

---

# What the independent Western media will not investigate

Friday, 29 May 2009

Last Updated Friday, 29 May 2009

The special session on Sri Lanka has come and gone, though interested parties such as the Dutch Foreign Minister seem determined to continue on an adversarial path. Nothing can be done however about those with political agendas, and though it is depressing to see such agendas asserted with self-righteous sanctimoniousness, the world does not really take seriously such posturings on the part of politicians.

More serious, because there are still those who take seriously whatever they read in newspapers, is the failure of the media to investigate the actual rationale for the session and related logistics.

Here then are a number of questions so-called independent journalists should ask and pursue - though there is little chance of them doing that, given the stranglehold Western politicians have on the agendas the media follows -

1. How much did it cost to have a special session on Sri Lanka of the UN Human Rights Council?
  2. Which countries relentlessly put pressure on others, in capitals and in private houses and at bilateral meetings, to ensure that there were enough signatures for a session?
  3. Why the original assertion, that the session was needed for civilians caught in the conflict zone, changed to a more general purpose while the media was led to believe that the session was intended to introduce a War Crimes probe?
  4. Why the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights announced at the special session on Gaza that Sri Lanka would be next, and whether she attempted to pressurize countries into asking for such a session?
  5. Why several independent experts issued a call for a probe coinciding with the efforts of some European nations to have a special session on May 14th?
  6. Did they exceed their mandate then, and also when they added their accusatory voice to the High Commissioner's at the beginning of the special session?
  7. Why were no countries in the South Asian region consulted on the matter, and why was there much secrecy for many weeks, until it became manifest that sufficient signatures would not be forthcoming before the 14th of May?
  8. Did some Europeans indicate that the call for a special session would be dropped if Sri Lanka engaged in a structured briefing session, while others were pursuing signatures and claiming that commitments were flexible since a multi-track approach was always acceptable?
  9. Were there any countries that regretted the destruction of the terrorist LTTE?
  10. Which countries had contacts with the new leader of the LTTE, Mr Pathmanathan, who is wanted by Interpol on criminal charges?
  11. What expectations were given to LTTE supporters, including former officials of the TRO which collected money for LTTE use, who had arranged to come to Geneva on May 14th, and who appeared and spoke at the special session?
  12. Which countries shared the view of the British that a call for a probe was essential to calm the feelings of LTTE supporters who were demanding this, and would such demands with regard to the activities of other countries be similarly indulged?
- Prof Rajiva Wijesinha Secretary General Secretariat for Coordinating the Peace Process Courtesy: SCOPP