

**International
Institute of
Social Studies**

Erasmus

**Representations of humanitarian action in the
media at the end of the Sri Lankan Civil War:
A Discourse Analysis (Jan 2009- May 2009)**

A Research Paper presented by: *Akshay Kadam, India*

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major: **Social Justice Perspectives: Human Rights, Gender and Con-
flict Studies (SJP)**

Specialization: **Conflict and Peace Studies**

Members of the Examining Committee:

dr. Helen Hintjens

dr. Shyamika Smits Jayasundara

The Hague, The Netherlands

December 2016

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Contents

List of Appendices	v
List of Acronyms	vi
Abstract	vii
Relevance to Development Studies	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Context and Research Problem	1
1.2 Debating the Humanitarian Setting	2
1.3 The “War on Terror” Discourse and LTTE	4
1.4 Introducing Groundviews and the Authors	5
1.5 Methodology	6
1.6 Research Questions	7
1.7 Implications of the Study	8
1.8 Chapter Outline	8
Chapter 2: Analysis of Blog Articles from Groundviews	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 International Aid: Helping or Hurting recipients?	9
2.3 Let’s do Away with Humanitarian Interventions	10
2.4 The Humanitarian “Terrorists”	11
2.5 Conclusion	13
Chapter 3: Representing Humanitarian Actors in Sri Lanka	14
3.1 Introduction	14
3.2 Scared of Government Intimidation, Dr. Senanayake?	14
3.3 The Sri Lankan Government’s Puppet	16
3.4 LTTE and GoSL are cooperating together, Surprised?	19
3.5 Conclusion	22
Chapter 4 Legitimation and Delegitimation Frames	23
4.1. Introduction	23
4.2 Delegitimizing International Financial Institutions.	23
4.3 Dr. Jayatilleka: The “Valiant” Spartan	26
4.4 Whose News Information is “Reliable”?	27
4.5 Conclusion	31
Chapter 5: Conclusion	32
5.1 Commentary	32
5.2 Table: Summary of Key Points	32
References	35

Appendices	39
I. The Aid Game and The Politics of Humanitarianism	39
II. Battleground Geneva: The Special Session of the HRC on Sri Lanka	45
III. Medical Administration and Relief within the Vanni Pocket: January to mid-May 2009	48

List of Appendices

- I. *The Aid Game and the Politics of Humanitarianism* by Darini Rajasingham Senanayake
- II. *Battleground Geneva: The Special Session of the HRC on Sri Lanka* by Dayan Jayatileka
- III. *Medical Administration and Relief within the Vanni Pocket January to mid-May 2009* by Michael Roberts

List of Acronyms

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
HRC	Human Rights Council
HRW	Human Rights Watch
ICG	International Crisis Group
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFI	International Financial Institutions
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPKF	Indian Peacekeeping Force
LTTE	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
RtoP	Responsibility to Protect
TRO	Tamil Rehabilitation Organization
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNP	United National Party
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
US	United States

Abstract

The reputation of Humanitarianism in Sri Lanka wavered tumultuously over the last half-century. Parties to the conflict perceived humanitarians to be helping during the tsunami but found them to be obstacles to peace in Sri Lanka when they were fraught with allegations corruption. Humanitarian interventions contributed positively to bring about limited peace between the LTTE and the government in 2002 but failed to sustain that peace. This paper argues that humanitarian action in Sri Lanka in the final stages of the war was ineffective because of its delegitimation in Sri Lankan society and also because humanitarian aid became increasingly politicized in the final stages of the war. This research analyses legitimation strategies and the representation of social actors in the articles using the critical discourse analysis methodology of Theo van Leeuwen. The objective of this research is to answer the question: How does the social media in Sri Lanka represent the relationship humanitarianism has engineered with Sri Lankan society and what purpose is achieved for the authors by legitimizing or delegitimizing humanitarian action in Sri Lanka?

Relevance to Development Studies

This research provides insight into local perceptions of humanitarianism in Sri Lanka. Local perceptions are seldom highlighted by humanitarian agencies as the majority of scholarly information emanates from the global north, this research will analyse discourse of three prominent scholars, well versed in the internal and international affairs of Sri Lanka, to shed light on how humanitarianism is perceived by Sri Lankans. Moreover, this research will evaluate whether humanitarianism is successful in achieving its goals in and whether it is able to achieve its basic missions, without falling into the pit of politics.

Keywords- *Humanitarian, Sri Lanka, LTTE and Tamils.*

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The Context and Research Problem

The war between the Sinhalese and Tamils began because of the discrimination employed by successive GoSLs towards Tamils. The British should be blamed first, because it was their divide and rule policy that created the tensions as they favoured Tamils with administrative positions within the civil service over Sinhalese (De Mel et al. 2012). Hence, after independence, the past grievances of the Sinhalese led to the excessive Sinhalese of the bureaucracy by the ruling elite, effectively sidelining Tamils from the government. Moreover, the Official Language Act No. 33 entrenched Sinhala as the central language of Sri Lanka, preventing Tamils from entering the government (De Mel et al. 2012).

Only in 1987 was this rule relaxed to allow the Tamil language equal parity with the Sinhalese language. However the implementation of this reform was so lax, that important documents continued to be published in Sinhalese, making Tamils feel more alienated. Added to this was the forced relocation of Sinhala farmers by the government to the North-East in the 1970s, which is predominantly Tamil, leading to uneven development patterns (Mallick 1998, Jayasuriya and McCawley 2010). The international community believes that the denial of rights to Tamils led to the commencement of the war in 1983 (Harris 2010). Moreover, (Schaffer 1999) points out that the LTTE would have only relinquished their violent methods after a full devolution of power to their region.

Buddhism, the prominent religion amongst the Sinhalese, is inherently non-violent, but in Sri Lanka the ruling Sinhalese along with the Buddhist clergy used the religion to incite violence against Tamils (De Mel et al. 2012, Schaffer 1999). Tamil politicians should be blamed for mobilizing their constituents similarly with the use of ethnic outbidding (Goodhand et al. 2005). Both groups failed to realize that since the 2nd century they had coexisted peacefully (De Mel et al. 2012). This discrimination culminated in the formation of the LTTE to mobilize Tamils and to begin destabilizing Sinhalese activities. Regardless of their usage of ruthless tactics, Tamils still support the LTTE as their legitimate leader (Schaffer 1999). However, credit should be given to the Kumaratunga government which in 1995 tried to appease the LTTE with pushing forward with constitutional reforms, which were ultimately deeply resented by the Sinhalese parliament that requires the support of two-thirds of the parliament to push through a reform (Schaffer 1999).

The role of the Sri Lankan media is important as it played a pivotal role in during the war. However, one backdrop highlighted by Hattotuwa is that the media during crises, focused on the negative aspects of the conflict (Hattotuwa. 2003). Despite of having the capacity to report with logic, the media aligns itself with the ruling political party (Hattotuwa 2009). Compounded with this is its capacity to affect the legitimacy of the stakeholders in the conflict. This was true during the final stages of the war as the media heavily delegitimized the presence of international actors (Goodhand and Walton 2009, Lee AC 2008, ODI 2010).

1.2 Debating the Humanitarian Setting

This paper analyses articles around the year 2009 and as such it is necessary to examine how international agencies were viewed at this time. DARA and (Harris 2010) contend that the international community's reputation in Sri Lanka had decreased, with lesser space to operate because of government restrictions (Hidalgo 2010, Lang and Knudsen 2008, Smits 2015, Lyons J. 2013). On the opposing spectrum (Lang and Knudsen 2008) contend that continued presence of aid agencies, even limited would have helped the trapped population as they could have carried out advocacy, serving as a deterrent to potential abusers.

On the other hand (Keen 2014, Lang and Knudsen 2008, Brauman 1998) suggest that the international community maintained a quietude regarding the humanitarian situation to ensure continued access to aid recipients. This quietude was not new; for instance when neoliberal schemes were implemented in 1977, the donors turned a blind eye towards the relocation of Sinhalese farmers to Tamil areas (Mallick 1998), because criticizing the government would jeopardize their economic interests (Brauman 1998). The situation changed with Wickremasinghe due to his extensive economic outlook and there was a nationalist backlash. (Biswas 2009) contends that governments do not wish to appear as being too hospitable to foreigners in fear of a nationalist backlash.

Another body of literature points to motivations that drive donors to interventions. Donors intervene to restore political stability that is assumed to bring an end to armed conflict (Stokke 2009, Goodhand and Walton 2009). On the other spectrum, scholars argue that donors intervene because they view underdevelopment as a security threat, viewing intrastate wars as threats to global peace (Toomey and Singleton 2014, Lim et al. 2008, Nair 2013). Moreover, powerful donors with stable welfare states dislike taking in migrants, as that would be an additional burden. Hence aid is given to ensure that the suffering population remains within its own borders (Hyndman 2007).

However, these interventions are often crafted by northern elitists, without due attention to context, leading to dependency followed with incomplete and failed interventions (Stokke 2009, Hyndman 2007, Goodhand and Walton 2009, Anderson 1998, Lee AC 2008, Nair 2013, Hehir 1998). The neo-liberal policies implemented by the donors following the signing of the accord in 2002 lacked a proper understanding of the context, leading to marginalization of the rural Sinhalese and minority Tamils (Hyndman 2007, Nair 2013). However, (Anderson 1998) states that donors perceive their continued presence as bringing benefits to the recipient population, and these still outweigh the unintentional damage caused by their presence. Moreover, (Jayasuriya and McCawley 2010) point out that relief aid was useful after the tsunami, as it prevented the country from falling into an economic crisis. However one backdrop is that interventions favour state over non-state actors. This is what happened in Sri Lanka, as the LTTE's 'terrorist' status prevented them from attending talks in Japan. Some scholars contend that superpowers, far from intervening from a humanitarian imperative, intervened due to economic and military interests to aid the GoSL in its effort to defeat LTTE (Stokke 2009).

Humanitarian interventions are controversial because they seek impartiality but they also infringe on sovereignty (Hehir 1998). They can be useful instruments to aid populations suffering repression from their own government (Krieg 2013, Saulnier 2002b, Weiss 2014, Hehir 1998). They encompass a new cosmopolitan outlook that prioritizes global concerns over the preserved sovereignty

of the state (Goodhand and Walton 2009). There is also the argument about the intention and motive behind humanitarian interventions because at times powerful states intervene in smaller states simply as an expression of power (Krieg 2013, Hehir 1998). In the case of Sri Lanka (ODI 2010) contends that funds meant for humanitarian aid were allegedly misused by the aid agencies instead of reaching affected recipients. Scholars agree that international agencies must improve their coordination efforts in aid delivery (Anderson 1998, Hoglund and Svensson 2011, Lee AC 2008, Senanayake. 2009).

To a large extent, regrettably, interventions are unsuccessful because international law has entrenched the concept of non-interference firmly. This was the case in Sri Lanka where after repeated engagement in the peace process, there were allegations that they were biased in favour of LTTE and doing more harm than good (Harris 2010, Saulnier 2002b). In cases where the state fails to protect its citizens, Hugo Grotius' argument then asks citizens to take control and oust their ruler (Krieg 2013). When suffering is evident, superpowers should continue with interventions especially when the state is repressing its own citizens. Interventions of superpowers in their satellite states during the Cold War were not humanitarian because the motive of self-interest was present (Krieg 2013).

The concept of RtoP can be invoked when the state is unwilling to halt atrocities against its citizens. The RtoP doctrine exists for the international community, which must act in situations when the UNSC fails to do so (Burke-White 2012). The content of the doctrine outlined in the Outcome Document is imprecise, making it harder to transform it from a norm to codified international law that can be bind states for compliance. The UNSC needs to transform the ways in which it responds to crises of great magnitude where large populations are threatened with immediate death. The UNSC's inability to act in Rwanda, Darfur and recently Syria calls for the General Assembly to play a greater role in interventions (Weiss 2014), hence showing the drastic effects of inaction to the UNSC. There are mechanisms whereby the General Assembly can act to help populations, but countries do not want to jeopardize their relationship with the powers of the UNSC (Burke-White 2012). The ambiguous and non-binding nature of the document has ensured that there are no measures put forth for UNSC reform. Hence making RtoP operational is a political rather than informational challenge as the UN is quite competent in terms of its research and analysis on these issues (Burke-White 2012, Weiss 2014).

Sri Lanka, in mid 2009 displayed signs of a situation where the RtoP doctrine was applicable as according to evidence (Darusman et al. 2011) the government committed 'crimes against humanity' and possible 'war crimes' against Tamils (Kingsbury 2012, Weiss 2014). The GoSL did not respect the distinction between combatants and civilians under the pretence of its own 'war on terror', hence shielding it from international censure (Kingsbury 2012). The government could not be held accountable because it had not ratified the Rome Statute and enjoyed the support of UNSC members, Russia and China (Kingsbury 2012, ODI 2010). Moreover, Indian and American military support to the GoSL made RtoP inapplicable (Hoglund and Svensson 2011, Weiss 2014).

One can blame the 'realist' paradigm in international relations which states that the internal affairs of another state are of no concern to other states (Kingsbury 2012). Accordingly, other countries may only interfere, if their citizens are affected by the internal happenings of another country. Sri Lanka is a 'realist' state because they have rejected the core tenets of the RtoP doctrine and this is highlighted in the statements of officials such as Jayatilleka who calls it the 'so-

called responsibility to protect' (Jayatileka 2009). Therefore, when the UK invoked the RtoP following the end of the war by withholding an IMF loan, this was countered by China's provision of economic support to GoSL. Finally, states chose not to intervene in favour of Tamils, as an intervention would indirectly support the terrorist LTTE group with financial help (Kingsbury 2012).

1.3 The "War on Terror" Discourse and LTTE

Following the 9/11 attacks, development agencies were compelled to align their objectives with the 'war on terror' discourse and take greater security measures (Toomey and Singleton 2014, Hyndman 2007, Høglund and Svensson 2011). This reduced the amount of support LTTE received. Moreover, Rajapakse's government, following its election in 2005, sought a military solution and intentionally encapsulated the 'war on terror' discourse to garner support internationally for its war against LTTE (Lang and Knudsen 2008, Høglund and Svensson 2011, Jayasuriya 2008, De Mel 2008). As a result, the NGO community in Sri Lanka reacted adversely to this militarization by stopping activities and pulling out once it was clear that the government was intimidating them for their 'protection and advocacy' activities that supported Tamils (Lang and Knudsen 2008, Saulnier 2002b).

Following 9/11, the field of operation for LTTE reduced as they were under constant international scrutiny. One aspect that has affected even non-violent freedom movements like Hizb-ut-Tahrir, is that their designation as 'terrorists' leads to their dehumanization and allows for their complete destruction (Toomey and Singleton 2014). Moreover, as the GoSL stated that it was fighting against the LTTE, their human rights were side-lined as terrorists are considered below human (Keen 2014, ODI 2010, Saulnier 2002b, Toomey and Singleton 2014). Therefore, humanitarian aid was given to Sri Lanka by the stronger donors to contain the conflict within Sri Lanka's border, ensuring that the threat of LTTE did not diffuse into their countries, affecting the livelihoods of their populations (Hyndman 2007).

The dehumanization of terrorists through securitization discourses allows states to take extrajudicial measures against them; what is troubling is that while combating terrorists, civilian and non-combatant casualties are ignored (Toomey and Singleton 2014) as they are viewed as necessary collateral damage to restore peace. This is true in Sri Lanka as the government was allowed to continue mass internment of the Tamil population after the war because it alleged that LTTE members were hiding amongst them (Keen 2014, ODI 2010, Lang and Knudsen 2008, Jayasuriya 2008), leading to unlawful detention of civilians and non-combatants. The GoSL succeeded in creating a climate of fear that justified the destruction of the LTTE and viewed them as threats to national security (Hyndman 2007, Goodhand and Walton 2009, Keen 2014, Brauman 1998, Anderson 1998, Høglund and Svensson 2011). To defeat terrorism, the government circulated nationalist Sinhalese discourses, creating a strong distinction between "us" and "them" and as a consequence Tamil and Terrorist became synonymous terms (Harris 2010).

1.4 Introducing Groundviews and the Authors

Groundviews blog was chosen because it publishes articles on Sri Lanka, with a focus on humanitarianism, governance and human rights. The blog encourages its authors to write on topic of governance, peace, and security issues and to draw attention also to humanitarian emergencies (Hattotuwa 2009). Moreover, the website features articles centred on the topic of humanitarianism during the Sri Lankan civil war. The website was searched with the term ‘humanitarianism’ and the specific authors were suggested by my second reader, who is well aware of the credentials of the different authors selected, Dayan Jayatileka, Darini Rajasingham-Senanayake and Michael Roberts. I will briefly provide justification for the authors and articles chosen.

Dr. Dayan Jayatileka

Jayatileka was chosen because he has considerable experience in the internal affairs of Sri Lanka. Apart from being Sri Lanka’s representative in the United Nations, he was credited for removing international scrutiny on Sri Lanka in 2009 for human rights violations. He is a staunch opponent of humanitarianism and believes they are political instruments, which have no applicability in the global south. Moreover, his credentials highlight that he has had a consistent career in the Sri Lankan politics and has published extensively for government and private newspapers in Sri Lanka. He was a brief member of the Sri Lanka People’s Party and an advisor to president Ranasinghe Premadasa.

His article *Battleground Geneva: The Special Session of the HRC on Sri Lanka* was chosen because in it he argues that humanitarian interventions are purely political processes designed to impede progress in the global south. Quite apart from highlighting the benefits of humanitarian interventions, his research draws on previous scholarship on the politicization of aid to highlight that the westerners were not really intervening in favour of the ‘trapped population’ rather it was the Tamil diaspora that prompted them to intervene. This article was chosen after surveying the author’s articles, specifically locating those where he discussed human rights and humanitarianism at the end of the Sri Lankan civil war.

Dr. Darini Rajasingham-Senanayake

Senanayake is a researcher with extensive background in Social Anthropology and has researched in human rights, policy-making, international relations, international relations and aid effectiveness as well as post-conflict development in Sri Lanka. As such she has extensive research experience centred on Sri Lanka and she is Sri Lankan.

Her article *The Aid Game and the Politics of Humanitarianism* was chosen because it was published during the final stages of the war and it has an explicit focus on the politicization of aid and highlights the backdrops of humanitarianism. Although the space devoted to the criticism of aid is considerable, she still evaluates IFIs positively to a limited extent to not completely discredit their presence in the developing world, but instead calls for reform, if they wish to have more clients from the global south. Her article emerges in a time, when the LTTE or the government did not favour international actors; hence it is crucial in highlighting whether humanitarianism achieves its said goals. Unlike Jayatileka who takes an extremist viewpoint against humanitarian action, she is open to the possibility of a reformed international presence in Sri Lanka.

Dr. Michael Roberts

Roberts' article was chosen because he provides a balanced opinion on events in Sri Lanka. He is of Burgher origin, neither Sinhalese nor Tamil; hence he doesn't pledge allegiance to either side and provides a balanced opinion to a large extent. He is influential in local scholarly circles and publishes on diverse issues on his blog, *Thuppathi*. According to his blog, he is familiar with nationalist ideologies and has written extensively on ethnic politics. Roberts is also well versed in the fields of anthropology, social sciences, history and politics.

