintegrate. Pro-separation and anti-separation problem were also used as a weapon to disorganize the political association for the second time. In the decision on pro-separation and anti-separation by voting, the British separated Myanmar from India with the view for their own sake although pro-separation won. The British expected that they would be able to rule Myanmar several years longer as a colony if it was separated from India as it was a hundred years later than India for colonization. Hill regions were also excluded from new administrative system as backward tracts. For the British government that exercised the Divide and Rule Policy, new Dyarchy administrative system and pro-separation and anti-separation problem were effective weapons to disintegrate the united Myanmar political organizations. With the use of Divide and Rule Policy, which is a political trick, the British colonialist were able to disintegrate of Myanmar and the exercising of this policy led to the disunity of anti-colonialist organizations of Myanmar.

Acknowledgement

We are very grateful to Dr Kyaw Win, Part-time Professor, History Department, Yangon University who encouraged us to do this research. We also indebted to Professor Dr Khin Thidar, Head of History Department for her kindly allowing to submit this paper and invaluable suggestions and guidance. Moreover, our special thanks go to Dr Kyi Shwin, Rector, Dr Mi Mi Aung, Pro-rector and Research Project Management and Ethics Committee of YUFL for their supporting and valuable efforts to publish this Research Journal.

References

Primary Sources:

- (1922, July 14). The New Light of Myanmar.
 Government of Burma Act: 1935. (1940). Rangoon, Burma: Government printing & Stationary.
 Memoranda submitted to the statutory commission by the government of Burma. (1930). Rangoon, Burma: Government printing.
 Peel, W. R. (1932). Burma Round Table Conference: 27th November, 1931-12th January, 1932. Proceedings. London: H.M. Stationery Off.
 Report of the Indian Statutory Commission (Vol. 1). (1930). London: His Majesty Office.
 Report on the administration of Burma for the year 1921-1922 (Rep.). (1923). Rangoon, Burma: Government printing & Stationary.
 Spearman, H. R. (1923). The British Burma gazetteer (Vol. 1). Rangoon?: Govt. printing.
 View of the local government on the recommendation of the Indian statutory commission. (1930). London, Burma: His Majesty Office.

Secondary Sources:

Books in English

Cady, J. F. (1958). *A history of modern Burma*. Ithace, NY: Cornell Univ. Pr.

Donnison, F. S. (1953). *Public administration in Burma: A study of development during the British connexion*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Furnivall, J. S. (1948). *Colonial Policy and Practice*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, D. E. (1968). *A history of Southeast Asia* (3rd ed.). New York: ST Martin.

Leach, F. B. (1937). *The future of Burma*. Rangoon: British Burma Press (Rangoon Gazette).

Maung Maung,Dr.. (1959). *Burma's Constitution*. Netherland: The Huge Martinus Nijhoff.

Maung, Maung,Dr. (1969). *Burma and General Ne Win*. London: Asia Publishing House.

Mya Sein,Ma. (1973). *The administration of Burma*. Rangoon: Zabu Meikswe Pitika.

Taylor, R. H. (1987). *The state in Burma*. London: Oriented Longman.....

Win, U. K. (1999). *The 1947constitution and the nationalities* (Vol. 1). Yangon: The University Press.

Books in Myanmar

မြန်မာ့စွယ်စုံကျမ်း (အတွဲ၃)။ (၁၉၅၆) ။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဘာသာပြန်စာပေအသင်း။

အမျိုးသားရေးနှင့် အမျိုးသားလှုပ်ရှားမှု သမိုင်းအကျဉ်း။ (၁၉၇၀)။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဘာသာပြန်စာပေအသင်း။

စိုးရင်၊သိပ္ပံ။ (၁၉၅၇) ။ မြန်မာနိုင်ငံ အုပ်ချုပ်ရေးသမိုင်း။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဇေယျာသိန်းပုံနှိပ်တိုက်။

ထွန်းသန်း၊ ဦး၊ တိုးတက်ရေး။ (၁၉၇၄)။ နိုင်ငံရေးရှင်းတမ်း။ ရန်ကုန်၊ အင်ကြင်းစာပေ။

ဟန်တင်၊ (စစ်ကိုင်း)။ (၁၉၆၆)။ နိုင်ငံတော်မှတ်တမ်း။ ရန်ကုန် ၊ ကုမာရပုံနှိပ်တိုက်။

ဟန်တင်၊ (စစ်ကိုင်း)။ (၁၉၇၅)။ မြန်မာ့လွတ်လပ်ရေးသို့-၁။ ရန်ကုန်၊ စိန်ရတနာစာပေ။

ဘခိုင်၊ ဦး။ (၁၉၆၄)။ မြန်မာ့နိုင်ငံရေးရာဇဝင်။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ပုဂံစာပေ။

သန့်၊ ဦး။(၁၉၆၁)။ ပြည်တော်သာခရီး(အတွဲ၁)။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဘာသာပြန်စာပေအသင်း။

လေးမောင်၊ ဦး။ (၁၉၆၁)။ မြန်မာနိုင်ငံရေးသမိုင်း။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဘာသာပြန်စာပေအသင်း။