

promoted reconciliation among races Sri Lanka wouldn't have these problems now.

As the census of 1881 revealed that the majority community of Sri Lanka was Sinhala, the British rulers attempted to divide the majority community as Up Country Sinhala and Lower Country Sinhala, the strategy was a complete failure. As Sinhala community had no visible external differences in the usage of language or the body features or the religious rituals they devoted and practiced, Sinhala people showed an affinity as a human whether they are from upcountry or lower country, they had clear and analogous identity. The division of Sinhala people as Sinhala Christian and Sinhala Buddhist was riskier to imperialist as such an effort might attracted international blame on them. Sinhala Buddhists and Christians worked together at the grassroots level without differences. In this way the divisive policy could not be implemented successfully within the Sinhala community. There were few differences within the Sinhala community based on caste dictions which were rapidly eliminating as a result of the widely expanding of education and the influence of religious values.

Caste dictions originated in Sri Lanka based on professions of people, which were not focus to discriminate others and the services of any caste essentially wanted to citizens of the country including the kings, who respected to services of different castes. At present we can see that the services of different castes have become profitable business which are performed by any kind of person without caste dictions. The Indian caste dictions primarily focal point to discriminate people from the origin and people of the high class has authority over the lower castes even sometimes to kill them. There have been legal changes in India since independence, it seems that legal changes have not implemented successfully due to inflexible attitudes of people.

Nobody can deny the fact that the State Council implemented several progressive policies in the country in which free education policy, agricultural development programs, and industrial development initiatives were vital to the building national integration. However, the divisive attitudes rooted in the Tamil community without logical thinking on the claims of racist Tamil leaders, were vicious to building national integration as they were highly motivated by political desires. The British rulers were directly responsible for the origination and complicating of national integration issues. They should have taken all community group representatives to a round table and discuss the factual points of the issue and settle the problem. Before the

British rulers, there were Indian, Portuguese and Dutch rules in the country, neither rules promoted divisive attitudes to encourage communalism in the country. The Solebury Constitution, which developed the reforms for granting independence also did not promote national integration and tried to spread communalism through the election system. The emergency of 1958 was the first communal struggle obviously echoed in the Sri Lankan society after the independence and the leader of the government had many difficulties to control the problem and the nominal head of state had to take executive power in hand despite the parliamentary traditions and limits of the independent constitution, to control the communal problem. Since then the communal problem in the country complicated and developed to a bloodletting terrorist war in 1983. There were many opportunities to initiate national integration between 1958 and 1983, however, nobody was interested in this matter as the politics in the democratic system gave priority for gaining power whatever the issue was using.

Since 1983 until the defeat of LTTE terrorism in 2009, various negotiations were between the government and Tamils, but they were not successful and one of the major reasons for the failure was external influences and the concept of national integration was purposely ignored by external forces. When it deeply analyses it shows that the external influences dislike the national integration as they might have hidden and undisclosed purposes against uniting Sri Lankans as one nation. It also might contradict with the plans of outside forces toward Sri Lanka.

The specific reconciliation process initiated after the 2015 presidential and general elections was unsuccessful as the process was clearly appeared to be not genuine to the majority Sinhala community and it seemed that it was a forceful activity involved in hidden tactics against the national unity influenced by external forces. This fact was clearly explained to Indian journalist by Mr Gotabaya Rajapaksa after election regarding the fully implementation of the 13th amendment to the constitution that disregarding the views of majority of people some contents of the amendment cannot be implemented. In history, before the Sinhala Kingdom established by Vijaya, Lord Buddha visited the country to reconcile a conflict between Chulodara and Mahodara and in that process, Lord Buddha played an impartial role and process in which people of the country accepted the outcomes of the reconciliation process. The reconciliation process that Lord Buddha conducted was very clear and agape to the two parties involved in the conflict and the transparency of the reconciliation process was attracted