His article *Medical Administration and Relief within the Vanni Pocket, January to mid-May 2009* was chosen because he highlights a GoSL and LTTE sponsored humanitarian initiative that aided the trapped population in Vanni. Instead of focusing on external interventions, he criticizes western powers for blindly accepting LTTE propaganda that was seeking to generate a humanitarian intervention. Moreover, his article was chosen because he highlights the positive relationship between the LTTE and the GoSL formed to provide humanitarian aid. The media was criticising both sides for human rights violations and failed to highlight this relationship. His article touches on the politics of aid delivery and the role of the media in facilitating aid transfers.

1.5 Methodology

The Critical Discourse Analysis methodology of Theo van Leeuwen as highlighted in *Discourse and Practice* (Leeuwen 2008) presents discourses as recontextualization of social practices and will be primary methodology of this research. He presents two useful categories of analysis in his study, the representation of social actors and the discursive construction of legitimation in discourses.

The representation of social actors is concerned with the expression of agency in representations. Actors can either be represented as 'patients' where they are recipients of actions enacted by the 'agent'. When 'patients' are subjected to actions, this is an expression of power that highlights power differentials between different actors. This is important as some agents are endowed with more power than others with consideration to context and within the representations analyzed these depict which agents have power to enact actions on their 'patients'. Attention should be paid also to authorities represented within text and prominent personas quoted directly, as these are used to lend authority to the text.

Exclusions of actors must be considered given the context in which the representations arise. Exclusions serve the purpose of power as those that are excluded from don't have their opinions voiced. For instance, in Jayatileka's text, he excludes Tamil opinions, as he is seeking to delegitimize the Tamil and LTTE stance, and place the Sri Lankan government in the spotlight for continuing the offensive against LTTE. Similarly in Senanayake's article, she includes opinions of prominent figures, only quoting them when they are delegitimizing IFIs for their failed policies in developing countries. Roberts represents international aid agencies as agents whose actions are hurting Sri Lanka. In contrast he highlights the government of Sri Lanka and LTTE as agents aiding the trapped population; the benefitting patients.

Exclusions are visible when actions are enacted but the author does intentionally not mention the agent responsible for the actions. Jayatileka mentions the defeat of the LTTE, but does not implicate the government directly, although it is obvious that the Rajapakse government was responsible. Likewise,

Senanayake mentions investigations are being carried out on corruption in international agencies, but no agent is specified as conducting the investigations, presenting them as concerns of the international community.

Legitimations are included in discourses to answer the questions, “why should this social practice take place?” or “why should it take place in this particular way?” Hence they are used to legitimate certain practices and used to delegitimize others. Representations legitimize themselves through the use of strategies of authorization, mythopoesis, rationalization and moral evaluation.

Authorization lends validity to arguments in the form of utterances when experts are quoted as saying something authoritative. When authority is vested in a particular person, they need not provide justification for their utterances. For instance, Senanayake quotes expert utterances to delegitimize IFIs.

Mythopoesis is legitimation through the use of stories. In myths, protagonists are given rewards for engaging in legitimate practices. For example, Jayatilleka uses story of Spartan resistance; Jayatilleka’s delegation were the honest Spartans defending Sri Lanka against the Persians representing the powerful Europeans. His delegation at the HRC in Geneva represents the Spartans’ just resistance, absolving his government of blame for human rights violations at the end of the war.

Rationalization is concerned with means and end and deals with the efficacy behind practices. Rationalization is concerned with answering the questions, “Does it work or not?” This explains why social practices exist in the forms they do and why they take the forms they do. Roberts rationalizes the role of the Red Cross by highlighting their involvement in the delivery of aid, while Jayatilleka rationalizes his use of the NAM policy in the United Nations, by highlighting how the global south can resist western pressure through its use. Finally, Senanayake rationalizes the criticism of IFI’s through highlighting their past failure and flawed structural adjustment policies.

Finally, legitimation through evaluation is when social practices are linked to discourses of value. The labeling of the LTTE as ‘fascist’ by Jayatilleka justifies the strong measures taken by the GoSL to defeat them. Evaluative adjectives are used to ascribe values to certain practices and to legitimize or delegitimize them. Roberts positively evaluates humanitarian activities of the government and the LTTE, calling them ‘astounding’ and ‘remarkable’ and in contrast, delegitimizing international actors for being complicit in Tiger propaganda and calling this a ‘monumental error’.

1.6 Research Questions

There is one main research question:

How does social media in Sri Lanka represent the relationship humanitarianism has engineered with different sections of Sri Lankan society, actors and institutions?

In addition, there are two sub-questions:

Which social actors/ ‘agent(s)’ command greater agency and possess the power to enact actions on their ‘patients’?

How is the criticism of International and Local Actors in Sri Lanka in 2009, legitimated by the three authors, Jayatileka, Dr. Senanayake and Dr. Roberts?

1.7 Implications of the Study

Secondary data analysis, limits this research, as real-time interviews of humanitarian actors would have led to a more accurate analysis of the humanitarian situation in Sri Lanka. Being an Indian, I identify with the concerns put forth by Tamils for constitutional reforms but strongly abhor the ruthless tactics employed by the LTTE to achieve their political objectives. Hence, I took a stronger stance towards the actions of the GoSL towards Tamils and the emotion was especially stirred up upon my initial reading of discriminatory policies of the state that favoured Sinhalese over Tamil rights. Of course, being in Sri Lanka would have been a great aid in order to interact with local organizations involved in the relief effort and to document their cooperation with international agencies for further clarification and understanding.

1.8 Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 will begin with an overview of the three articles. The central arguments of the authors will be highlighted in this chapter along with a description of the main agents. This chapter will supplement the arguments of the authors with relevant literature, to analyze their claims. Chapter 3 will analyze the main social actors presented by the three authors. This chapter will highlight power differentials between the actors and delve into other categories such as back grounding and exclusion. Chapter 4 will delve into legitimation and delegitimation strategies, as highlighted in (Leeuwen 2008) employed to rationalize their arguments and analyze the actors and institutions that the authors are delegitimizing. The context and literature will be included to test the legitimations and delegitimizations of the three authors. The conclusion, Chapter 5 will summarize the main arguments of the authors and end with a commentary on the summary table.

Chapter 2: Analysis of Blog Articles from Groundviews

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide a brief analysis of the three-blog articles chosen for the discussion of the humanitarian setting in Sri Lanka. Beginning with Senanayake, I will analyse her criticism of the international aid architecture and look at the arguments she puts forth for the reform of the aid industry. Following this, Jayatilleka's controversial article will be analysed as he criticizes the procedures through which humanitarian interventions are engineered, and through his disbelief, calls for countries in the global south to unite and resist western pressure. Finally Roberts' article is analysed to test his claims and criticism on the international media's reportage of Sri Lanka at the end of the war.

2.2 International Aid: Helping or Hurting recipients?

In her article *The Aid Game and the Politics of Humanitarianism*, published on 6th March 2009, *Senanayake* presents the US as the 'obstacle' to progress in Sri Lanka. The US government is the active agent hurting the 'suffering' patient is the GoSL. Washington's hesitance is humanitarian, but (Lim et al. 2008) highlight that US aid to Sri Lanka is actually based on the realist paradigm that considers aid an extension of the national security policy. Sri Lanka is dependent on the US to a small extent, but Senanayake contrasts this by highlighting the new relationship between China and GoSL. Senanayake's article depicts the growing influence of non-traditional donors, which are investing more in Sri Lanka. In this respect at least the UN has made the global south prominent and given it a platform to resist Western hegemony (Morphet 2004, Jayatilleka 2009). She calls the disbursement of funds a 'controversial' issue because of on-going debates in Sri Lanka on the 'relevance' of aid. Sri Lankans indeed experienced that their expectations were not met by aid agencies and perceived irregularities in aid allocation before and after the 2004 tsunami (Lee AC 2008). The agent making this issue 'controversial' is backgrounded to emphasize this as a universal concern.

The UNSC is presented as devious, promising not to block the loan informally, but not keeping the promise formally. Senanayake uses utterance autonomization while quoting the Mexican president to highlight his disbelief in placing sanctions on Sri Lanka. She is right about the power held by China in the UNSC as the country recently used it to prevent effective action to relieve suffering populations in Syria (Weiss 2014). Senanayake employs passive agent deletion when representing the 'developing world' that was affected by the conditionalities of the IFIs. The patients are not specified because the conditionalities adversely affected several countries. (Kapur 2001) highlights that IMF's reputation in developing countries was declining because of the organization's conditionalities.

Consideration should be given to the idea of international organizations holding 'discursive power' over their recipients, demanding them to remain passive (Nair 2013), a reason why Senanayake asks for reform. She nominates Stiglitz, as the former Chief Economist of the World Bank. She doesn't mention the reason for his Nobel Prize, but indirectly says, "He won it for saying the

truth about the harmful nature of IMF policies.” (Goodhand and Walton 2009) mention how international actors involved in the peace process were confused and their timing for implementing changes was flawed.

The ‘developing world’ is foregrounded when mentioning the harmful actions of the IFIs. Backgrounding, according to (Leeuwen 2008) is done to suppress the identity of one actor, because the author wants the reader to focus on another actor. Senanayake wants the reader’s attention on IFIs to show their reduced relevance in the global South (Kapur 2001). RtoP does not motivate the conditionalities of IFIs; rather powerful countries implement them to increase their moral authority amongst their citizens (Goodhand and Walton 2009). The new donors are activated, in relation to helping Africa and Asia with investment. China got involved in Sri Lanka following the break of the ceasefire (Keen 2014). She doesn’t believe in a reform bringing changes to IFIs. She quotes a British saying, “The king is dead, long live the king’, alluding to the domination of neo-liberal economics within IFIs despite Gordon’s proclamation that the Washington Consensus is dead.

Senanayake presents Sri Lanka as permitting IFIs to ‘step in’ and help with aid monies. Sri Lanka is justified in being cautious towards accepting foreigners as past experience highlights, they benefit little from loans (Kapur 2001). IFIs and their members are represented as corrupt, hence ‘investigations’ are being conducted, but the agent is not mentioned, to emphasize it as a pressing matter. Likewise, we are not told who is raising the ‘inquiries’. ‘Members of the ‘international financial system paid themselves big bonuses’ and ‘British’ parliamentarians are nominated similarly to target perpetrators. She nominates them to highlight their shortcomings as the government was under pressure from the same countries for accountability for its shelling of civilian areas (Darusman et al. 2011).

Senanayake’s disbelief in international actors is evident as she double quotes ‘experts’ and ‘hardship allowances’. She highlights that Red Cross ‘brought’ foreign delegates to Sri Lanka, but does not specify the reason for their presence, highlighting that they were not helping anyone. She expands on this by highlighting their lack of ‘technical expertise’ and their large ‘120,000 USD’ salary. She does not consider that international actors aided the country following the tsunami (Jayasuriya and McCawley 2010). On the other spectrum (Lim et al. 2008) argue that the international aid structure is a top-down approach, where recipients are meant to accept assistance without questions.

2.3 Let’s do Away with Humanitarian Interventions

Jayatilleka begins by highlighting the LTTE as the ‘main adversary’ that must be defeated as his aim is to justify their defeat and making them appear as undeserving of a humanitarian intervention. The LTTE was isolated as is because aid agencies refused to work with them after their proscription as ‘terrorists’ (Hoglund and Svensson 2011); this reduced the quantity of aid delivered to their areas (Hidalgo 2010). The GoSL was against aid going to LTTE as it accused the group of using aid monies to increase its military capacity (Goodhand et al. 2005).

Participants of a social practice fill the roles of instigator, agent, affected and beneficiary (Leeuwen 2008). In Jayatilleka’s text the instigators are the western governments, NGOs, humanitarian actors and the LTTE. Jayatilleka’s delegation and the GoSL are the affected parties. LTTE is also an affected party, but

their suffering is justified because they are antagonistic to the national interest 'historically'. Angarika Dharmapala, a "revered" monk must be blamed for creating this historical animosity, as he ensured the prominence of Buddhism by blindly accepting a western version of the religion, and consequently vilifying other religions on the island (Neumaier 2004).

The opponents of Sri Lanka in the UN are the affected party to emphasize their defeat by a nation from the global south. In terms of agents, there are the (bad) western governments helping the LTTE and the (good) agents are, the Sri Lanka HR delegation and the GoSL. One should not disregard the international community's efforts in calling for an end to the violence against civilians (Hidalgo 2010, Darusman et al. 2011), pleas that the GoSL ignored.

The beneficiaries are the nations of the global south. Jayatilleka shows that Sri Lanka's victory was a result of its commitment to the policy of NAM and evaluates it positively. The NAM has been used by the global south to resist western pressure in the UN (Morphet 2004). Sri Lanka is the beneficiary for winning in Geneva against the Europeans allied with the Tamils. Jayatilleka assumes that the entire population supported the war efforts. He forgets that Tamils supported the LTTE as their leader, regardless of their ruthlessness (Roberts 2014).

Jayatilleka seeks to 'inspire' his staff through the story of the minute Spartan force resisting the domineering Persian army. "This I told them, would be our task and should animate our work and attitude" (Jayatilleka 2009). This performance mode is emphasized to illustrate the odds facing his delegation in the UN and the need for strength. He mentions his father, Mervyn de Silva inspiring his staff and holding their ground in the face of odds. The Battle of Thermopylae is referenced as an example of bravery displayed by martyrs that defend their motherland against invading foreigners.

Jayatilleka's article reflects a growing concern from the NAM regarding power imbalances in the UN (Morphet 2004). The manipulation of UN by powerful countries is represented in his article, "...their men and women seeded through the upper reaches of the UN system." This indicates that the UN is run according to the dictates of strong nations. He does not consider that the European Community was one of the major donors giving aid to Sri Lanka during the war (Hidalgo 2010). His scepticism for interventions continues when he reflects various possibilities, "In Geneva...we could have stopped short and capitulated in a compromise on sovereignty masked as consensus." His claim is true as (Burke-White 2012) states that interventions are disliked by states, as they constitute an infringement on sovereignty.

His statement contains two assumptions, "humanitarian interventions affect a state's sovereignty no matter their emphasis on consensual decision making." His statement is true regarding Sri Lanka's experience with the IPKF when the force was perceived to be invading the island instead of peacekeeping (Rotberg 1999). The second one, "that there is considerable loss of agency for the state actors after an intervention." This was true given the proscribed neo-liberal focus of policies, trumping discussions on power sharing.

2.4 The Humanitarian 'Terrorists'

Robert's article *Medical Administration and Relief in the Vanni Pocket: January to mid-May 2009* published on 1st July 2014 focuses on joint efforts by the government

and a body of doctors in providing humanitarian relief to the trapped population in the Vanni. The article is unique as it portrays the LTTE in a favourable light. Keen describes how the 'war on terror' frame had a big role in legitimizing the defeat of the LTTE (Keen 2014). In this article Roberts highlights the government providing 'Ministry of Health doctors' to the LTTE. However he delegitimizes the LTTE when he mentions their manipulation of the trapped population and possibly also the Tamil doctors for propaganda purposes. (Brauman 1998) states that in battle situations this is a strong possibility. Roberts uses the affidavit of Dr. Shanmugarajah to counter the fabrications presented in the media regarding 'civilian death tolls' and 'government shelling'. Scholars are sceptical of the government's contribution during the initial peace process in finding solution acceptable to Tamils (Goodhand et al. 2014, Lang and Knudsen 2008, Schaffer 1999, ODI 2010). His discourse places the government in a positive light and this is beneficial for them as in mid-2009 they were being scrutinized for human rights abuses (Harris 2010, Darusman et al. 2011).

When Roberts writes 'on-going propaganda war' he indicates the possibility that even the 'honest doctor's affidavit' could be fabricated. The role of propaganda should not be underestimated, as it was clear during the peace process of that both sides used ethnicity to manipulate voters through circulating nationalist discourses (Harris 2010). Roberts is asking the question; why misinformed numbers and statements were released in the international media regarding civilian casualties? His assertion is that western governments were fooled by the LTTE into believing that a humanitarian disaster while in reality it was the genius of LTTE propaganda machine (Roberts 2014). Jayatilleka and Roberts agree on the capabilities of the LTTE in this regard.

Roberts highlights the LTTE as being knowledgeable of humanitarian relief operations as they respect the distinction between civilians and combatants hospitals, an essential rule of humanitarianism (Saulnier 2002a) and train efficient medical orderlies to assist the wounded, another useful aid in wartime. Roberts counters the evidence provided in the DARA report (Hidalgo 2010) that the government prevented civilians from leaving the Vanni when he mentions ICRC facilitating transfers of the sick and wounded to hospitals outside the battle zone.

Roberts presents Shanmugarajah as not distinguishing between government and LTTE doctors in his affidavit, pointing to the neutrality of doctors in wars. Even though the doctor's evidence is not present in the media, his viewpoint gains credibility because 'doctors were the primary source of information for foreign reporters' according to (Roberts 2014). There is a friction between Keen's claim that there was a need for doctors (Keen 2014) and Robert's evidence that doctors had sufficient supplies provided by ICRC and GoSL.

HRW at the time also targeted the government for preventing access to reporters (Daruwala and Adams 2009) but Roberts' counters with a list of journalists that were airlifted and nominates two prominent journalists from Associated Press and BBC as lying about the government denying access to conflict zones (Roberts 2014). Hence he is 'mind-boggled' at why respectable institutions such as the Darusman Panel and scholars like Frances Harrison were disseminating false numbers of dead civilians.

There is little mention of agencies involved in the delivery of aid, precisely because he wants to shed light on the work of the 'unsung' Tamil heroes. Their legitimacy in this period was low, as only the ICRC was working in cooperation with the government. An ICRC news release from January 2009 indicates that in its role as a facilitator it handled the safe transfers of vulnerable populations

(ICRC. 2009) from the Vanni. His article's aim is to delegitimize the international media for being complicit in Tiger propaganda and for blatantly following the advice of their Tamil constituents at home. There is a deletion of actions that highlight the destructive role-played by the government in relation to Tamils and LTTE and the article maintains a positive stance on the GoSL.

During 2009, the International Crisis Group was vocal in criticizing the government for attacking Tamil political parties (Senanayake 2009) (International Crisis Group 2016). For instance he doesn't mention the militarization of Sri Lankan society through television shows, advertisements and patriotic messages (De Mel 2008) in prioritizing a military solution to the LTTE problem before a political settlement. Roberts does not consider the misappropriation of aid meant for Tamils, as the World Bank's research noted uneven development patterns between Tamil and Sinhalese inhabited areas.

2.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, Senanayake's discussion has shown that dislike for Western powers in Sri Lanka was evident during the final stages of the war. It is in this context, that the three authors are able to delegitimize international actors. Senanayake's central aim consists in criticising IFIs for their failure in developing countries along with highlighting that the international aid architecture cannot be trusted to operate efficiently unless it is thoroughly reformed. As an alternative she calls for the global south to cooperate with the emerging non-traditional donor, China.

Jayatileka's ensures that the GoSL is not censured for defeating the LTTE and to discredit them further by highlighting them as undeserving of a humanitarian intervention. Finally he calls for more nations to adhere to NAM as it can be used to resist western hegemony in the UN. Roberts criticizes the international media for being complicit in the Tiger propaganda machine and places the LTTE in a favourable light for carrying out humanitarian operations during the final stages of the war. Most importantly he counters the fabrications in the world media regarding civilian casualties, presence of doctors and highlights the GoSL providing access to journalists.

