

## Transcript of an Exchange of Views on Twitter

15 – 17 May 2025



[The Irrawaddy \(Eng\)](#)

[@IrrawaddyNews](#)

[May 15](#)

Kyaw Zwar Minn, who was appointed by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's government, has refused to leave his ambassadorial residence in London as demanded by the junta.

[#WhatsHappeningInMyanmar](#)



[Ousted Myanmar Envoy to UK Charged With Trespass in London Residence Row](#)

[From irrawaddy.com](#)



[Derek Tonkin](#)

[@DerekTonkinUK](#)

-----  
[@NUGRepofficeUK](#) [@NUGPressSPOX](#) [@NUGMyanmar](#) [@AmbassadorTun](#) [@DavidAltonHL](#)  
[@ukinmyanmar](#) [@FCDOGovUK](#)

I might be wrong, but here are a few thoughts about the background to this dispute. Kyaw Zwar Minn (KZM) is living in property owned by the Myanmar State, described when purchased in 1952 as "The Union of Burma". This is confirmed in the UK Land Registry extract attached. The Metropolitan Police state in the Charge - see

<https://networkmyanmar.org/ESW/Files/KZM-6.pdf...> - that the property belongs to the Mission of the Republic of Myanmar to the UK. But the Republic (the State) is surely a different entity altogether from the Mission. A Mission cannot be a State, and vice versa.

Since the purchase of the property in 1952, the State has changed its name three times - in 1974 (new Constitution), in 1989 (redesignation of "Burma" as "Myanmar") and in 2008 (new Constitution). None of these changes of name - not a change of ownership - has yet been recorded in the Land Registry. Note the admonition in the Land Registry extract that: "If you need to prove property ownership, for example, for a court case, you'll need to order an official copy of the register".

But which Foreign Ministry has the right to administer this diplomatic property today: the SAC or the NUG? The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961 offers no guidance about competing claims. The SAC want KZM out, but the NUG might want him to stay for the present, not least as he has offered to hand over to a representative of the NUG the keys to "Myanmar House", if the NUG want them. One thing that needs to be done is to bring the title up-to-date. This could take time. The Land Registry will need written evidence of the three changes and of British acceptance of these changes. But who has the legal capacity to act in 2025? The SAC or the NUG? Or both? Or neither?

Since the UK no longer recognises Governments (see attachment), the Westminster Magistrates Court might well conclude on 30 May that they are out of their depth and refer the dispute to a higher Court. (The Charge states pointedly: "You can tell the court how you will be pleading at any hearing of your case, even if your case may have to be heard at the Crown Court" – see <https://gov.uk/courts/crown-court#:~:text=A%20Crown%20Court%20deals%20with...> ).

The SAC and NUG are rival claimants in the UN to the Myanmar seat, but the UN General Assembly has for four years running declined to choose between them and instead allowed [@AmbassadorTun](#) , appointed like KZM by the deposed NLD Administration, to keep the Myanmar seat. See [https://networkmyanmar.org/ESW/Files/A\\_79\\_613-EN.pdf...](https://networkmyanmar.org/ESW/Files/A_79_613-EN.pdf...) and [https://networkmyanmar.org/ESW/Files/A\\_RES\\_79\\_132-EN.pdf...](https://networkmyanmar.org/ESW/Files/A_RES_79_132-EN.pdf...)

I hope the NUG will have the wit and courage to take a public position on this case even though they and KZM reportedly do not see eye to eye on some issues.

I would not though wish to predict the outcome of this dispute, though I somehow doubt that it will be settled on 30 May.



## Title register for:

**49 Redington Road, London, NW3 7RA (Freehold)**

**Title number: 147954**

Accessed on 10 May 2025 at 19:11:52

This information can change if we receive an application. This service can not tell you if HM Land Registry are dealing with an application.



**This is not an official copy. It does not take into account if there's a pending application with HM Land Registry. If you need to prove property ownership, for example, for a court case, you'll need to order an official copy of the register.**

## Register summary

Title number	147954
Registered owners	THE UNION OF BURMA 19A Charles Street, Westminster, W1
Last sold for	No price recorded

## A: Property Register

This register describes the land and estates comprised in this title.

Entry number	Entry date	
1	1911-01-30	CAMDEN  The Freehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and

The Freehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and

---

being Maryon Lodge, 49 Redington Road.

**B: Proprietorship Register**

This register specifies the class of title and identifies the owner. It contains any entries that affect the right of disposal.

**Class of Title:** Title absolute

Entry number	Entry date	
1	1952-08-25	PROPRIETOR: THE UNION OF BURMA of 19A Charles Street, Westminster, W1.
2	1952-08-25	RESTRICTION:-Except under an Order of the Registrar no disposition is to be registered.

**C: Charges Register**

This register contains any charges and other matters that affect the land.

**Class of Title:** Title absolute

Entry number	Entry date	
1		The land is subject to the covenants and stipulations referred to in a Deed dated the 11th of November 1910.  NOTE: Copy filed.

---

The text on this page has been created from Hansard archive content, it may contain typographical errors.

**Viscount AMORY**

 [Share](#)

asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether they have completed their re-examination of British policy and practice concerning the recognition of Governments; and what is the result of that re-examination.

**Lord CARRINGTON**

 [Share](#)

Following the undertaking of my right honourable friend the Lord Privy Seal in another place on 18th June last we have conducted a re-examination of British policy and practice concerning the recognition of Governments. This has included a comparison with the practice of our partners and allies. On the basis of this review we have decided that we shall no longer accord recognition to Governments. The British Government recognise States in accordance with common international doctrine. Where an unconstitutional change of régime takes place in a recognised State, Governments of other States must necessarily consider what dealings, if any, they should have with the new régime, and whether and to what extent it qualifies to be treated as the Government of the State concerned. Many of our partners and allies take the position that they do not recognise Governments and that therefore no question of recognition arises in such cases. By contrast, the policy of successive British Governments has been that we should make and announce a decision formally "recognising" the new Government. This practice has sometimes been misunderstood, and, despite explanations to the contrary, our "recognition" interpreted as implying approval. For example, in circumstances where there might be legitimate public concern about the violation of human rights by the new régime, or the manner in which it achieved power, it has not sufficed to say that an announcement of "recognition" is simply a neutral formality. We have therefore concluded that there are practical advantages in following the policy of many other countries in not according recognition to Governments. Like them, we shall continue to decide the nature of our dealings with régimes which come to power unconstitutionally in the light of our assessment of whether they are able of themselves to exercise effective control of the territory of the State concerned, and seem likely to continue to do so.

 [Column 1122](#)