by people and there was no string from outside. Two parties had direct negotiation with the mediator (Lord Buddha) and it was attractive to everyone involved in the problem. The reconciliation process commenced after the elections of 2015 was not direct negotiation between two parties to the conflict. Sri Lanka's government and Army forces were one party but the other party, LTTE was not participated to the process taking the responsibility for the conflict from 1983 to 2007 and atrocities. Tamil political parties were directly represented Tamil nationals (Most probably for the Tamil nationals and LTTE) but never accepted the responsibility for atrocities done by LTTE. It was not supported to a conflict resolution or a reconciliation process. The outside forces did not force TNA and other Tamil Organizations to accept the responsibility and indemnify the damages done to the country. It seemed that reconciliation was an attempt to punish Sri Lanka's government rather than expressing the accountability of LTTE. The behaviour of LTTE from 1983 to 2009 was against international law and order.

The reconciliation process that began in the yahapalana regime was forceful to Sri Lanka's government to accept a variety of conditions, which were strange to the public. It seemed that the reconciliation process did not prioritize the conditions with the agreement of two parties involved in and it was an attempt to insist conditions that were against the culture (rules and regulations) generally accepted in the society of Sri Lanka. According to international experiences, it is quite clear that forceful reconciliation would not last long, people involved in the reconciliation process should be accepted by the parties to the reconciliation whether the outside forces like to it or not.

The other major shortcoming of the reconciliation process was that the process did not focus on building national integration as one nation including all communities living in Sri Lanka. What were the reasons to ignore national integration? The general opinion of people was that outside forces disliked a national integration, which promotes the unity of all communities as one nation. Practically, outside forces promote communal divisions concerning policy implementation and related process. Such a division would be helpful to outsiders, who are eyeing to take Sri Lanka's assets and facilities for their purposes. Any country like to promote national integration, despite many communities living in the country, may have different purposes, however, the priority should be given to the prime purpose. For example, in many European countries, people from other countries live together though they have migrated from different countries with different cultural backgrounds,

governments of those countries have promoted and integrated to one nation. Why is this strategy being not suitable for Sri Lanka? According to the demographic records of the census of 2012, the total population in Sri Lanka divides into Sinhala 74.90%, Sri Lankan and Indian Tamil 15.27% (Sri Lankan Tamils 11.29% and Indian Tamils 15.43%), Muslim 9.30%, Burghers 0.19%, and others 0.34%. It is estimated that demographic records have already changed increasing the Sinhala population to 78% and reducing the Sri Lankan Tamils to less than 10%. It is quite easy to build national integration as 98% of total population in Sri Lanka know Sinhala language and 95% of people in Sri Lanka use the Sinhala language as main language or communication media in homes. Many Muslim organizations recognize Sinhala as their national language. The demographic results clearly show that reconciliation and national integration of Sri Lanka is easier based on the Sinhala language and giving opportunity to learn Tamil would be supported to the process.

The major problem in Sri Lanka is lack of economic opportunities to lower income earners irrespective of they are whether Sinhala, Tamils or Muslims. Muslim and Tamil political parties reluctant to talk about economic issues and they scare to express open views on these matters as they are scare that they will be rejected by people when improves economic conditions of them. Another significant point is that current legal system in the country supports for discrimination using various cultural, castes, ritual and gender and politics of Tamil and Muslim parties do not support to elimination of discrimination and making a cultural design one law for one nation. Democratic advocates of the west reluctant to talk about adverse discrimination and make a cultural design.

Lack of political leadership and divisive attitudes of religious institutions after independence in 1948 made complexity in the thrust of national integration. The constitutional reforms initiated in 1972 attempted to national integration, but the expectation was remote as the head of state or the president in the 1972 constitution was lacking executive power and the president was inactive for the building of national integration. The constitution introduced in 1978 gave executive power to the president, despite terms of the 1972 constitution, several amendments made to the constitution have become barriers to national integration. The effort of national integration needs beginning from the grassroots level and the other important point is that people of the country unite to secure the country first rather than dividing the country by a new constitution. Reconciliation of communities and national integration are responsibilities of citizens but not outsiders.