Chapter 3: Representing Humanitarian Actors in Sri Lanka

3.1 Introduction

This chapter elaborates on the central actors mentioned in the first chapter to analyse expressions of power within the three analysed texts. This chapter will bring in relevant categories from the chapter on social actors presented in (Leeuwen 2008) and analyse the reasons why some actors are endowed with greater power than others and delve into the different characterizations of actors along with an analysis of the expression of agency in the texts. Moreover, this chapter will analyse the exclusions of actors and the reasons for their backgrounding by the authors. This chapter will build on the preceding one by analysing how the representation of social actors helps us to analyse the main arguments put forth by the authors.

3.2 Scared of Government Intimidation, Dr. Senanayake?

Senanayake begins with putting China on a pedestal as the non-traditional donor unaffected by the new power of the IMF following the financial crises. The international aid architecture is passivized to the dictates of the growing Asian powers, India and China. The developing countries are the active agents whose actions are harming the reputation of IFIs, emphasizing her point on the utilitarian nature of non-traditional donors.

Senanayake characterizes the Asian donors as doing the exact opposite of western nations, i.e, not attaching policy conditionalities and not concerned about paying lip service to human rights. India's role is activated in relation to providing the beneficiary, Sri Lanka with humanitarian assistance, post-conflict reconstruction aid, investing in ports in Sri Lanka and helping defeat the LTTE. Sri Lanka is benefiting from the actions of a country from the global south, similar to Jayatilleka who applauds the global South's commitment to the NAM. Senanayake is similarly against interventions, the experience with IPKF in 1987 was sour and even Tamils felt the same (Biswas 2009), hence India limited its role in Sri Lanka to a purely economic one that Sri Lanka appreciates.

IMF is again the 'patient' when Sri Lanka is shown to have turned down its offer to give it the status of a heavily indebted poor country. Pointing out that Sri Lanka does not need aid because that particular status, although beneficial, leads to complicated conditionalities enforced on the recipients. She doesn't consider that previous SL governments allowed foreign presence in Sri Lanka like the UNP in 1977, which had an extensive liberal focus, to attract funds for the Mahaweli Dam project (Mallick 1998).

Senanayake uses aggregation to include opinions of experts in cases when she wants to show majority opinion as being against IFIs. Aggregation is used to regulate practice and manufacture consent opinion. People believe in the opinion of the majority; hence surveys, opinion polls and reports carry credibility on their own. For example to legitimize her argument, she uses aggregation-

- Recently **there have been investigations** into the large bonuses and salaries...

- Given such concerns, **many had been** arguing that...
- **It is generally agreed** that Sri Lanka's current economic woes are related more to soaring defence expenditure...

The identity of the government is backgrounded as no agent is mentioned as responsible for ensuring 'sustainable peace' and a 'genuine devolution of power'. Tamils and Muslims are backgrounded, as they are the implied beneficiaries of this action. The peace process from the beginning did not push the government enough for constitutional reform as the Norwegians being the entrusted peacekeepers, made it clear that they would not focus on constitutional changes (Goodhand et al. 2005), rather they focused solely on financial incentives. Added to this the intervention team ignored the Muslim community and their grievances in regards to violence against them (Goodhand and Walton 2009).

The government's identity is suppressed in relation to the action of misusing 'aid monies' as she avoids being too critical. She concludes by calling for an economic focus to the aid delivered by donors, and implicates them for 'aid dependency' and 'poverty trap' problems. A big part of her argument is that Sri Lanka's economic downturn was because of the war, absolving the government of blame for any mismanagement, and she stresses this in three separate instances. This is true as because of defence expenditure the government was unable to divert funds towards law enforcement (Jayasuriya 2008). She doesn't consider that during the war the Sri Lankan army had intelligence gathering problems compounded with a weak internal structure, leading to inefficient responses to LTTE attacks (Rotberg 1999).

The government is activated in relation to obtaining funds for just purposes such as reconstruction, servicing its debt and defence expenditure. This is true as the 'war on terror' frame led to donors giving the government aid in the form of security against terrorism (Toomey and Singleton 2014). Internally the war was framed as a humanitarian war by the government. The use of the reconstruction discourse by the GoSL allowed it to show off positive development in the north-eastern region according to (Goodhand and Walton 2009, International Crisis Group. 2016) and was used as a public relations campaign to attract donor's attention as Senanayake similarly contends.

The government is never mentioned as directly receiving loans from IFIs; not represented as being reliant on foreigners. The government is the cautioned actor giving the IMF permission to 'step in' the country. Sri Lanka is intentionally not mentioned as a recipient as Senanayake wants to highlight that the aid eventually flows back to donors' pockets. 'Loans' and 'grants' are given, but a recipient is not mentioned. Moreover, hostility towards international actors was entrenched due to their overt focus on 'protection'; Rajapakse believed a political settlement with Tamils would only commence after the defeat of the LTTE (Goodhand and Walton 2009). The Red Cross is activated in relation to bringing unprofessional and 'costly' delegates to Sri Lanka, not contributing to the alleviation of suffering. While it is generally agreed that donor recovery programmes were flawed to some degree in the post-Tsunami period (Harris 2010), the government's internal response time to the disaster in 2004 was similarly delayed as the PTOMS mechanism took over a year for implementation (Goodhand et al. 2005).

The government is not implicated directly for misusing funds as she writes that they 'could be' misusing the funds. The humanitarian policy group criticizes

the government for impeding the activity of NGOs and asking the donors to keep quiet for continued access to conflict zones (ODI 2010). There are hints for the government to improve its handling of aid, Senanayake mentions that aid 'may' be used for development projects, conflict de-escalation and demilitarization. The government is never directly asked to implement these reforms, but it is always the intended beneficiary.

The GoSL did not have strong priorities starting from the Tsunami when the imperative to destroy LTTE took precedence to the objective of aiding disaster-affected communities (Jayasuriya and McCawley 2010). Senanayake keeps her criticism to the minimum, as the government was actively silencing NGOs and her literature contributes extensively to this field. (Brauman 1998) states that donors in conflict situations maintain quietude to ensure access to suffering populations. As a result a dilemma arises, should aid agencies be vocal and increase their chances of expulsion from the recipient country or carry out advocacy activities on behalf of the population (Saulnier 2002b). Advocacy is useful but critics fail to consider that the Red Cross continued in Sri Lanka because the government knew it was a neutral party.

The government is portrayed in a positive light as it takes actions to curtail the actions of corrupt companies such as Citibank and Standard Chartered Bank. Here Senanayake includes the new IMF loan being discussed in Parliament as if it is a part of the internal problems of Sri Lanka and a government minister is activated with utterance autonomization to show his non-tolerance for IMF conditionalities. Even during the peace process, peace conditionalities were not looked upon favourably by the two belligerents (Goodhand et al. 2005), but were ignored as the donors were providing peace dividends. In the end, they proved their non-utility when conditionalities failed to bring LTTE to the negotiating table, as a strong financial diaspora network was an alternative and effective source for money (Goodhand et al. 2014).

The GoSL is criticized in relation to only showcasing the eastern province as a development model and not doing much in actuality towards improvements. She highlights scepticism, but through the lens of the ICG. By using the utterance of an international actor she distances herself from experts critical of the government. International Opinion is included to stress on stronger points, those that Senanayake cannot emphasize on. The ICG report (International Crisis Group. 2016) blamed the government for not devolving power to Tamils, providing impunity for killings committed by their forces and for encouraging fights between factions of pro-government TVMP. The criticism is reduced when she writes, "...many of them **apparently** committed by government forces."

3.3 The Sri Lankan Government's Puppet

Jayatilleka represents the government's actions abstractly to remove agency for the defeat of the LTTE, making it appear as an overwhelming global concern. The actions of EU are generalized to ensure that a wide spectrum of actors fit the category of Sri Lanka's opponents. 'Obviously someone up there...', 'these personalities', 'the surge was assisted'. 'Pro-Tiger' forces are characterized in a similar fashion to include western European nations and to imply a large base of support for Tamils against a seemingly small HR delegation of Sri Lanka in the UN.

The actions of the citizenry are generalized to draw attention away from the idea of domestic opposition to the offensive. Local support is represented through ‘...supported by the national will, the people’s will...’, ‘a huge number of who watched.’ De Mel highlights how the threat of LTTE was emphasized in Sri Lanka and the extremely close relationship between the military and civil society that prioritized a military solution (2008). Compounded with this was the support that Rajapakse had to go ahead with a military solution to the LTTE problem and his generally positive reputation within Sri Lanka for putting in place a welfare state which got him the support of the citizenry (Goodhand and Walton 2009). Jayatilleka generalizes on the NAM to show its application in different contexts and its strategic value. For instance, Yugoslavia, India and Egypt worked together on the Korean War and the NAM had a major role in passing resolutions that protected the integrity of Palestine (Morphet 2004). He nominates Cuba to show an instance where narrow nationalism can have adverse effects, rather countries are asked to be more internationalists in their thinking.

The purpose for Sri Lanka’s involvement in the HRC session is created with, ‘When we aren’t involved, our arithmetic goes awry.’ indicating that Sri Lanka’s absence in major conflicts leads to the publishing of inaccurate information. The GoSL had disliked foreign interventions since the soured experience with IPKF (Goodhand et al. 2014, Biswas 2009, Rotberg 1999). Moreover, the defeat of the LTTE is emphasized early on, when Jayatilleka adds an imaginary third ‘ideological’ defeat, to emphasize the defeat of the Tiger propaganda machine. Ideology remains central to the discussion of Senanayake as well who mentions that the LTTE threat will remain in South Asia until its ideology is eradicated (Senanayake. 2009). It is common practice for state actors to increase their legitimacy vis-à-vis non-state actors, the state has to appear strong and not take an appeasing stance to non-state actors (Biswas 2009), Jayatilleka does this in his article by elevating the government on a high moral pedestal with calling the LTTE, ‘fascist’.

Jayatilleka evaluates his experience in Geneva positively, by mentioning that the consequences were “profoundly educative” for Sri Lankans. Highlighting it as a positive experience but disregarding the effects of the offensive on the trapped population in the Vanni. Another factor that blocked support for the population was the GoSL’s non-cooperation with media agencies (Smits 2015). Parties in this conflict used the ‘victim’ card to draw attention to their cause (Biswas 2009, Goodhand et al. 2005). The government never deviated from militarism, as was evident after the first peace agreement in 2002, when the ceasefire was violated, and upon its deterioration in 2006, there was a period of intense militarization (Lang and Knudsen 2008). However, writing as a representative of Sri Lanka to the UN, Jayatilleka has little choice but to align his opinion with the government.

The British and their minister Ed Miliband are positioned as obstructing the rightful path of the government even after its just war with the LTTE. He is portrayed as having a close relationship with a newspaper that cannot reason independently and follows the flawed reasoning of some politicians. The use of the word, ‘stand-up microphone’ gives an image of comedians attempting to please a crowd with their jokes. This again reflects Jayatilleka’s disbelief in RtoP and humanitarianism. His disbelief is not unfounded as RtoP is invoked when the state loses support from its citizens and this wasn’t the case in Sri Lanka where the militarization of society ingrained a military solution in the mind-sets of the citizens and provided support to the GoSL (De Mel 2008). Jayatilleka

doesn't acknowledge the power of the Tamil diaspora in bringing the spotlight on Sri Lanka and their powerful lobbies in the West. Tamil diaspora networks were important as they lobbied the political constituencies of western countries to hold the GoSL accountable for 'war crimes' (Harris 2010, Goodhand et al. 2014).

Why does Jayatilleka say 'historic' when referring to the long-standing hatreds between Tamils and Sinhalese? He fails to mention the intentional relocation of Sinhalese farmers to Tamil areas during the Mahaweli dam project, which led to Sinhalese farmers controlling lucrative areas and the grievances this generated amongst Tamils (Mallick 1998). Jayatilleka also glosses over the commonalities between Buddhism and Hinduism and the core Buddhist Principle of dependent origination, which stresses the interconnected nature of all things and requires the practice of harmony to achieve inner and external peace (Neumaier 2004). He does not understand that the threat from LTTE would have subsided if adequate power sharing measures were implemented after independence. Srimavo and her husband Solomon Bandaranaike had other plans for Sri Lanka as upon becoming prime ministers, they prioritized Sinhalese rights leading gradually to the entrenchment of Tamil grievances (Rotberg 1999).

The strong support of western governments for the trapped population in Vanni exposes a caveat in his argument because some concerns expressed by western nations and their Tamil diaspora were legitimate and the very fact that there existed concerns, shows that criticism was not unjustified. Moreover, it is generally agreed amongst aid workers that their presence outweighs the damage done when they are absent from recipient countries (Anderson 1998). Western states also deserve credit for their efficient response to the Tsunami in 2004, when the lack of aid would have led to a currency crisis and deteriorated the economy (Jayasuriya and McCawley 2010).

The LTTE is intentionally characterized negatively given their defeat at the hands of the Sri Lankan army in May 2009. LTTE's delegitimation is evident in the HRC special session resolution where they are criticized for using civilians as human shields (United Nations General Assembly 2009). However, the session fails to consider that Tamils actively rejected their Sri Lankan identity despite of being held hostages in Vanni (Roberts 2014). Regardless of this censure, LTTE was delegitimized during the initial peace process because of their proscription as a terrorist organization by the United States and their subsequent travel ban to the peace conferences of Tokyo and Washington (Hoglund and Svensson 2011) which finally led the LTTE to believe that donors favoured the government over them.

Western governments are represented as groupings of actors through the method of association where likeminded individuals are grouped together in a discourse. This association exists only in the discourse as the actors form temporary alliances for a specific purpose. For instance, the Europeans are presented as allying with the pro-Tamil Tiger forces, for the sake of holding the GoSL accountable for alleged 'war crimes' (Darusman et al. 2011). In Jayatilleka's article, Sri Lanka's opponents are referred to in the abstract as "a powerful bloc of forces". He wants to emphasize that powerful nations were targeting Sri Lanka, the attacks from which the country escaped unscathed.

International governments are passivized to emphasize their defeat at the hands of a developing nation. Their defeat is mentioned but the agent responsible is never mentioned, as he wants to attribute the victory to the numerous nations that supported Sri Lanka at the HRC session. He is right in criticizing

the political nature of humanitarian interventions because at times powerful states intervene in smaller states solely for expressing their power, to increase their moral legitimacy amongst their citizens (Hehir 1998).

The GoSL's actions are backgrounded because Jayatilleka's aim is to absolve the government of criticism for defeating the LTTE. This point is repeated extensively in the article, as there is no mention of the agent that made the EU 'amend its text' and drop the 'obsolescent call' to pressure Sri Lanka from stopping its offensive against the Tigers. This applies to the international media, which in his opinion is dominated by western governments. They are activated similarly like their governments as they are publishing news reports 'calling for a pause', and highlighting the utility of 'RtoP'.

When referring to the authority attempting to hold Sri Lanka accountable, Jayatilleka employs indeterminacy (Leeuwen 2008) where actors are referred to anonymously because the author considers their identity irrelevant. Jayatilleka writes, 'Obviously someone up there wanted to punish Sri Lanka...' He considers their identity irrelevant and leaves it ambiguous, because 'someone' could represent the member of any one of the countries that were opposing Sri Lanka in the UN, which goes to show the lack of respect he has for his opponents and presents opposition coming from many sides; emphasizing that it was a miracle that Sri Lanka survived. This relates to the context 2009 as the Sri Lankan media then perceived the international actors to be working in favour of the LTTE (ODI 2010, Goodhand et al. 2005).

3.4 LTTE and GoSL are cooperating together, Surprised?

Key social actors represented in Roberts' text are doctors, western news agencies, the trapped population and the LTTE. The trapped population is passivized to emphasize their lack of agency and to show that a humanitarian intervention in their favour was justified. The forced entrapment of the population and their lack of agency under the LTTE are also mentioned in the Darusman Panel report (Darusman et al. 2011). Hence, the trapped population being in need of aid is positioned as receiving aid from the ICRC, the LTTE and the GoSL. Passivized social actors in representations can either be subjected or beneficialized. When they are subjected they are treated as means of exchange whilst when they are beneficialized, the action is shown to have either a positive or negative effect on them.

The trapped population has little agency due to their manipulation by LTTE. 'Enforced an eastward movement of the trapped populace', here the trapped population is beneficialized and represented as 'patients' not benefitting from the LTTE. They serve a purpose for the LTTE, as human shields, and labourers. The population is referred to as 'the normal gamut cases' and 'large body of people' as he wants the reader to focus on other actors, and not the population. He has left it anonymous as the trapped population contained anti and pro-LTTE elements. As a result, the trapped population is categorized as having a dual identity, being Sri Lankan and Tamil (Roberts 2014).

He categorizes the Tamil population in such a way to emphasize that they were loyal to the LTTE regardless of their forced displacement and torture. Due to this dual identity they are passivized in the article, on the one hand receiving aid from the government and also being 'marshalled' and 'congealed' by the LTTE. The manipulation of the population by the LTTE to serve as human shields and labourers is mentioned in by HRW in their report (Human Rights

Watch 2009). This categorization is carried on for the doctors, as he does not eliminate the possibility of doctors being complicit in LTTE propaganda. However, we have to remember that previous SL governments discriminated against Tamils, resulting in their loyalty to the *Thamil Eelam state* (Mallick 1998, Neumaier 2004). The GoSL is nominated to draw attention to an instance of mutually beneficial cooperation between them and LTTE, something unheard of in global media. As a result, Roberts contrasts the evidence of HRW and Darusman panel that maintain that the government denied aid workers access to hospital sites (Human Rights Watch 2009, Darusman et al. 2011).

The ICRCs role is limited to the provision of humanitarian relief. “ICRC used chartered vessels...to (a) send essential medical and food supplies to the LTTE controlled area and (b) to evacuate, sick, wounded and elderly people.” The ICRC’s is active because they are the only NGO providing aid to the passive trapped population. ICRC’s role is minimal in the text as they are only involved in delivering aid. ICRC requires the consent of the government before it begins its operations and works on a principle of neutrality to ensure equal access to all parties to a conflict (Arrizabalaga 2014), a factor that got them the limited trust of the GoSL.

International actors on the other hand are presented as being tricked by the LTTE. However, Roberts like Jayatilleka doesn’t pay heed to altruistic humanitarian motives behind interventions (Burke-White 2012). Donors are motivated to provide aid to recipient countries to quell unrest that can destabilize global peace and out of a moral imperative for action over inaction (Nair 2013). There is repeated impersonalization of international actors as ‘external intervention’. This category is left abstract due to the conglomeration of states in favour of an intervention to help Tamils. Jayatilleka similarly aggregates the group of western nations to highlight opposition to the GoSL in the UN.

Humanitarian interventions arise to restore the balance of power in the recipient country and to correct the political practices of countries outside the European orbit (Hehir 1998). Roberts believes that the westerners were intervening after reasoning and accepting Tiger propaganda, “The concocted claims manufactured by this LTTE network were willingly and widely accepted by...powerful western media outfits and vociferous human rights advocates’. Roberts writes ‘vociferous’ and ‘powerful’ to show the irony that even powerful organizations with expert information repositories were duped by the LTTE. Roberts keeps the criticism of the government to the minimum and does not mention the government’s intimidation and threats to journalists publishing critical information (Hattotuwa 2009).

Roberts uses the technique of association to emphasize the cooperation between the government and LTTE. The association existed for helping the trapped population and gains validity, because this association is seldom highlighted in the media. A Dr. Susiri, working for an NGO comes away with the ‘highest praise’ for LTTE’s female medics. Roberts emphasizes the association in several places. He mentions how the Dr. Shanmugarajah ‘encompassed them in his note’, referring to the LTTE doctors despite their lack of ‘formal accreditation’.

In one instance the LTTE and Dr. Shanmugarajah is passivized to the GoSL when Roberts writes, “...the pressure on the LTTE and Dr. Shanmugarajah and his medical staff was partially eased by this process.” The government is active in ensuring that the aid reached the population in conjunction with the ICRC. Here the passivized parties benefit from the government despite of tensions and

the on-going war. ICRC also mentions the presence of Ministry of Health doctors evacuating patients for better treatment from government-controlled areas (ICRC. 2009).

The entire readership of the article is passivized in relation to the doctor and positioned as his receptive audience, 'we can look towards Dr. Shanmugarajah...to clarify the issue of numbers injured...' Doctors are passivized to the LTTE only in one instance to touch on the possibility that they could have been complicit with the LTTE. Roberts nominates the 'Tiger doctors' and includes their names as their actions have drawn limited attention in the media. This confers legitimacy on the Tigers, for ensuring that their injured cadres were cared for. Moreover, it is only Shanmugarajah's opinion that is activated, him being the focus of the article.

Robert's using the technique of association and forms a group with Amnesty International, HRW and international crisis group, to show their opposition to the government, only in regard to its targeting of civilians. This is a temporary alliance, in reality; these groups have bigger mandates than to oppose the government. As a result, Roberts calls them 'oblivious' categorizes their gullibility in a similar fashion. He makes different associations of actors to emphasize their opposition to different ideas. Hence, Amnesty et al. form an opposition, but another group consists of, 'one-eyed western moral crusaders', 'reporters seeking vengeance', 'powerful media chains' and 'powerful states'.

Roberts' points out that the LTTE 'found itself on the military backfoot' but does not mention the agent responsible for the LTTE's retreat. The government is never mentioned as destroying the LTTE, a common factor amongst all three authors. Although he mentions the Tamil population living in areas in danger of shelling, no agent is attributed responsibility. Even when it comes to the possibility of the GoSL (un)intentionally attacking hospital premises, the government is backgrounded through passive agent deletion. The doctor mentions damage to hospitals, but again no mention of the agent that did the 'artillery damage'. Roberts is keeping the criticism minimal, because his discourse positions the government in a positive light, given their triumphant victory over LTTE.

The Tamil population's purpose is to serve the Tigers as they are positioned as 'pawns' of the Tigers. This purpose is repeated extensively within the article, 'so as to use them as a strategic resource', 'the disadvantage for the Tamil populace...was that they had to adhere to the LTTE's strategy and demands' and also 'undergo the weight of war'. However 'Seeking to inspire intervention' portrays the LTTE in an unfavourable light because it glosses over the fact that the population may have benefitted from an RtoP intervention. Their lack of agency is emphasized as they benefit from, 'gaining access to certain resources' from the government. Their lack of agency, leaves them only two options, 'trying to escape' and 'attempting to flee' from the LTTE. They are subject to the forces of destruction that surround them as they are 'forced to flee' due to shelling. When Roberts' writes, "The latter supervised the distribution of the limited food and water resources that were available", the LTTE is mentioned as taking charge of distribution, but the beneficiaries of the action are not mentioned. The author is motivated to represent trapped population in such a way to emphasize their lack of agency. The trapped population is unable to escape its dire predicament, and their backgrounding emphasizes this fact.

3.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, Darini represents international actors as being active in hurting the developing world because of their expensive assistance and harmful conditionalities, while Roberts takes a similar stance by highlighting international media agencies as taking an active role in disseminating false information regarding the final stages of the war, leading to incomplete and false conclusions. Jayatileka represents Sri Lanka as the active force, impeding western countries from holding Sri Lanka accountable and engineering a humanitarian intervention. Jayatileka represents the global south as taking an active role in resisting western pressure through its commitment to NAM, while Roberts represents the LTTE and the GoSL as taking an active role in providing relief to the trapped population in Vanni. All three authors place the government in a positive light, absolving it from any blame for defeating the LTTE, by failing to attribute responsibility to the action of 'defeating LTTE'.

Chapter 4 Legitimation and Delegitimation Frames

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will examine again the arguments of the three authors with specific focus on what they are seeking to legitimate and the ideas they are delegitimizing. I will observe the practices that the authors are seeking to legitimize with consideration to context, to analyse whether these are contextually specific, legitimations and delegitimations.

4.2 Delegitimizing International Financial Institutions.

Senanayake legitimates the defeat of the LTTE by calling their fighter planes ‘mosquitoes’, this has a strong delegitimizing function as it gives an inhumane image of LTTE as being ‘blood-sucking creatures’. Coming to international aid, she is legitimizing the fact that Sri Lanka needs the support of international aid for its problems, but to a limited extent when compared to the ‘aid tsunami’ period (Senanayake. 2009). She delegitimizes IFIs through mentioning their ‘costly’ loans and ‘overpriced technical assistance’. She doesn’t consider that donors were unwilling to play a role in Sri Lanka because of the reescalation of the conflict and diminished prospects for peace (DARA 2008). She is legitimizing Sri Lanka as a valid recipient for the IMF loan by negatively evaluating the economy.

Goal orientation is used to construct the purpose in the people. When purposes are constructed in people, this is a form of instrumentalization. For these criteria to be fulfilled the agency of the purposeful actor has to be expressed and the purposeful action, must have the same agent. She uses goal orientation when mentioning Washington’s refusal to give Sri Lanka the loan. This is goal orientation because by pressuring the GoSL, the US is attempting to hold the GoSL accountable for violations; hence morality is invoked to justify the sanctions. Indeed, satellite analysis showed that the government had endangered the lives of civilians by targeting LTTE hospitals without adequate information (Lyons J. 2013).

She uses personal authority, a form of authorization where experts are used to lend authority to a subject. In this case the governments of Britain, France, and the High Commissioner for Human Rights are represented as asking for an inquiry into war crimes and violations of law by both sides. However, she counters this desire for by invoking the authority of the Mexican ambassador who thinks it unnecessary to pressure Sri Lanka, highlighting that Sri Lanka has the support of the global south. She uses evaluation to stress the ‘considerable influence’ that the American government holds within the IMF highlighting it as a political rather than humanitarian desire, behind the American sanction. However, she is cautious in avoiding extensive criticism of the strong powers within the UN as the global south still needs the support of stronger nations even to further NAM objectives (Morphet 2004).

She uses effect orientation to emphasize how the IMF loan to Sri Lanka “reopens an old debate on international aid, its relevance and effectiveness, both within and beyond the island.” Here she stresses effect orientation when the

purpose is looked at from hindsight, as something that always existed. Hence she legitimizes her discourse by pointing to pre-existing debates on international aid. She uses evaluative objectives to criticize western governments by pointing to their 'diminished relevance' and 'effectiveness'. Greater scrutiny by the global south is necessary and a restructuring of the aid architecture is needed as (Anderson 1998, Lee AC 2008) state that agencies intervene with a preconceived notion on the abilities of their recipients, they rarely account for pre-existing local response mechanisms and often disorganized emergency aid can exacerbate the problem.

Senanayake uses the authority of conformity to legitimize through 'majority' opinion. The answer to the 'why' question is 'because that's what everybody else does'. The authority of conformity gains a higher ground compared to laws, hence lawmakers implement laws after observing what the majority conforms to. Therefore, Senanayake states the reason why 'many' countries of the global South are seeking funds in private capital markets. To emphasize that majority countries have lost faith in IFIs. The delegitimizing function is implemented with the use of evaluative adjectives such as 'unpopular' when referring to policies and controlling nature with 'conditionalities imposed by the body.' The presence of international actors in solving internal matters during interventions is generally disliked as interventions are globally considered an infringement on sovereignty (Hehir 1998).

Senanayake evaluates through the use of abstraction when she refers to practices in abstract ways that moralize the actions of the actors, this is done to link the discourse to a discourse of moral values, so the values from the moral discourse are transferred to the present understanding of the discourse. In this context she uses 'exacerbated' usually used in relation to the exacerbating of wounds or diseases. Hence the critique of IMF policies is connected to a discourse of medicine and disease, to highlight the contagious nature of their policies. In contrast, Senanayake uses positive evaluation when referring to the 'emergence' of the new Asian powers. She legitimates the continuation of IMF's reformed involvement in the developing world by using an analogy from the Britain, "Long Live the King, The King is Dead." The positive values of continuing with IMF policies are highlighted with this analogy, along with representing Britain as a supporter of the Washington Consensus.

Senanayake's claim about over-internationalization harming the country has validity because long-term international dependence can indeed trigger a nationalist backlash from the local population (Biswas 2009). This liberal economic outlook overrides humanitarian concerns and leads to donors ignoring violations of human rights. She ends this with a negative evaluation that continued IMF presence, 'will make little difference' because of failed past promises by the donors (Senanayake. 2009). Moreover, donors didn't voice accusations at the time, because the GoSL had a strong economic outlook and welcomed corporate investments with open arms (De Mel 2008).

Senanayake uses impersonal authority legitimation, to show that 'there are investigations' taking place, but no agent conducting investigation. Hence the answer to why the investigations are carried out is because 'the laws say so'. The justification for the investigation is provided with evaluations such as 'large bonuses', 'paid themselves' and 'scandal' of improper payments.' President Obama's personal authority is included to show an expert's disbelief in the international aid structure and hence legitimizing an investigation. She uses means orientation to highlight that the, "...international system too needs scrutiny,

transparency and regulation.” The purpose consists in the international system ‘needing’ transparency. This is looked at from an ethical standpoint as she uses, ‘transparency’. The purpose of the scrutinizing is constructed in the agent, ‘the international aid industry’ whose actions led to the commencement of the investigations. She ignores any positive mention on conditionalities. For instance conditionalities and advocacy are useful in some circumstances, for example when MSF and other international NGOs organized a successful march to protest the misappropriation of aid by Vietnamese authorities originally meant for suffering Cambodian populations (Brauman 1998).

She uses goal orientation to represent the actions of the Tamil diaspora, whose existence increased western pressure on Sri Lanka. The Tamil diaspora is represented as ‘troubled’ by the humanitarian situation.’ The Tamil concerns voiced by the LTTE were legitimate to some extent as during the peace process Tamils perceived the donors to take an appeasing stance towards the GoSL and ignoring Tamil demands (Hoglund and Svensson 2011). Tamil concerns were side-lined by the donor community with the beginning of an international campaign to delegitimize the LTTE as a terrorist group.

Senanayake is legitimizing the concerns of Tamils to a small extent by highlighting their ‘humanitarian’ concerns. From this angle, she is legitimizing western pressure on Sri Lanka. She uses goal orientation when mentioning the actions of the strong countries, and constructs their purpose for involvement, being due to the existence of fear on their part that the LTTE threat would leave Sri Lankan borders. Their fears are legitimized to a small extent, as they want the funds used for the development effort. Her criticism of international actors is relevant because it was alleged by experts that aid agencies misused the funds during the post-tsunami period (ODI 2010, Lee AC 2008).

Senanayake evaluates the relationship with the non-traditional donors positively by highlighting their ‘nonchalance’ towards paying lip service to human rights, signifying what Sri Lanka really expects in its relations with the world. She uses goal orientation to emphasize why the Tamil diaspora were pressuring their European constituents. Their power is illustrated with ‘significant’ and ‘troubled’. She uses impersonal authority legitimation to show ‘concerns’ arising on ‘exchangeability’ of aid showing it as a global concern. Apart from being concerned about the usage of aid by the GoSL, international donors were also insistent on monitoring the actions of China and ensuring that the Chinese accounted for human rights conditions before transferring aid monies (Hidalgo 2010).

India’s new involvement in legitimized by evaluation, ‘prime’ and ‘much coveted’, showing their interest in lucrative ports in Sri Lanka. India also provided Sri Lanka with military assistance to help with the LTTE offensive in Jaffna during the final stages of the war (Goodhand et al. 2005). Moreover, the ‘significant’ financial assistance from China is reciprocated with allowing the country to build a port near one of the ‘world’s busiest shipping lines.’ This relationship is beneficial as the country’s interventions are driven by a profit motive that the GoSL desires (Hidalgo 2010). Goal orientation is used for actors that hold greater power in the context in which the representation is arising. Hence the relationship with the non-traditional donors is valued over the stronger western nations. Senanayake discredits American and Indian military analysts who believe China is investing in Hambantota for military purposes. Her limited faith in their claims is shown with, ‘so-called string of pearls strategy.’

She wants to minimize the criticism of China, considering their newfound relationship with Sri Lanka. As a result, she uses goal orientation extensively in relation to Chinese actions that eventually benefit the Sri Lankan economy; hence lending greater authority to China within her representation compared to the Americans.

The Ethics of the Europeans are missing according to Senanayake, as the international aid system is helping developing nations, but with ‘expensive technical assistance’. In contrast China holds higher moral ground in Sri Lanka as when describing the jets provided by them, she uses, ‘free of charge’ emphasizing the altruistic nature of the donation at a time when Sri Lanka was in urgent need of ‘defence’ technologies. The intervention in 2002 was criticized similarly for providing aid, but keeping quiet on human rights abuses (ODI 2010). For instance, during the process donors gave LTTE the free hand to deal with the Karuna faction (Keen 2014). They only focused on mending relations between the LTTE and GoSL, and ignored the existence of other communities.

Although the major part of the criticism is directed at international actors, she uses impersonal authority legitimation to highlight that scholars ‘generally agree’ that Sri Lanka’s economic woes are due to internal problems with governance but maintains that these would not exist were it not for the ‘defence expenditure’ hence blaming LTTE for Sri Lanka’s internal problems. Chandrika Bandaranaike attempted to help Tamils by calling for devolution of power to their regions, however her initiative was met with hostility from the majority Sinhalese. The internal structure of the government prevented any constitutional changes, unless two-thirds approved of it (Schaffer 1999).

Senanayake uses goal orientation for IMF as an actor’s whose intentions will eventually hurt Sri Lanka; the conferring of the status ‘Heavily Indebted Poor Country’ would mean a return to conditionalities. Even the NAM countries collectively agree on the greater trading potential of China in the long run (Morphet 2004). She uses effect orientation to stress the outcomes for Sri Lanka if they adhere to IMF policies. Effects are stressed to caution the audience from keeping a distance from certain opinions and looked at from foresight as a warning. Senanayake cautions developing countries to think twice before allowing IFIs to operate in their countries.

4.3 Dr. Jayatilleka: The “Valiant” Spartan

Jayatilleka wants to legitimize Sri Lanka’s commitment to the NAM policy and advises the government to ‘recommit’ and ‘practice’ the NAM policy. The NAM movement led the global south to pressure the powerful members of the UN to restructure the UNSC and increase the number of observers present (Morphet 2004). He praises Mao Zedong’s as the influence for his adopted stance in Geneva. Zedong’s thinking is referenced as ‘crucial,’ and states are asked to ‘unite their friends’, ‘neutralize the intermediate parties’ and ‘defeat the isolated adversary’, referring to the LTTE. This is a justification for his belief in the policy as he writes, ‘...one has to be internationalist in order to defend and protect the patria.’ The policy of NAM is useful as it serves as a front to resist western hegemony (Morphet 2004).

The government is presented as providing the ‘surge’ that eventually ‘wipes out’ the LTTE. LTTE is never nominated; they are referred to as ‘aggressors.’ The defeat of the LTTE was legitimized in the Sri Lankan media (De Mel 2008),

moreover they were delegitimized in 1997 after the US declared them as a terrorist group (Goodhand et al. 2005). The main purpose of Jayatilleka's delegation was to lower international scrutiny on Sri Lanka. The LTTE is never given direct voice, but are passive actors. This is relevant given the context because Jayatilleka was successful in Geneva in reducing international scrutiny on LTTE for human rights abuses and the resolution passed congratulated the government for taking adequate steps in reconstruction and rehabilitation measures for the population (United Nations General Assembly 2009).

Reactions are another form of evaluation and are included to show the support garnered by Sri Lanka in the UN. 'It's a beautiful wave going through...', referring to a friend's reaction to the support Sri Lanka received in the UN. Jayatilleka calls the European Union decision asking Sri Lanka to halt the offensive 'obsolescent', highlighting his dislike for a political solution. Jayatilleka is for the NAM, and hence, views the President's changes to the policy as 'unfortunate'. Morphet highlights the relationship between NAM and China to show how a UNSC power can aid the global south (Morphet 2004). He reacts positively upon hearing the heart-warming felicitations from DEW Gunasekera, his senior and minister of the Communist Party who commends Jayatilleka. He uses expert authority to legitimize his stance in the UN and to emphasize that prominent Sri Lankans supported him. Jayatilleka's presents himself and Gunasekera as being sentimental after Gunasekera's 'poignant' reference to Mervyn de Silva. This legitimizes his stance on NAM, as his father also supported the policy. By highlighting his links to leaders of parties that held him in great respect he increases his own legitimacy.

Social practices are legitimated through Mythopoesis; the use of stories to legitimate social practices. It is common in moral tales that the hero is rewarded for acting heroically, and bringing stability to society. Jayatilleka uses the tale of Spartan resistance at Thermopylae to legitimize the role of his delegation. As a result, his delegation's dedication and resistance to the west is given positive moral weight against the Tamils and their Western supporters becoming the Persian army, the aggressors. The positive moral connotation of resistance of an outnumbered Spartan force impeding a domineering Persian army is carried on to his delegation. This draws attention away from the government's past harmful actions against the Tamils and positions their struggle as a just and fair one.

One of the most significant parts of the article is where Jayatilleka mentions that it was the Sri Lankan army's 'historic' task to defeat the Tigers. Jayatilleka's claim is valid in relation to the entrenchment of the Mahavamsa ideology amongst the Buddhist clergy that ensured Sinhalese domination in the state (Neumaier 2004). The authority of tradition is used to legitimize the defeat of the LTTE. He portrays the army and the LTTE as historic rivals. Hence, the answer to the question 'why should they be defeated?' results in 'because that's what we have always done', that allows no objections to be raised for the practice. He invokes the authority of tradition, to normalize their defeat.

4.4 Whose News Information is "Reliable"?

Roberts uses the analogy of 'cumulous clouds' covering reviews of the last stages of the war to highlight the use of propaganda by the LTTE, the GoSL and the international media, highlighting the immense confusion surrounding what constituted 'accurate' information during the final stages of the war. The negative

connotation of being blinded by clouds during a thunderstorm is utilized by Roberts to highlight the need for 'brightness'.

Roberts consistently provides legitimation, by reference to his personal reasons for carrying out this specific research. He uses goal orientation to highlight his personal reason for undertaking the research. He writes of himself as, 'an observer who attaches primacy to the subjective sentiments of a set of people...' he is legitimating his view by empathizing with the suffering of Tamils and basing his analysis on the 'reality' of the situation. An IRIN report from March 2009 highlights the immense problems facing civilians in the Vanni (IRIN 2009b). The government was accused of not allowing civilians to leave, firing into civilian safe zones and the camps that the government did not care to furnish with supplies (IRIN 2009a, Hidalgo 2010). Roberts counters this evidence by highlighting the government providing relief, and also allowing civilians to leave safely (Roberts 2014).

Robert's reporting of the story is legitimized as he finds it 'astounding' and 'remarkable' that the joint team of government and LTTE doctors were able to sustain their medical operations on limited supplies; bearing in mind that they were in constant need for emergency supplies (IRIN 2009b). The IRIN report remains skeptical that the lives of the trapped population would improve. Roberts is legitimizing the fact that it was a miracle that Shanmugarajah and his team were able to treat many patients on limited supplies. Roberts counters Knudsen and Lang (2008), who criticize the government for impeding humanitarian movement of agencies whereas Roberts mentions that the government allowed ICRC to conduct voyages and evacuate 13,794 people (Roberts 2014, ICRC. 2009).

Roberts uses goal orientation when highlighting the reasons why the LTTE was training 'medical orderlies', for the purpose of treating 'battlefield casualties'. The Red Cross stresses the importance of protecting medical personnel and temporary shelters during war times (Tamanini 2012, ICRC. 2009, Arrizabalaga 2014). The doctor's being the central focal points are evaluated positively when Roberts' mentions them as being 'trained' and having 'reasonable experience'. The discourse is further legitimized because a solicitor helps in forming Shanmugarajah's affidavit, conferring expert legitimacy to the affidavit. The affidavit is valued positively by Roberts as no, 'public document can rise beyond' it. This is in contrast to experts that remain sceptical of the LTTE's capability in aiding civilians (Biswas 2009, Darusman et al. 2011).

The reason for the GoSLs involvement in helping the LTTE is justified through a negative evaluation of their current state with, 'found itself (LTTE) on the military back foot.' The downtrodden state of the LTTE and the population in 2009 (Layton 2015, BBC 2009) legitimates aid for areas under their control. Robert's represents the government as the actor taking steps to minimize the suffering of the LTTE in contrast to the negative evaluations it received from DARA and (Harris 2010)

Scholars ignore the fact that the Kumaratunga government took positive initiatives to share constitutional power with Tamils but failed to garner votes for it in parliament due to opposition from the Buddhist clergy (Schaffer 1999). Initiatives were put forward by Tamil politicians for peace talks, but the repeated denial of these initiatives and rights led to the continuation of the war in Sri Lanka (Biswas 2009). Through goal orientation, the government is positioned as the actor that 'got together and drew up a disaster contingency plan'. The government characterized positively with the 'officials' end goal being to 'guard,

move and maintain' relief supplies. Roberts represents the government as adhering to humanitarian norms. The DARA report holds the government as the primary obstacle and mentions that aid was difficult to reach the trapped population (Hidalgo 2010).

According to Roberts, the sole purpose that the trapped population serves for the LTTE is to 'extract an international intervention'. The Feinstein report mentions Westerners insisting the GoSL to help the trapped population (Harris 2010). Hence Harris evidences that Western governments were fooled into intervening due to the sophistication of LTTE propaganda. However, Roberts criticises the LTTE for suppressing the movement of the population. Manipulation of civilians and their usage as human shields is prevented by article 51.7 of the Geneva Conventions Additional Protocol 1 (Saulnier 2002a). This is another reason for western pressure on LTTE. Roberts negatively appraises the situation with 'enforced an eastward movement of the trapped populace...'

Van der Voorde explains the nature of their transnational networks that were used to entrench the Tamil cause for self-determination through the media and gather funds from diaspora Tamil communities scattered in western countries (Voorde 2005). Roberts' gets the audience onside asking questions about the validity of data and cautioning against propaganda. He does this by, "If one was to accept the fact', 'then one has to provide', 'should be an eye-opener to those that remain blinded...' and 'that computation will enable one to...', 'it would be simple-minded for us to think...' (Roberts 2014). (Goodhand et al. 2014) highlight that parties in a conflict manipulate narratives and intentionally withhold information from peacekeepers, which leads to the possibility of both sides manipulating information to tilt international support on their side.

Roberts' is legitimizing the idea that the Tiger propaganda machine misled western governments into believing the existence of a humanitarian disaster (Roberts 2013). He is insistent on this fact and adds a moral evaluation, by mentioning that the world is 'confronted with a barefaced lie'; a lie that is countered by the 'good doctor's' evidence. He mentions that the evidence can serve as an 'eye-opener' for misinformed people. He evaluates this as a 'monumental error' on the part of the western governments and their news agencies. This is indeed ethically questionable as the Darusman Panel was set up by the Secretary General, and staffed by experts from prominent organizations. International donors were seldom criticized for failing to act effectively during the previous peace negotiations. Critics point to the excessively 'market-oriented' nature of the initial peace process (Goodhand et al. 2005). This was a missed opportunity for the focus on human rights, as according to (Saulnier 2002b) human rights mechanisms are best implemented in peacetime.

Roberts' uses impersonal authority legitimation to bring key facts to the audience's attention. He is legitimizing by reference to laws and hence, brings attention to the fact that the world media did not include the number of 'injured' civilians present where there are dead, which is a necessity. For him this is a cardinal facet, not to be ignored (Roberts 2014). He legitimizes his explanation by references to the Korean and Vietnamese war where the number of injured was provided along with number of dead. By reference to law, he demands an explanation on the why the number of 'injured' civilians were not mentioned. This reinforces his argument that the on-going propaganda war is serving political purposes and serves as an additional warning to readers, against believing information, even if it emanates from prominent institutions. Mudslinging and the use of information to manipulate opponents is not uncommon practice in

Sri Lanka as the Kumaratunga government used Human Rights for political leverage to gain votes over the Wickremasinghe government (Schaffer 1999) and Jayatileka similarly believes that the west for interfering in Sri Lanka for political rather than humanitarian purposes (Jayatileka 2009).

LTTE's goal is constructed in not interfering with the delivery of aid between the government and trapped population. Their non-interference is backed by an ICRC news release that mentions the LTTE granting permission to GoSL officials, to collect a wounded army soldier from an LTTE camp (ICRC 2009). The actions of the government affecting the LTTE and the trapped population are represented using means orientation, hence agency is left intact and the government is never mentioned. The Tamil population's goal is isolated to only being 'pawns' of the LTTE emphasizing their passive role at the end of the war. He uses means orientation to depict the usefulness of accuracy regarding the number of casualties and the consequences for the audience being a 'distant observer'. In the case of means orientation the purpose is constructed 'in the action'. The reason he provides for this purposeful action is that people not present on the battlefield, have no business publishing 'accurate' facts, rather, the doctor, a first hand witness to the suffering can provide reliable information to a large extent (Roberts 2014).

However, Roberts shows a caveat in Shanmugarajah's calculation of casualties and he is presented as drastically underestimating the number between January to May 2009, however, Robert's calls it an 'underestimate that places in perspective the gross figure of '40,000' deaths presented by the Darusman Panel and Gordon Weiss' because the doctor's underestimate exposes fabricated propaganda. Doctors had an additional purpose because they were 'happily accessible to Colombo journalists'. They are attributed dual roles because Roberts thinks it abnormal for doctors to find time to speak to journalists considering the great number of patients they had to care for. He brings up their 'ubiquitous' presence in Vanni, which he uses to prove that information was available to journalists contrary to (Hidalgo 2010)'s evidence. However, their 'ubiquitous' presence could have served propaganda purposes for the LTTE.

Roberts includes ICRC's opinion to legitimate the question on the whereabouts of the 'bystanders' as he asks, 'what happened to the 'bystanders', once they were separated from the sick, wounded and LTTE members in detention by the GoSL?' He opens the possibility that the GoSL might have unlawfully detained these 'bystanders'. This is the only instance where the government is indirectly questioned and asked to reveal the truth about the 'bystanders'. The ICRC's purpose is restricted to the action of 'deeming' the bystanders as "accompanying caregivers". Further legitimation is granted on the LTTE after stating their involvement in the supervision of the bystanders. Roberts uses goal orientation by highlighting how he personally benefits from Citizen Silva's research. This is a legitimation for his own research, building on the expert authority of Silva (Roberts 2013). He gives credibility to Citizen Silva's work with the use of 'meticulous.'

Roberts uses effect orientation to stress how Tamil's benefited from having dual citizenship status in Sri Lanka. He highlights this because it has 'drawn limited attention in the international circuit.' and represents Tamils as the beneficiaries of this situation. This grants legitimacy to the government at a time when its reputation was declining in the eyes of the international community. Robert's mentions Tamil 'pensioners' receiving their funds consistently from the government from the start of the Eelam War. This delegitimizes international actors

that held that the populations were suffering immensely and held that no relief was reaching them (Darusman et al. 2011).

Dr. Susiri Weerasekera's commends the LTTE for taking steps to train medical orderlies and Roberts compounds this by adding the opinion of professors Wickremagama, an expert in geology and Gerald Peiris whose research on satellite images reveals little damage to hospital premises again countering the evidence provided by (Darusman et al. 2011). Satellite research must be conducted accurately and there is a chance that falsity in the data released can have drastic political consequences (Lyons J. 2013). Moreover, when using satellite imagery it is difficult to attribute responsibility or find a responsible agent (Lyons J. 2013) as was the case with Sri Lanka in the final stages of the war.

4.5 Conclusion

All three authors delegitimize international actors in varying degrees but maintain a consistent stance in delegitimizing the military weakness of the LTTE. Senanayake delegitimizes IFIs through negative moral evaluations by highlighting the US's considerable political influence in these institutions, she delegitimizes the IFIs largely through the use of expert authority legitimation and the authority of conformity. To a small extent, Senanayake and Roberts, legitimize the concerns of the Tamil diaspora for the trapped population in the Vanni. Finally Senanayake delegitimizes IFIs through effect orientation by cautioning the developing world against allowing IFIs to operate on their territory.

Jayatilleka legitimizes the GoSL's stance in Geneva through the use of Mythopoeisis, by placing his delegation on a high moral ground in comparison to the unfair force mounted by the Western Europeans in the UN, whilst simultaneously delegitimizing humanitarian interventions and the RtoP doctrine. Roberts takes a similar stance and delegitimizes western news institutions for gullibly believing the Tiger propaganda machine and uses expert authority to counter the fabrications put forth by the Darusman Panel and Frances Harrison.

Jayatilleka uses the reactions of prominent Sri Lankan ministers to legitimize his stance by highlighting their support for his delegation in Geneva. Finally, he legitimizes the defeat of the LTTE by positioning them as the 'historic' enemies of the Sri Lankan people. In contrast, Roberts positively evaluates the activities of the government in relation to helping the LTTE and places the LTTE on a high moral ground for taking the initiative for respecting humanitarian principles and taking positive steps to minimize the suffering of the trapped population. Roberts legitimizes his research by empathizing with the 'sentiments' of the Tamils and finally, by reference to the authority of conformity asks why the number of 'injured' civilians was not mentioned, when it is a cardinal rule that when there are dead civilians, there is always a mention of 'injured'.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1 Commentary

In conclusion, the key points of the three authors can be divided into four broad categories that encompass their core arguments about humanitarian aid and its relevance and effectiveness in Sri Lanka. All three authors engage in the criticism of international actors in Sri Lanka through varying perspectives. Senanayake takes a stance that opposes the presence of IFIs in Sri Lanka considering their declining reputations in developing countries due to the failure of their programs to bring significant changes in developing countries. She achieves this through the negative evaluation of IFI policies, and through positing them as actors, whose actions are hurting Sri Lanka. Ironically, all three take a similar stance when mentioning the defeat of the LTTE and provide no mention of the ‘agent’ responsible for defeating LTTE, possibly because they consider it relevant, or because they fear unwanted repercussions coming from the government of Sri Lanka, this is true in Senanayake’s case who fails to mention the government even in relation to responsibility for post-conflict reconstruction.

5.2 Table: Summary of Key Points

(KEY)- Jayatilleka- J, Senanayake- S, Roberts- R

Criticising International Actors	Emphasizing South-South Cooperation	Legitimizing LTTE and Tamil Freedom movement	Delegitimizing LTTE
Interventions , RtoP and Human Rights as political tools J, S, R	Resisting West with NAM- J	Moderate Tamil voice needs to play a role in post-conflict reconstruction D	Removing GoSL from equation when mentioning LTTE defeat. J,S,R
IFIs harm developing world (need reform) S	Non-traditional donors, better partners for financial, military and diplomatic assistance (China, India, Pakistan) J, S	GoSL and LTTE provided relief to population in Vanni ‘Ministry of Health Doctors’ (positive evaluation) R	Using trapped population as ‘shields’ ‘labourers’ and ‘manipulation as pawns’ R
International media complicit in propaganda (Darusman Panel)	GoSL Thanking global south for resisting Western Pressure in UN (re-	GoSL needs to devolve power to Tamils (Diaspora is ‘troubled’ by ‘humanitarian	‘Historic’ enemies of Sinhalese, ‘mosquitoes’ and ‘fascists’ (negative evaluation)

J, R	actions, evaluations, mythopoesis) J,S	situation' (again, GoSL not mentioned) D	J,S
Corruption in Aid Bureaucracy and UN. S,J	GoSL taking active role in post-conflict reconstruction J, S	LTTE knowledgeable in humanitarian relief 'trained medical orderlies', 'evacuated bystanders' (positive evaluation, expert authorization) R	Obstructing GoSL offensive against LTTE as 'unlawful' (SL citizens support offensive of Rajapakse) J
Allying with LTTE and impeding GoSL offensive J	IFIs need clients in South, not the other way around. S	Highlighting corruption in GoSL, but not mentioning agent D	Using propaganda to engineer humanitarian intervention J,R
Rejecting Analysis targeting Chinese involvement in SL- S	Non-traditional donors unconcerned with 'lip service' to human rights requirements- S	Depicting suffering of population (legitimizing aid) R	LTTE 'mosquito' planes defeated by superior defence technology of GoSL

Similarly, Jayatilleka takes a stance against the proponents of humanitarian interventions, showing them to be politically motivated, instead of being altruistic nature and highlights the political nature of how human rights were used to hold the 'just' Sri Lankan state accountable; Jayatilleka achieves this in a similar fashion to Senanayake, by representing the 'LTTE supporting' Western Europeans as nations whose actions in the UN are impeding the movement of Sri Lanka, a nation following an honest offensive against LTTE. Roberts takes a stance, specifically against media agencies for being complicit in LTTE propaganda and publishing inaccurate number of dead civilians and false information regarding the final stages of the war in Sri Lanka.

Senanayake and Jayatilleka take a similar stance when it comes to emphasizing South-South cooperation as their articles are delegitimizing international actors. Senanayake highlights the positive Sri Lanka has developed with non-traditional donors such as China, India and Pakistan and through effect orientation positions them as taking actions that benefit Sri Lanka in the long run, because they can be relied on financial, military and diplomatic support. Jayatilleka also praises the countries of the global south that supported Sri Lanka in the UN and halted a Western Intervention from interfering into Sri Lankan politics and infringing on sovereignty. His core argument consists of glorifying the GoSLs

commitment to the policy of NAM and by evaluating it positively to encourage more nations of the global South to follow in Sri Lanka's footsteps.

To a small extent, Roberts and Senanayake legitimize the Tamil freedom movement and the LTTE struggle. Roberts points out an instance of cooperation between ministry of health doctors and LTTE doctors in bringing relief to the trapped population in the Vanni, and portrays the LTTE as being knowledgeable in humanitarian relief and its core tenets, to a small extent. He backs his claims with the expert authority to show that his claims are not unreasonable. Senanayake highlights that the problems of the Tamils have continued because the government failed to devolve power to the north-east and also includes a mention of the 'Tamil diaspora's humanitarian concerns' concerning the suffering trapped population to show that the population really did need help and not everything emanating from LTTEs side constituted as propaganda. Moreover, Senanayake also criticizes corruption as being part of the problem, and delegitimizes the government, hence legitimizing the Tamil struggle for self-determination. However the space reserved for criticizing the LTTE is comparative larger than the space for legitimation and even Roberts achieves this by mentioning the possibility that the doctors were disseminating propaganda and highlighting the manipulation of the population by LTTE to suit their military purposes, hence endangering their lives.

All three authors delegitimize the LTTE in varying degrees in their articles. The defeat of the LTTE is mentioned, by no agent is mentioned as conducting the defeat, because the authors no longer consider it relevant to reveal the identity of the actor because they are not a threat to Sri Lanka or the world. Moreover, the identity is backgrounded because numerous actors contributed to the defeat of LTTE, as its regional neighbours and more prominently, the Americans helped the GoSL. Jayatilleka legitimizes their defeat by placing them as 'historic' enemies of the Sri Lankan people and evaluating them as fascists. Similarly Senanayake and Roberts also evaluate their activities negatively, Senanayake, when she mentions their defeat because GoSL had superior defence technology in its possession, and Roberts who mentions that the LTTE used the trapped population as human shields, labourers and also shot the civilians that attempted to escape from the Vanni.

References

- Anderson, M. (1998) "You Save My Life Today, but what for Tomorrow?": Some Moral Dilemmas of Humanitarian Aid', in J. Moore (ed.) *Hard Choices: Moral Dilemmas in Humanitarian Action*, pp. 137-157. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Arrizabalaga, J. (2014) 'Introduction. on the 150th Anniversary of the Red Cross: New Issues and Perspectives in the History of War Humanitarianism', *Asclepio* 66(1): 1-8.
- BBC (2009) 'Sri Lanka Jets Bomb 'Rebel Base' BBC, South Asia.
- Biswas, B. (2009) 'Can'T we just Talk? Reputational Concerns and International Intervention in Sri Lanka and Indonesia (Aceh)', *International Negotiation* 14: 121-147.
- Brauman, R. (1998) 'Refugee Camps, Population Transfers and NGOs', in J. Moore (ed.) *Hard Choices: Moral Dilemmas in Humanitarian Action*, pp. 177-195. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Burke-White, W. (2012) 'Adoption of the Responsibility to Protect', in J. Genser and I. Cotler (eds) *The Responsibility to Protect : The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in our Time*, pp. 17-36. New York : Oxford University Press,.
- DARA (2008) *Humanitarian Response Index 2008*. Palgrave.
- Darusman, M., Y. Sooka and S. Ratner (2011) '**Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Experts on Accountability in Sri Lanka**'. New York: United Nations.
- Daruwala, R. and B. Adams (2009) Chair and Right Honourable Commonwealth Ministers & Members of the Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group. 'Joint Letter to CMAG on Follow-Up Action on the Deepening Crisis in Sri Lanka'. Human Rights Watch.
- De Mel, N. (2008) 'Marketing War, Marketing Peace: Mediating Global Capital and National Security', 'Marketing War, Marketing Peace: Mediating Global Capital and National Security', *Militarizing Sri Lanka*, Sri Lanka: Sage.
- De Mel, N., K. Samuel and C. Soysa (2012) 'Ethnopolitical Conflict in Sri Lanka: Trajectories and Transformations', in D. Landis and R. Albert (eds) *Handbook of Ethnic Conflict: International Perspectives*, pp. 93-118. Springer US.
- Goodhand, J., B. Klem, D. Fonaseka, S. Keethaponcalan and S. Sardesai (2005) 'Aid, Conflict and Peacebuilding in Sri Lanka: 2000-2005', Six Part Series, No. 1. Sri Lanka: The Asia Foundations.
- Goodhand, J., B. Klem and G. Sorbo (2014) 'Battlefield of Method: Evaluating Norwegian Peace Efforts in Sri Lanka', in O. Andersen, B. Bull and M. Chouane (eds) *Evaluation Methodologies for Aid in Conflict*, pp. 61-85. Oxon: Routledge.
- Goodhand, J. and O. Walton (2009) 'The Limits of Liberal Peacebuilding? International Engagement in the Sri Lankan Peace Process', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 3(3): 303-323.

- Harris, S. (2010) 'Humanitarianism in Sri Lanka. Lessons Learned?'. Medford: Tufts University.
- Hattotuwa, S. (Last updated 2003) 'Media and Conflict in Sri Lanka' (a webpage of Cerebration). Accessed December 18th 2016 <<http://www.cerebration.org/media.html>>.
- Hattotuwa, S. (2009) 'News Media and Conflict Transformation in Sri Lanka', *Transforming Security and Development in an Unequal World* 40(2): 28-35.
- Hehir, B. (1998) 'Military Intervention and National Sovereignty: Recasting the Relationship', in J. Moore (ed.) *Hard Choices: Moral Dilemmas in Humanitarian Action*, pp. 29-55. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hidalgo, S. (2010) 'Sri Lanka: Processing a Slaughter Foretold', *The Humanitarian Response Index 2009: Whose Crisis? Clarifying Donor priorities.*, pp. 198-207. Great Britain: DARA.
- Hoglund, K. and I. Svensson (2011) 'Schizophrenic Soothers: the International Community and Contrast Strategies for Peace-Making in Sri Lanka', *Cooperation and Conflict* 46(2): 166-184.
- Human Rights Watch (2009) 'War on the Displaced: Sri Lankan Army and LTTE Abuses Against Civilians in the Vanni', No. 1-56432-443-5. United States of America: Human Rights Watch.
- Hyndman, J. (2007) 'Forum: The Securitization of Fear in Post-Tsunami Sri Lanka', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97(2): 361-372.
- ICRC (Last updated 2009) 'Sri Lanka: ICRC Facilitates Handover of Wounded Soldier to Authorities' (a webpage of ICRC). Accessed October 21 2016 <<https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/news-release/2009-and-earlier/sri-lanka-news-220108.htm>>.
- International Crisis Group (Last updated 2016) 'Sri Lanka's Potemkin Peace: Democracy Under Fire' (a webpage of International Crisis Group). Accessed June 6th 2016 <<http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/publication-type/media-releases/2013/asia/sri-lankas-potemkin-peace-democracy-under-fire.aspx>>.
- IRIN (2009a) 'Clinton Raises Security Fears for IDPs in the North' *IRIN*, Food.
- IRIN (2009b) 'Mass Exodus Leads to Massive Humanitarian Need' *IRIN*, Conflict.
- Jayasuriya, S. and P. McCawley (2010) 'Sri Lanka', 'Sri Lanka', *The Asian Tsunami: Aid and Reconstruction After a Disaster*, pp. 123-171. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Jayasuriya, D. (2008) 'Financial and Economic Sanctions Relating to Economic Crimes in Sri Lanka', *Journal of Financial Crime* 15(4): 364-368.
- D. Jayatilleka (2009) 'Battleground Geneva: The Special Session of the HRC on Sri Lanka' *Groundviews: Journalism for Citizens*. Accessed 17th August 2016 <<http://groundviews.org/2009/06/01/battleground-geneva-the-special-session-of-the-hrc-on-sri-lanka/>>.

- Kapur, D. (2001) 'Expansive Agendas and Weak Instruments: Governance Related Conditionalities of International Financial Institutions', *The Journal of Policy Reform* 4(3): 207-241.
- Keen, D. (2014) 'The Camp' and 'the Lesser Evil': Humanitarianism in Sri Lanka', *Conflict, Security and Development* 14(1): 1-31.
- Kingsbury, D. (2012) 'Sri Lanka', in J. Genser and I. Cotler (eds) *The Responsibility to Protect : The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in our Time*, pp. 298-315. New York : Oxford University Press,.
- Krieg, A. (2013) 'The Legal and Moral Legitimacy of Intervention', 'The Legal and Moral Legitimacy of Intervention', *Motivations for Humanitarian Interventions*, pp. 3-35. Netherlands: Springer.
- Lang, H. and A. Knudsen (2008) 'Sri Lanka's Conflict Induced Internal Displacement: Challenges and Dilemmas of Protection for Humanitarian Agencies in Trincomalee', in H. Adelman (ed.) *Protracted Displacement in Asia: No Place to Call Home*, pp. 107-131. England: Ashgate.
- Layton, P. (2015) 'How Sri Lanka Won the War: Lessons in Strategy from an Overlooked Victory.', *The Diplomat* .
- Lee AC (2008) 'Local Perspectives on Humanitarian Aid in Sri Lanka After the Tsunami.', *Public health* 122(12): 1410-7.
- Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lim, Y., G. Barnett and J. Kim (2008) 'The Structure of International Aid Flows and Global News Media', *The Journal of International Communication* 14(2): 117-142.
- Lyons J. (2013) 'Documenting Violations of International Humanitarian Law from Space: A Critical Review of Geospatial Analysis of Satellite Imagery during Armed Conflicts in Gaza (2009), Georgia (2008), and Sri Lanka (2009)', *International Review of the Red Cross* 94(886): 739-763.
- Mallick, R. (1998) 'Foreign Aid for Conflict Development in Sri Lanka', in R. Mallick (ed.) *Development, Ethnicity and Human Rights in South Asia*, pp. 128-150. Delhi: Sage Publications Inc.
- Morphet, S. (2004) 'Review Essay: Multilateralism and the Non-Aligned Movement: What is the Global South Doing and Where is it Going?', *Global Governance* 10: 511-537.
- Nair, S. (2013) 'Governance, Representation and International Aid', *Third World Quarterly* 34(4): 630-652.
- Neumaier, E. (2004) 'Missed Opportunities: Buddhism and the Ethnic Strife in Sri Lanka and Tibet', in H. Coward and G. Smith (eds) *Religion and Peacebuilding*, pp. 69-93. Albany: State University of New York.
- ODI (2010) 'Humanitarian Space in Sri Lanka: what lessons can be learned? ', 18th November 2010. Overseas Development Institute pp1-16.

- M. Roberts (2014) 'Medical Administration and Relief within the Vanni Pocket: January to Mid-may 2009' Groundviews. Accessed October 17th 2016 <<http://groundviews.org/2014/01/07/medical-administration-and-relief-within-the-vanni-pocket-january-to-mid-may-2009/>>.
- Roberts, M. (2013) 'Introducing “Numbers Game” – A Detailed Study of the Last Stages of Eelam War IV' *Colombo Telegraph*.
- Rotberg, R. (1999) 'Sri Lanka's Civil War: From Mayhem Toward Diplomatic Resolution', in R. Rotberg (ed.) *Creating Peace in Sri Lanka: Civil War and Reconciliation*, pp. 1-17. Virginia: World Peace Foundation.
- Saulnier, F. (2002a) 'Civilians', in F. Saulnier (ed.) *The Practical Guide to Humanitarian Law*, pp. 43-47. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Saulnier, F. (2002b) *The Practical Guide to Humanitarian Law*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Schaffer, T. (1999) 'Peacemaking in Sri Lanka: The Kumaratunga Initiative', in R. Rotberg (ed.) *Creating Peace in Sri Lanka: Civil War and Reconciliation*, pp. 131-143. Virginia: World Peace Foundation.
- Senanayake, D. (Last updated 2009) 'The Aid Game and the Politics of Humanitarianism.' (a webpage of Groundviews). Accessed December 30 2016 <<http://groundviews.org/2009/06/03/the-aid-game-and-the-politics-of-humanitarianism/>>.
- Smits, S. (2015) 'Sri Lanka's Civil War: What Kind of Methodologies for Identity Conflict?', in D. Zarkov and H. Hintjens (eds) *Conflict, Peace, Security and Development: Theories and Methodologies*, pp. 187-202. New York: Routledge.
- Stokke, K. (2009) 'Crafting Liberal Peace? International Peace Promotion and the Contextual Politics of Peace in Sri Lanka', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 99(5): 932-939.
- Tamanini, M. (2012) 'Healthcare in Danger: Violent Incidents Affecting the Delivery of Health Care January 2012- December 2014.', *Health Care in Danger*, No. 4237. Geneva: ICRC.
- Toomey, M. and B. Singleton (2014) 'The Post-9/11 "Terrorism" Discourse and its Impact on Nonstate Actors: A Comparative Study of the LTTE and Hamas', *Asian Politics and Policy* 6(2): 183-198.
- United Nations General Assembly (2009) 'Report of the Human Rights Council on its Eleventh Special Session'. Human Rights Council.
- Voorde, C. (2005) 'Sri Lankan Terrorism: Assessing and Responding to the Threat of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)', *Police Practice and Research* 6(2): 181-199.
- Weiss, T.G. (2014) 'Military Humanitarianism: Syria Hasn't Killed It', *The Washington Quarterly* 37(1): 7-20.

Appendices

I. The Aid Game and The Politics of Humanitarianism

Darini- Rajasingham Senanayake- 6th March 2009

The US government, which wields considerable influence at the International Monetary Fund (IMF), has sought to delay Sri Lanka's USD 1.9 billion loan appeal. Washington's hesitance is tied to the context of the humanitarian crisis that preceded the defeat and destruction of the LTTE and the killing of its leader, Velupillai Prabhakaran. Sri Lanka needs the IMF loan to service its external debt, which has accumulated as a result of soaring defence expenditure as well as borrowing related to controversial oil-hedging deals. The government is also seeking funds for the reconstruction of the conflict-affected northeast.

The disbursement of the funds has also been a somewhat controversial issue outside Washington, DC. Initially, the United Nations Security Council had determined that it would not block the loan, when the subject came up during informal discussion. The UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Britain and France have, however, asked for an investigation into war crimes and violations of the Law of War by both sides. Earlier, the Security Council president, Mexican Ambassador Claude Heller, stated that all 15 members agreed that such a move or other steps to punish Sri Lanka were unnecessary." The island's two main donors, China and Japan, along with Russia and Vietnam on the Security Council, regard the conflict between the government and LTTE as an internal matter.

Beyond the politics, the pending IMF loan to Sri Lanka re-opens an old debate on international aid, its relevance and effectiveness, both within and beyond the island. Before the current global crisis, the IMF and many supra-national banks had almost run out of relevance "and, more significantly, clients "in the developing world. Many countries had started borrowing in private capital markets. This was partly due to the unpopularity of the Structural Adjustment Programmes and other conditionalities imposed by the body. The institution had also lost considerable credibility for its response to the East Asian financial crisis during the late 1990s, and its handling of the Argentina economic collapse, from 1999 until 2002. This was particularly true in the wake of World Bank Chief Economist Joseph Stiglitz's critique that IMF policies actually exacerbated these crises. Stiglitz subsequently lost his job at the World Bank, but won the Nobel Prize for Economics in 2001.

The IMF's diminished relevance prior to the current financial crisis was also due to the emergence of new Asian donors such as China and India moving into Africa and Asia with billions of dollars, to secure the natural resources needed to sustain growth at home. Following the financial crisis, the IMF gained a new lease of life, with a revitalised mandate to assist poor countries affected by the downturn. The G20 Summit in London in April was a particular turning point, as the IMF garnered pledges in the billions to help economic recovery. However, at the same meeting, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown also declared, the Washington Consensus is dead." (Perhaps he was following in the English tradition of announcing, The king is dead! Long live the king!) In any event, it

appears that the IMF, at least in Sri Lanka, may now step in where the World Bank once trod “ the latter being the Bretton Woods twin once tasked with post-conflict reconstruction. Going off of the Sri Lanka’s most recent aid experiences, however, perhaps it will make little difference: despite promises in 2003 of some USD 4.5 billion by the four co-chairs of the peace process (Norway, Japan, the US and the EU), much of that aid turned out to be ‘phantom aid’, with some 70 percent being given in the form of loans rather than grants.

Recently there have been investigations into the large bonuses and salaries that CEOs, experts and executives in the international financial system paid themselves over the years and Pres. Obama has asked for a cap on salaries and perks, likewise there is a scandal of improper payments made by British Parliamentarians to themselves. Similar inquiries may be raised with regard to the international development and humanitarian aid industry, particularly UN agencies and INGOs which is lacking in transparency, whose CEOs, representatives and experts” are paid enormous salaries, per diems and hardship allowances” while claiming to be doing poverty alleviation while living in extraordinary comfort in disaster affected countries..

For instance, the Red Cross brought 183 foreign delegates to Lanka after the tsunami (they were Red cross volunteers from the different RC countries with no particular technical expertise), and each delegate cost over 120,000 USD per annum. Just as the international financial system’s and politician’s excesses are being exposed at this time the international aid system too needs scrutiny, transparency and regulation. In short ETHICS need to be re-inserted into the international aid business and it seems that now is the time to do begin the process of cleaning up the aid industry.

New donors Resurgent as the IMF may be, it has not reduced the importance of India and China as newly established donor countries. Indeed, there has been a shift in the structural dynamics of the international development architecture, as the current aid configuration in Sri Lanka reflects. In the context of a general critique of the Western aid system taking root in the Global South, there has been an emergence of new Asian donors, particularly China and India. What is more, the stepped-up power of these two donors may also be increasingly rendering the established international aid architecture irrelevant. While these Asian donors tend to have a more state-centric approach to aid, they do not attach many policy conditionalities, and offer cheaper technical assistance. The new donors also tend to be less concerned about paying lip service to human-rights requirements, as was clearly demonstrated by New Delhi and Beijing’s recent stance in Sri Lanka.

Such nonchalance is quite in contrast to many Western donors, many of which have a significant Tamil diaspora in their capitals that was troubled by the humanitarian situation as the war drew to a close. Tied in with this concern has the question of the exchangeability of the aid. As the areas in which the aid can be used are rather flexible, there were fears for many donors that Colombo could be redirecting some of the funds to its war effort, for instance, rather than using it for development projects. Given such concerns, many had been arguing that conditionalities on an IMF loan should relate not only to immediate humanitarian assistance, but also extend to a sustainable solution “ demilitarisation and good governance for conflict de-escalation.

India, always a significant political force in Sri Lanka, has now taken on a development role previously alien to it. To begin with, it has pledged post-conflict reconstruction assistance, and has sent emergency humanitarian assistance to the conflict zones in northern Sri Lanka, including teams of navy doctors. Of course, New Delhi also supplied intelligence to Colombo and provided defence equipment, principally radar equipment to detect LTTE planes. In the commercial arena, it has also leased oil terminals in Sri Lanka's prime and much-coveted natural harbour in Trincomalee, on the northeast coast. The island also counts on China for significant military and financial assistance. In Hambantota " the southern tip of Sri Lanka, 106 km from one of the world's busiest shipping lines " is a vast construction site, where a Chinese-funded port is being built. One of the poorest districts on the island, Hambantota is also President Mahinda Rajapakse's electorate. And while China says that the USD 1 billion port is a purely commercial venture, American and Indian military analysts regard it as part of a so-called 'string of pearls' strategy, meant to encircle strategic waterways.

China has also helped Sri Lanka in other ways as well, including encouraging Pakistan to sell weapons to Colombo and supporting it diplomatically at the Security Council, especially blocking votes on the war. It is also reported that Beijing provided, free-of-charge, six F-7 jet fighters last year. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, it was these very planes that subsequently shot down the LTTE 'mosquito' planes. And the relationship shows no signs of dwindling, with Chinese aid to Sri Lanka jumping from a few million dollars in 2005 to USD 1 billion last year, replacing Japan as the island's largest donor. Of course, Beijing was already Colombo's biggest arms supplier by the 1990s. As both India and China fish in Sri Lanka's strategically located troubled waters, the government seems to have been using the rising Asian donors in particular to defeat the LTTE and to counter the Western aid lobby " one that may increasingly become irrelevant in Asia.

Aid tsunami It is generally agreed that Sri Lanka's current economic woes are related more to soaring defence expenditure, dysfunctional governance and corruption (which have fuelled and been fuelled by the extended armed conflict), rather than to the global economic crisis.

Three years ago, Sri Lanka turned down an IMF offer to give the country a status of Heavily Indebted Poor Country. Then, the Rajapakse regime celebrated the departure of the IMF with fanfare, promising never to go back to Western aid conditionalities, which often included the privatisation of public corporations and assets, underperforming or otherwise. Colombo had also concluded that concessionary loans (one at little or no interest rate) offered by international financial institutions were too costly. This was especially true given aid conditionalities, including over-priced technical assistance from donor countries that flow back to the contributor, amounting to 'phantom aid'. Since then, Sri Lanka's Central Bank has followed a path of borrowing from private capital markets. Not so long ago, the governor of the Central Bank of Sri Lanka, Nivard Cabraal, went on record telling the IMF to put Washington's finances in order following the global financial crisis, rather than advising Sri Lanka on monetary policy. Sound as this advice to the IMF may have been, the Sri Lankan economy itself is hardly in good shape. The country currently suffers from a serious deficit, a home-grown balance-of-payments crisis caused by excessive defence expendi-

ture, bloated public sector spending and inflation that peaked last year at 30 per cent. All the while, official reserves have in recent years been whittled away by defending an exchange rate of 108 Sri Lanka rupees to the US dollar. According to Razeen Sally, the director of the European Center for International Political Economy, an apparent balance-of-payments crisis is also related to corruption and institutional rot that set in long ago, but has plumbed new depths". Currently, controversial oil-hedging deals are under investigation by the Bribery Commission, following a Supreme Court stop order on payments by the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation, including to Citibank and Standard Chartered Bank. Recently, the United National Party, the main opposition, raised questions about conditionalities attached to the IMF loan under discussion in the Parliament. The Rajapakse government has stated that it will not tolerate conditionalities from the IMF, which would likely welcome a client from Southasia given its declining clientele in the region.

Historically, Sri Lanka has been a bit of a donor darling, receiving disproportionate international media attention when compared with other conflict regions. Despite and arguably because of cycles of conflict, peace-building, reconstruction and destruction in the last quarter-century " as well as due to Sri Lanka's lush tropical beauty, cultural openness and tourist-friendly people and infrastructure " the island has been a favourite of the international development industry. The country, however, tends to underutilise normal development assistance (making use of only around 17 to 35 percent of the total aid, depending on the project).

It has also at times experienced 'hot' aid flows. This was particularly the case following the 2004 tsunami, when over 500 donors and international organisations arrived on the island to provide relief " and then stayed on for several years. This experience gave rise to a local discourse that the island had been struck by an 'aid tsunami', which had caused new conflicts and problems of coordination, equity and lack of local ownership of recovery priorities and programmes. Several studies indicated that a significant part of the funds for disaster victims were consumed by international experts from various UN Agencies, the International Committee for the Red Cross and their partners, and INGOs based in Colombo " rather than reaching affected communities.

International assistance can certainly be helpful. But it is clear that aid dependence in conflict situations may lead to institutional de-development that exacerbates the emergent conflict, creating a poverty trap in places where long-term, low-intensity conflict prevailed. It is in this context too that the GoSL has recently been quite dismissive of Western aid donors. Ultimately, the giving and receiving of aid is as much about politics as it is about humanitarian aid or poverty alleviation. In the words of political theorist Joseph S Nye, Politics in an information age is not only about whose military wins, but whose story wins." This has proven to be a truism in Sri Lanka, especially as the war has wound up in recent months.

Trade, not aid With much physical and political reconstruction work now necessary in Sri Lanka, the issue of aid disbursement becomes more relevant than before. It is still possible for Colombo to win the war but lose the peace. Many have predicted that the remaining LTTE cadre will melt into society, in Sri Lanka and South India, continuing to fight a guerrilla war until the root causes

of the conflict are addressed. After all, the core concerns of the Tamils are in no way addressed by the military victory. These fundamental concerns will cease to exist only with the devolution of power to the north and eastern regions. Tamil moderates could argue that now, when the LTTE threat has passed, meaningful power-sharing should take place. This should be in direct opposition to the masquerade of democracy that has been evident in the east since the government 'liberated' the Eastern Province. After that area was re-captured by the Sri Lanka military in mid-2007, the situation in the east has been showcased as a post-conflict development model. A report by the International Crisis Group, issued in mid-April, notes:

Even now, the Eastern Province is still not the 'post-conflict' situation that development agencies had hoped. Despite the presence of tens of thousands of soldiers and police in the east, the LTTE have proven able to launch attacks on government forces and their rivals, the Tamil Makkal Viduthalai Puligal (TVMP). There have also been violent conflicts between different factions of the pro-government TVMP and impunity for killing and disappearances, many of them apparently committed by government forces and their allies. The government has still not devolved power to the Eastern Province as required by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution which established the provincial council system in 1987 in response to Tamil demands for regional autonomy. In this environment, development of the east remains affected by the conflict and threatens to exacerbate them. Despite the need for development there is a danger of funds being wasted or misused.

The critique of development assistance within the country has, of course, also remarked that international aid itself has contributed in the past to the conflict. Poor governance locally as well as in the international aid bureaucracy, where phantom aid, lack of transparency, poor monitoring and evaluation, and non-existent exit-strategies, are all part of the problem. In this context, it is to be hoped that the IMF loan and other international aid is now conditional on a scenario that ensures sustainable peace through genuine devolution of power.

Most importantly, the moderate Tamil voice that had been stifled by the LTTE and government-allied paramilitaries must play a central role in the reconstruction of the northeast. The military defeat of the LTTE does not mean that its ideology has been defeated. This will only happen when the state recognises the multicultural and multi-religious nature of the country, and ensures equal rights to all communities. The state will need to reach out to the minority community, ensure that displaced people are not held in internment camps, and offer the Tamils an acceptable political solution. There also needs to be a process of reconciliation and peace-building among the various ethnic and religious communities. Affirmative action, by hiring minority community members into government institutions, the bureaucracy and the armed forces, could be a useful start.

Unfortunately, much like the LTTE, southern politicians have played the 'ethnic card', using the conflict to win votes and stay in power. This political culture must end in order for bridges to be built and ethnic relations to improve in Sri Lanka. Ultimately, no amount of aid, howsoever large, can heal Sri Lanka's wounds if it is not implemented in an environment of compromise and under-

standing. Indeed, as Colombo's political approach to Tamils and other minorities must change, so must the state's handling of aid monies. Naturally, the involvement of national development experts as well as civil society in monitoring the IMF loan and other reconstruction assistance is extremely crucial. What is more, there should be clear timeframes and exit strategies for all the reconstruction players. Finally, 'trade not aid' is the path forward for sustainable economic recovery, as well as to avoid aid dependency and the related poverty trap in which northeast Sri Lanka has been caught for the last two decades.

II. Battleground Geneva: The Special Session of the HRC on Sri Lanka

Dayan Jayatilleka- 6th January 2009

Sri Lanka forces West to retreat over ‘war crimes’ with victory at UN” – The TIMES (London), May 28, 2009

Oh, I get by with a little help from my friends | Mmm, I’m gonna try with a little help from my friends” – The Beatles

Was Geneva the last battle of the Thirty Years (hot) war, the first battle of the next war “ a long Cold War against Sri Lanka — or was it a combination? Only future history will tell.

When we aren’t involved, our arithmetic goes awry. We speak of four Eelam wars when there were five, because we omit the important one fought between the LTTE and the IPKF. There were five Eelam wars fought on the soil of our island: 1978-1987, 1987-1990, 1990-1994, 1995-2002, and 2006-2009.

Similarly, there weren’t two defeats suffered by the Tigers and pro-Tiger separatism, namely military (on the Wannai coast) and diplomatic (at the UN in Geneva), but three, military, politico-ideological and diplomatic. The political defeat actually preceded the decisive military defeat and provided the final pre-requisite for the surge that overran the LTTE leadership. This was the result of the Indian election and especially the wipeout of the hardcore pro-Tiger forces in Tamil Nadu.

Geneva was the third defeat. It was not a defeat of the Tiger Diaspora alone. It was the defeat of a powerful bloc of forces: the foreign affairs apparatuses of the European Union (driven by several Western European states), the Western dominated international media, the amply endowed international NGOs, the pro-Tiger Tamil Diaspora, anti-Sri Lankan elements within the UN system, and a residual political fifth column within Sri Lanka itself.

An unintended consequence of the Geneva session was the profoundly educative and collective character of the experience for Sri Lankans, a huge number of whom watched the proceedings on the live web-cast which was picked up by at least one popular TV channel. It was a distance learning Open University on international affairs for the country as a whole.

The nation saw who our true friends were and who the friends of our separatist terrorist enemy were. Sri Lanka saw and heard hypocrisy at work in world affairs. It also saw and heard fairness, friendship and solidarity.

As a former student activist of the Independent Students Union of Colombo University, now a university lecturer in New Zealand emailed me about the support we received: It’s a beautiful wave going through, if I start from the west”, from Brazil, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Venezuela and Cuba through Egypt, Iran, the Middle East via Russia, Pakistan, India, China to the Far East including Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam and Cambodia etc up to the Philippines. More pro-saically, we received solidarity in the forms of vote (member states) and voice (observers) from the following states, geographically clustered by a young Sri Lankan student from Cambridge, voluntarily interning in our Mission.

Euro-Asia: Russian Federation South Asia: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Nepal Far East: China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Maldives, Singapore, Thailand, Lao People's Democratic Republic Middle East: Azerbaijan , Bahrain , Egypt , Jordan , Qatar , Saudi Arabia , Iran , Syrian Arab Republic , Lebanon , Oman , United Arab Emirates Latin America: Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Venezuela Africa: Angola , Burkina Faso , Cameroon , Djibouti , Ghana , Madagascar , Nigeria , Senegal , South Africa , Zambia , Algeria , Sudan

When I handed in my credentials here on June 1st 2007, I assembled the Mission staff and told them of the chronicle in Herodotus' Histories of the three hundred Spartans at Thermopylae who held on against incredible odds to provide the time and political space for the rest of the Greek federation to mobilize and crush the aggressors. This, I told them, would be our task, and should animate our work and attitude. It worked and we held the line, not permitting a single move or sound out of Geneva which could reinforce the other prong of Western diplomacy working for a humanitarian pause" and an evacuation or honorable exit" for the Tiger leadership— before the Sri Lankan armed forces finished their historic task, decimating the Tiger army and decapitating the fascist enemy.

The Western Europeans had pushed for a special session for weeks, lobbying intensively in capitals across the world. Their target date was May 14th. They failed due our intense resistance, and that was our first success. The story is best told by Prof Rajiva Wijesinha in his *How the West Was Sidelined (For the Moment)*, which appeared in *The Island*. Though the proffered reason was the fate of trapped civilians, a Reuters report out of Geneva on Friday May 15th, datelined 5:30 pm, and dealing with the call for a special session, let slip the truth. It leaked the text of a draft declaration to be adopted by the EU Council on Monday May 18th which would insist that the Government of Sri Lanka desist from a final assault". This then was the agenda, because the EU had reckoned that with the Tamil Nadu elections over on May 13th, the Sri Lankan armed forces would storm the last redoubt of the fascist Tigers. They were right.

When the European Council met on Monday May 18th, it had to amend its text, dropping the obsolescent call for desisting from final assault" and substituting instead one for an independent international inquiry into war crimes, and urging the UN Human Rights Council to have a special session. The news leaks surrounding it clearly stated that the EU expected the Human Rights Council to be the appointing body for such a probe. Obviously someone up there wanted to punish the Sri Lankan state for pressing ahead with the offensive and finishing off the LTTE. On May 19th, after President Rajapakse's address to the Sri Lankan Parliament, UK Foreign Secretary Miliband submitted a written Ministerial statement endorsing the European Council's call. One simply must recall that it was after the visit of secretary Miliband to Washington that the joint US-UK statement called for a pause and negotiations, and that the remarks by Foreign Secretary Miliband and Foreign Minister Kouchner in a co-signed article in *The Times*, Mr. Miliband's favorite paper (which he commended twice to reporters at the UN Security Council briefing) concluded by sounding the note of the so-called Responsibility to protect and calling for an international inquiry, more than 18 days before the war would be over. These personalities echoed this call at their remarks at the standup microphone outside the Security Council following the UN SC Press statement on Sri Lanka.

The EU worked overtime across the globe during the weekend of May 16-17 and in an activity spike occasioned by the May 18th statement in Brussels and the written Ministerial statement in Westminster of May 19th, finally managed to get the 16 signatures (peaking at 17) by the middle of that week. The surge was assisted by vigorous lobbying by Tamil ethnic lobbies in some countries of the global South and most of all by a blitzkrieg of disinformation in the Western dominated world media.

How did little Sri Lanka first resist successfully and then prevail over, for the moment but a decisive moment— the concerted global efforts of old, massive, well funded and thoroughly professional foreign offices of the UK, France, Germany and Denmark, together with their access to the media, their paramilitary proxies' the INGOS, and their men and women seeded through the upper reaches of the UN system?

In the first place we had a political leadership, or more correctly, a politico-military leadership, in President Mahinda Rajapakse and Defense Secretary Gotabhaya Rajapakse, that possessed the political will to go ahead despite the odds, and in this they were supported by the national will, the people's will, to prevail over the Tigers whatever the external pressures.

The strategy that I adopted in Geneva was discussed and agreed upon in a one-on-one conversation with President Rajapakse at the very time he appointed me. He had sent me on the delegation for the HRC sessions in March 2007, so I could get a feel for the place. Upon returning I outlined my perspective, simply that which came authentically to me, of actively re-committing to and practicing Sri Lanka's traditional foreign policy of Nonalignment. The President briefed me on certain unfortunate departures from this policy that had taken place, which had led to changes he had just made in the foreign relations apparatus; deviations he wanted rectified including in the disarmament realm — and gave me the needed autonomy, saying you know my thinking". As for the specific scenario I anticipated, given that the EU had a draft resolution against Sri Lanka on the table since March 2006, he said Yes, even if we lose, go for a vote. President Rajapakse re-endorsed the strategy in two telephone conversations I had with him on the weekend just prior to the special session.

Sri Lanka's leading analyst of international affairs, Mervyn de Silva, my father, died ten years ago this month, June. I practiced in Geneva that which I had absorbed from him. He told me of Ben Bella and Patrice Lumumba even before I started schooling. As a boy I had seen Sri Lanka's diplomatic stance at its best, adopted by his friends Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe, Neville Kanakarathne, Gamini Corea, and Anton Muttukumar. Through my teens I attended the lectures, including by Sir Michael Howard, organized by the Ceylon Institute of World Affairs, of which Maj Gen 'Tony' Muttukumar was President and Mervyn was Secretary General, and the Bandaranaike Centre for International Studies which was founded on the basis of a report by Mervyn. As importantly I was introduced to top foreign diplomats such as Cuba's Armando Bayo and foreign policy thinkers such as Russia's Evgeni Primakov. From the library at home to my father's famous foreign journalistic friends, from our travels overseas to our conversations at dinner, the world my family inhabited was as much international as it was national. Eschewing lucrative offers of journalistic employment overseas, my father had his feet firmly in the national reality but his head in the international. I grew up with hardly any dividing line between one and the other, with my own role models and independent identifications being

with a trend, tradition and experience that was internationalist and truly world-historical.

Mervyn de Silva believed firmly that Sri Lanka's national interests were best served by active membership in the Non Aligned movement and commitment to the policy of Non Alignment. He believed that our relationship with our neighbor should be the bedrock of our foreign policy. He was also keenly aware of tendencies towards multi-polarity and new global trends such as identity politics which transcended national boundaries (in this age of identity, ethnicity walks on water" he said in one of his last essays). Though he avoided didacticism of any kind, something he told his staffers (as revealed in the reminiscences of one of them, the journalist and literary critic Gamini Dissanayake) was that if you don't stand for something, you will fall for anything and everything".

In Geneva we stood for something. In our hour of need, we reaped the harvest of a principled and active foreign policy practice, in the votes and supportive speeches we received from our natural constituency, variously identifiable as the global South and Russia, or the NAM plus Russia and China, or G77 plus Russia. Mao ze Dong identified the crucial question of strategy as Who are our friends? Who are our enemies?" and commended the building of the broadest possible united front, uniting all those who can be united, neutralizing those intermediate elements who cannot, and isolating the main adversary. Without clarity in identification of who one's friends are, one cannot build the broadest possible united front and succeed. In Geneva last week we may have applied the tactics of Zizek's Lenin, of a high risk pushing for an endgame while we could have stopped short and capitulated in a compromise on sovereignty masked as consensus, but our approach was more Lennon than Lenin. We won with a little help from our friends".

As Cuba has proved, one cannot defend the national interest by being narrowly nationalist; one has to be internationalist in order to defend and protect the Patria. Geneva was a miniature diplomatic Dien Bien Phu or Bay of Pigs for the EU. Of the many comments on Sri Lanka's victory (and the many congratulations that came my way) the most accurate was in an email and fax from DEW Gunasekara, who wrote both on his behalf as well as that of his party. Currently Minister of Constitutional Affairs and National Integration, DEW is the leader of the Communist Party, but more pertinently he was the International Affairs Secretary of that party when I first knew him more than three decades ago. Revealing that the Cabinet had been meeting, monitoring the Geneva HRC proceedings real time, with President Rajapakse expressing optimism at the result, reminiscing that he had known me from my days as an undergraduate at Peradeniya, and making a poignant reference to his late friend and my father Mervyn, comrade DEW correctly summed up the Geneva outcome: it was a historic session reflecting the growing role of the new world balance of forces". None can do a Kosovo on Sri Lanka: wrong century, wrong continent, wrong country.

III. Medical Administration and Relief within the Vanni Pocket: January to mid-May 2009

Michael Roberts- 1st July 2014

Amidst the obfuscations and cumulus clouds of propaganda that have subsumed

reviews of the last stages of Eelam War IV, it has taken time for some remarkable feats to emerge. The affidavit provided by Dr. Veerakanthipillai Shanmugarajah on 10th May 2012 with assistance from a British solicitor reveals astounding medical relief work by a body of doctors, nurses, attendants and administrative aides during the Tamil peoples' enforced retreat and crucible of battle in 2009. This statement has been deployed by a collective named ENGAGE SRI LANKA in the course of its criticism of Channel Four's video reportage and the claims of "Vany Kumar" (Gnanakumar Thamilvani in name, who also presented herself under such aliases as "Damilvany" and "Vany Kumar"). As such, it is an element in the ongoing propaganda war – one which no public document can rise beyond.

However, my focus here is directed towards a larger dimension rather than the fabrications and distortions perpetuated by *Tamilnet*, Vany Kumar and Channel Four which is the interest pressed by Engage Sri Lanka (2013 for latter). I will be focusing upon the empirical detail and the 'lens' provided by Shanmugarajah's affidavit account of 10th May 2012.

I do not merely report. I marvel. I wish you, too, to marvel and applaud the dedication and capacity revealed by a substantial (and mostly unnamed) team of unsung Tamil heroes. I do so in point form with numbers identifying the segments in Dr. Shanmugarajah's statement that provide the empirical foundation for my review. The sections highlighted in purple are contextual elaborations and contentions that embody my thoughts.

1. As the LTTE administered insurgent state of *Thamilttam* found itself on the military back-foot in mid-late 2008, the medical authorities and senior government agents got together and drew up a "disaster contingency plan" – one which was informed by previous experiences in coping with the impact of the tsunami. This involved preparatory training of staff (aided by Oxfam) and the stockpiling of drugs and medical supplies with the support of the Government of Sri Lanka
2. Their equipment included 30 refrigerators that were generator-driven and their stockpile included fuel to run these essential items, with officials assigned to guard, move and maintain them
3. When the LTTE regime enforced an eastward movement of the trapped populace of some 300-320,000 so as to use them as a strategic resource and a bargaining tool to extract international intervention (Roberts, "BBC-Blind," 2013d), the medical staff moved along with their people and established makeshift hospitals, usually in school buildings
4. One should note that the LTTE constructed **protected bunker-wards** that were **partially underground** alongside the buildings they used as hospitals for their injured cadre. It appears that these sections were distinct from the makeshift hospitals for those deemed civilian.
5. Dr. Shanmugarajah and his staff took with them "more than 30 truck-loads of equipment and supplies" Though the number of available refrigerators eventually dwindled to 14 and the generators dwindled from six to three the medical teams were able to sustain their theatre operations till, and including, the 13th May (28) – an astounding feat surely in the eyes of anyone familiar (from whatever distance) with the circumstances prevailing within the Vanni Pocket and thereafter in the Last Redoubt during the period January-May 2009.

6. The medical staff included “more than ten doctors” – every one of them with reasonable experience – and 15 “trained theatre nurses”. As far as I know, there were only five doctors accredited to the Ministry of Health so this requires clarification
7. Supplementing Dr. Shanmugarajah’s evidence, I note here that the LTTE had inserted some of their cadre into the medical streams at the University of Jaffna and recruited doctors themselves. So Shanmugarajah is encompassing them in his note. They were called “doctors;” even where they had not received medical accreditation. Tamil informants from the north indicate that the following were among the “Tiger doctors”: Ajanthan, Bāskaran, Sujanthan, Malaravan, Sivamokan and Sathiyā. The LTTE also built up and trained a staff of medical orderlies to assist the treatment of battlefield casualties. There were nearly twenty such LTTE trained personnel with about ten being women. Anyone who has studied war knows that experienced battlefield medics, including orderlies, are an asset. Several of the propaganda images circulated by *Tamilnet* during the course of 2009 quite incidentally show the ubiquitous presence of these personnel. Much later in August 2009 when Dr Susiri Weerasekera of the Friend-in-Need Society visited the detention centre for captured Tiger women at Pompanadu in connection with the supply of artificial limbs for amputees, he came away with the highest praise for the capacities displayed by the two female medics who aided his team in their work (Weerasekera 2012).
8. Apart from injuries caused from gunfire or shellfire, these medical workers dealt with the normal gamut of cases, including serious ailments, which any large body of people experience. Thus, as a specialist obstetrician, Dr. Shanmugarajah’s work entailed the delivery of babies (27).
9. Several of these doctors and nurses and some of the orderlies were formally on the staff of the Ministry of Health centered in Colombo; so that Dr. Shanmugarajah, for instance, could leave the Vanni territory constituting the state of *Thamililam* and visit Jaffna on business on occasions during the war. The Government of Sri Lanka paid their salaries though they took orders from the LTTE state.
10. Likewise, their stockpiled medical supplies of drugs, dressings, instruments et cetera were provided by the Government of Sri Lanka, while the re-stocking that occurred from January to May 2009 was facilitated by the ICRC working in conjunction with the government. The last ICRC land convoy was in late January 2009. From early February the ICRC used chartered vessels, usually the “MV Green Ocean” but also “MV Dublin,” manned by the SL Navy to (a) send essential medical and food supplies to the LTTE controlled area and (b) to evacuate sick, wounded and elderly people.
11. Thus, the pressure on the LTTE and Dr. Shanmugarajah and his medical staff was partially eased by this process – itself a remarkable fact during a mortal battlefield situation. Access to Citizen Silva’s meticulous work enables me to indicate the considerable achievement on this front. There were as many as 31 voyages undertaken between February and mid-May. A total of 13,794 people were evacuated. Beyond a total figure of the number evacuated we have no details about those taken away during the first eight voyages. From the breakdown for the other 23 voyages totaling 10,103, we discover that there were 1,789 injured/sick males and

- 1,537 injured/sick females. There was a large component of children: 3,471. This means that there were also adults who were deemed “accompanying caregivers” (or “bystanders”) by the ICRC in its public documents. These bystanders numbered 3,783 in the partial total for which details are provided and amounted to 37.4% of the adult medivac cluster.
12. It is evident that the LTTE supervised the selection of those sick or injured who should be evacuated as well as the children and adult “bystanders” granted this privilege. Thus an interesting issue arises: what happened to these “bystanders” once the sick and wounded were accepted by the Ministry of Health and military and lodged in the hospitals at Pulmoddai, Trincomalee, Padaviya, Vavuniya and Mannar over the weeks that followed? If they were not eventually sent to the detention centres at Mänik Farm but found their way to kinsmen, the death toll estimates that work backwards from a total figure (e. g. IDAG 2013) would have to be reduced. Thus, if, say, 1800 of these “bystanders” were not detained and/or counted in the GSL figures, the estimate provided by Citizen Silva, that is IDAG, would have to be reduced by 1800.
 13. The processes described in Points 9-11 above mark a circumstance that has drawn limited attention in the international circuit. The people of the insurgent state of *Thamiltlam* benefited from the fact that they were also deemed citizens of Sri Lanka – thereby gaining access to certain resources of that state at the same time that they were subject to the dangers of shelling and death because they were corralled in the Vanni Pocket. That is, they were dual citizens. Illustratively, from the very start, say from 1990, pensioners in LTTE territory were able to receive their pensions. The logic of GSL aid described above in 9-11 flowed from this status.
 14. Their citizenship in Sri Lanka, however, was an imposed one: imposed by the government of Sri Lanka. From my analytical viewpoint as an observer who attaches primacy to the subjective sentiments of a set of people, the individuals residing in the areas controlled by the de facto state of *Thamiltlam* were not “Sri Lankans.” They were citizens of *Thamiltlam* (Roberts 2013c). Their collective identity was “Eelam Tamilian” in ways that consciously rejected Sri Lankan-ness.
 15. Loyal to the idea of *Thamiltlam* and residing within its domain from the start of Eelam War IV, these peoples were nevertheless happy to receive some goods and services from GSL and the LTTE were quite willing to reduce the load on their exchequer so ‘generously’ provided by an enemy they disliked and were warring against.
 16. The disadvantage for the Tamil populace at the receiving end of this duality was that they had to adhere to the LTTE’s strategy and demands: (a) providing labour of an auxiliary military character; (b) providing new conscripts; and (c) moving lock, stock and barrel ahead of the advancing SL Army till they were hemmed in within the Vanni Pocket from January 2009 – there to undergo the weight of war because they were now pawns illuminating the spectre of “an impending humanitarian disaster” that was the central pillar in the Tigers’ grand strategy of blackmail directed towards salvaging their survival as a collective entity – a goal seeking to inspire international intervention with the support of Amnesty International, other such agencies and amenable Western states (Roberts, “BBC Blind,” 2013). This was recognised THEN by some of these agencies.

Human Rights Watch (2009) stressed that “the LTTE has forcibly taken along all civilians under its control [These] civilians ... including children are subject to forced recruitment into LTTE forces and hazardous forced labor on the battlefield.” Gordon Weiss summed up this type of assessment in 2009 quite neatly within his subsequent review: “the presence of civilians served multiple purposes for the Tiger command. Primarily a civilian population was a buffer against all out assault by the army. Too many pictures of dead children transmitted around the world ... might limit [the government’s] resolve and weaken its support from foreign governments” (2012: 108). In seeking a ceasefire at this stage, however, both the Western governments and these agencies seemed oblivious to the stark fact that they were aligning with the LTTE policy and favouring the Tiger command in what was a mortal war.

17. The cumulative disadvantage of these policies for those among this populace that did not successfully slip out of the LTTE corral in January/February 2009 was that they were marshalled by the LTTE within a 12 by 2 km stretch of the coast east of the Nandikadal Lagoon—an arena I have termed the “Last Redoubt.” In consequence they were congealed as a mass of people in conditions of privation within a space that one resident described as the “world’s largest latrine.” This space thereafter became a theatre of infantry warfare in late April and May 2009.
18. However, the difficulties of daily life within this circumscribed arena were alleviated not only by the dedication of the medical personnel organised by Dr. Shanmugarajah and others (as summarised above), but also by the organisational efficiency of the LTTE and officials of *Tham-*il*lam*. The latter supervised the distribution of the limited food and water resources that were available. Queuing was an integral part of life in the highly congested demographic circumstances of the Last Redoubt.
19. One of the themes emphasised by Tamil and other agencies seeking to inspire a ceasefire or some form of foreign intervention in Sri Lanka was the spectre of malnutrition within the mass of people trapped in the “war zone” as they called the Vanni Pocket. “We don’t have any independent assessment of the condition of people inside the zone but we understand that malnutrition levels are extremely high, not to mention of course battlefield casualties,” said the UN spokesman in Sri Lanka, Gordon Weiss (BBC 2009). Thus, it is noteworthy that Dr. Shanmugarajah categorically refutes this idea by asserting that he personally “saw very few cases of malnutrition”. However some caveats are in order here. While such evidence must be given weight, one must be cautious in accepting this claim as a generalisation because the condition of the mass of people reaching the rear battlefield in late April-mid May 2009 and thence at the detention centres in the Vavuniya locality indicated severe dehydration, while a few could be described as “walking dead” — a state of health that led to the initial death rate per day at the detention centres being on the high side till June. This body of people also brought with them such illnesses as hepatitis, dysentery and chicken pox which were then diffused among the inmates as well as the security personnel and other staff servicing these centres.
20. Dr. Shanmugarajah’s statement includes details of the shell fire that descended upon the makeshift hospitals or in their vicinity: in summary, over the 4 and one-half months five shells in total impacted upon the

hospitals or their vicinity at Vallipuram, Puthukudiyiruppu and Vellamullivaikkal causing a total of 10 deaths and 24 injured; while shells (no figure) landing at the Mullaivaikkal hospital caused four deaths and 10 injuries.

21. These skeleton details indicate that the hospitals were not deliberately targeted by SL Army or Air Force bombardment. A “barrage” – a technical term – involves a cluster of bombs directed to swamp a specific target marked by advanced technology. Thus, the good doctor’s evidence indicates that the specific distress which the medical personnel and inmates underwent during these sporadic incidents was “collateral damage.”
22. It also suggests that it was mostly mortar fire that they experienced, especially at Vellamullivaikkal and Mullaivaikkal near the coast because Citizen Silva’s specialist work concludes that the craters within the Last Redoubt were mostly of mortar size as distinct from that of artillery; while there is hardly any evidence of MBR impact (there is one on the beach near the SS Farrah wreck). Mortar fire is usually the work of units in close-support of the infantry.
23. Further support for these contentions is now provided by ongoing research undertaken by Professors Gerald Peiris and Wickremagama of Peradeniya University which has “examined several series of satellite images (each taken at 2-week intervals during the LTTE retreat from Kili-nochchi to their final stronghold at Nandikadal) of the war zone, and found that there is, contrary to what Darusman says in the section of the report dealing with satellite images, very little evidence of artillery damage in hospital premises (i.e. buildings and surrounding areas) except in the one case where one can perceive what looks like bombardment damage to one hospital building. This is probably the one referred to by Dr. Shanmugarajah as well” (email report from Gerald Peiris, 30 December 2013).
24. Therefore, Dr. Shanmugarajah (inadvertently?) adds to the body of data that demonstrate the degree of fabrication and exaggeration mounted in such intensive fashion by the LTTE in Lanka and abroad. The concocted claims manufactured by this LTTE network were willingly and widely accepted by both powerful Western media outfits and vociferous human rights advocates in ways that amounted to a veritable blitzkrieg in the second quarter of 2009. As the desperate LTTE pressed in frantic manner for international intervention in early-mid May, this propaganda programme intensified. Their campaign lit the skies and captured the moral high ground. Channel Four’s subsequent *Killing Fields* was therefore addressing an audience already onside. Dr. Shanmugarajah’s specific illustrations of shell fire casualties need to be matched with specific contextual data for the periods when he was at the four hospitals. One set of illustrations of the mismatch between his testimony for Mullaivaikkal and Vellamullivaikkal and the frenetic claims propagated by *Tamilnet* and other Tiger agencies will serve my purpose here. On the 10th May the web outlet serving as the platform for the hip-hop artist M.I.A. (or Maya Arulpragasam) referred to the “current genocide that was underway in Sri Lanka” and then delivered this cluster of ‘bombs’: “A massive artillery barrage by the Sri Lankan army last night killed at least 257 civilians and left another 814 wounded in the small strip of territory that remains

under the control of Tamil Tiger rebels. A doctor working in the warzone described the assault as the bloodiest he had seen in the government's offensive against the Tamil Tigers. Dr V Shanmugarajah said he feared many more may have been killed since some bodies were being buried on the spot without being brought to the makeshift hospital he runs. Shanmugarajah described seeing shells fly through the air, with some falling close to the hospital, forcing many to flee to bunkers for shelter. The rebel-linked TamilNet website said about 2,000 people were feared dead. It accused Sri Lankan forces of launching the attack, a charge the military denied." In line with this thrust, *TamilNet* carried the following report on 10th May 2009 under a title which ran "2000 civilians feared slaughtered in same night." The reference to the bombardment that had commenced from Saturday (9th May) night and the scattered bodies was attributed to doctors. It was backed up on the 11th May by a title that referred to "carnage" and described the "relentless barrage of shelling using all sorts of heavy weapons;" while quoting Lawrence Christy of the Tamil Rehabilitation Organisation to the effect that "more than 3,200 had been killed since Sunday evening up to Monday morning." CBS News joined the chorus. It referred to the *Tamilnet* claim and then noted that Human Rights Watch "accus[ed] the military of repeatedly hitting hospitals in the war zone with artillery and aerial attacks that killed scores of people." CBS then referred to "Dr. V. Shanmugarajah, a physician working in the war zone, [saying that] the bodies of 378 people had been brought to the makeshift hospital that he runs;" that "1,122 more people have been wounded;" and that he had used "the help of volunteers to dig graves for the bodies brought to the hospital."

25. These series of sketches, therefore, bring us to the difficult arena of the civilian death toll in circumstances where it is difficult for outside and distant observers to separate those "truly civilian" from (i) "civilians in belligerent duty as auxiliaries" and (ii) Tiger personnel; and virtually impossible to work out the proportion of true civilians killed by the Tigers as they tried to escape or because they resisted conscription. Dr. Shanmugarajah's affidavit adds two important jigsaw pieces for those addressing this crazy puzzle. He asserts that (a) "perhaps thirty per cent [of the people his medical staff attended to] would [have been] LTTE combatants, and the rest civilians" (10); and that (b) "Our computerised records were lost in the last days of the fighting but I would say that there were between 500-600 deaths in March 2009 and in all about 2,500 deaths up to the end of the crisis that I was aware of."
26. Dr. Shanmugarajah undoubtedly worked hard and rendered a yeoman service to humankind, but he was not in every nook and cranny in the Vanni Pocket. As his caveat (*viz.* "I was aware of") suggests, he would not have observed or even heard of many deaths from SL government shelling or infantry attack nor seen the killings of their own people by the LTTE as they attempted to flee or because they showed dissent in the face of conscription. His estimate of deaths in March-May is probably an underestimate. It is, nevertheless, a telling underestimate that places in perspective the gross figures presented by the Darusman Panel and Gordon Weiss in his second incarnation (2011a, 2011b) as well as the astronomical claims peddled by Frances Harrison and her informants (2012). It is helpful to have a Tamil at the coalface bringing all of us

- down to earth.
27. The stupendous figures for the number of civilian deaths that have been adopted worldwide, in tandem with such strident terms as “carnage,” “slaughter” and “genocide,” neglect one cardinal facet integral to any theatre of war. Where there are dead, there are also injured. The injured usually outnumber the dead. Thus, among the American forces the ratio of injured to dead in World War Two was one: 1.7; in the Korean War one:2.8 and in the Vietnam War one:2.6. If one was to accept the fact that 40,000 civilians and Tiger personnel died, then one has to provide empirical evidence to indicate that there were, say, some 60,000 to 80,000 or thereabouts injured. That is, one has to indicate what happened to all these injured people (as IDAG has contended: 2013).
 28. That such a monumental lapse and error (point 26 above) has been repeatedly obscured and glossed over in the assessments presented by respectable institutions is quite mind-boggling. It would seem that the professional personnel who were part of the Darusman Panel appointed by Ban Ki-Moon and those who staff such institutions as International Crisis Group, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have accepted the emotion-charged claims of Tiger and/or Tamil spokesmen because they were hostile to the government of Sri Lanka and remain adamant hostile in degrees and ways that have compromised (and still compromise) their intellectual sagacity.
 29. This remains a monumental failure.
 30. This huge shortcoming was compounded by a blinding insistence that this particular military struggle was “a war without witnesses,” This headline was trumpeted by Andrew Bunscombe of *The Independent* among others in February 2009 and became a standard refrain in the outcries of numerous reporters and human rights agencies: from Yolande Foster of AI to Reporters without Borders. After their visit to Sri Lanka in late April the British and French Foreign Ministers (David Miliband and Bernard Kouchner) asserted in the *New York Times* that “restrictions on journalism meant that there was a war without witness in Sri Lanka.” Miliband in the meanwhile told the House of Commons in Britain that “At present, the GoSL are (sic) engaged in a war without witness in the north of the country. Civilians have fled the terror of the LTTE, but are afraid of what awaits them at the hands of the Government and unsure whether they will ever be allowed home” (see *Hansard*, 30 April 2009).
 31. Several months prior to this, as the crunch situation was developing in October 2008, Ravi Nessman of Associated Press had stressed that “the government has barred independent observers and foreign journalists from the war zone” and “that last month it banned foreign aid groups as well, promising to make up for their absence by providing aid itself” (2008). The latter contention was partially correct, but needs qualification by reference to (a) the continued presence of Tamil aid workers attached to such UN agencies, the access to the Tamil civilian population granted to ICRC officials who entered the area by land convoy or SL Navy ship (the latter from early February). While it is true that there were constraints on journalists visiting the frontlines, clusters of reporters were airlifted to the rear areas every now and then. A full listing is now available and should be an eye-opener to those who remain blinded by the headline in neon lights (viz. “a war without witnesses”). Roland

- Buerk of the BBC was at the front on 21st September 2008, 4th October 2008, and 7th November 2008. Ravi Nessman himself was one of those provided this privilege on 14th September 2008 and 24th January 2009.
32. Luckily we now have access to Kanchan Prasad's photographs of Nessman at work in January 2009 (Roberts 2013i), while David Gray has presented photo-images from the rear arena of the frontline in late April 2009 (Gray 2009). As with a great deal of war reportage by embedded (that is "accredited") journalists, Gray's footage relates to military hardware and technical aspects or images of Tamil refugees who had escaped to the rear. It is not about close-quarter combat or atrocities. Kate Adie has told us, moreover, that images of captured POWs and dead bodies are edited out in the West. Placed within this empirical data demonstrating a modicum of access to the battle front in the Vanni by foreign reporters and a series of informative articles on the topic by Muralidhar Reddy in the reputable India magazine *Frontline* (see Bibliography), therefore, the hegemony exercised by the headline "war without witnesses" is something of a puzzle. When Nessman presented a report on the 13th May 2009 which echoed the themes pressed by *Tamilnet* and HRW on 10th May by using the headline "Satellite shows shelling, says human rights group," he also told readers that "reports of the fighting are difficult to verify because the government has barred journalists and aid workers from the war zone." Here, then, we confront a barefaced lie. In sum, what one sees is a tale of duplicity, oversimplification, gullibility and sensationalism peddled by an array of reporters, politicians and moral crusaders.
 33. As remarkably, the conviction that no reporters could enter the war zone remains a firm conviction today. Frances Harrison, ex-BBC, Ex-Amnesty International and a budding scholar, introduces her book and its *raison d'être* thus: "nobody has told these tales because there simply were no international journalists or aid workers in the war zone in the final month to send harrowing accounts of civilian suffering" (2012: 8). Marketing goals are not the only reason for such a claim – underlined later by another statement to the effect that the "government had banned all journalists from the war zone" (2012: 143). She is a true believer parked in the Tamil Tiger realms, yet also Orientalist to the core in her disdain for the reports in the *Frontline* and *The Hindu* which appeared in the course of April-to-June 2009.
 34. Located now within this context of misinformation, we can look towards Dr. Shanmugarajah and the other Tamil doctors who were on active duty within the Vanni Pocket to clarify the issue of the numbers injured, whether Tiger or civilian. They can, for instance, provide an indication of the numbers that were not transported out of the area by the ICRC and supply estimates of the likely number injured between the 9/10th and the 17/18/19th May. This will be one step towards a rough estimate of the total number of people INJURED during the period 1 January to 19 May 2009. That computation will enable one to generate estimates for people killed.
 35. This tough series of questions generates a conundrum. The Tamil medical personnel, both the Ministry of Health personnel and the LTTE doctors/medics, were the principal source of information on the pro-

gress of the war for the foreign media in Colombo and beyond. Muralidhar Reddy in Colombo witnessed this daily during those tumultuous months in 2009: “The only source of information for western reporters based in Colombo, other than the Defence Ministry, was the LTTE cadre doctors and auxiliary staff. Amazingly all the doctors in the field were not only armed with satellite phones, but happily accessible to Colombo journalists. I had asked a couple of Colombo based journos if they ever wondered how doctors amid all the blood and gore could spare time to speak to journalists. It is their version of the battle zone which dominated the world space that time” (email to Roberts, December 2013). As we have seen, Dr. Shanmugarajah was among the most widely quoted informants in a variety of news reports. His affidavit says that this reportage was under duress. This is likely. But we also know that a significant proportion of the Tamil middle class in the northern reaches were sympathetic to the goal of Eelam and the LTTE’s role as its spearhead. Some of the Ministry of Health doctors may conceivably have been willing participants in Tiger propaganda; while it is probable that Drs. Ajanthan, Sujanthan and company, the Tiger doctors, were whole-hearted supporters of the LTTE strategy. The tall tales conveyed subsequently by “Dr. Niron” and retailed more or less verbatim by the journalist Frances Harrison in her book *Still Counting the Dead* (2012: 73-91) indicate the degree of duplicity which such commitment has encouraged.

It would be simple-minded for us to think that medical personnel never lie and do not spin stories in circumstances of life and death complicated by patriotism and hostility. The status and authority of medical doctors made them an ideal channel for the Tiger propaganda drive that was seeking to engineer a foreign intervention on humanitarian grounds. One-eyed Western moral crusaders, reporters seeking vengeance for the intimidation and killing of journalists in Sri Lanka and powerful media chains and powerful states with their own agendas complemented the process. Fabrication and gross exaggeration could thereby be inscribed in stone.