LAST GASP OF MOON?

Counterpoint By The Reflector

Ban ki -Moon is on his last legs, and is trying his best to get a second term in office. Prospects of his dreams coming true are pretty bad. That is why he has resorted to desperate tactics in order to curry favors with the powers that be, which invariably are the block of Western powers led by the international policeman, the US. Perhaps Moon with all his experience has yet to realize the basic tenet of US friendship, which is to drop today's bosom friend like a hot brick tomorrow if the relationship stands in the way of its reaching set goals however unpalatable they are to the friend. Remember what happened to Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden? They were originally friends of the US nurtured and pampered by the Big Power. They turned out to be its arch enemies and threats to world peace overnight. Why? Simple truth was because they no longer served their ambitious designs and programs.

Even Hosni Mubarak was once upon a time a friend and ally of US, providing it facilities for torturing those captured for offences against the US in the 9/11 attack. When public opinion was turning against Mubarak, however, US had no hesitation in turning against the erstwhile friend. It was really the fault of the Egyptian leader in taking the US as a dependable ally. At the same time one has to be wary about US intentions in the long run. Were they really

innocent onlookers of the rising tensions among the population and the movement against Mubarak quietly taking shape? How much interest and instigation was there by US agents in generating that unrest and movement? One cannot overrule the possibility if one looks back on the record of the C.I.A and other agents in former Persia, Chili and a number of Latin American countries. How did Mossadeq and Allende fall? Were they simply victims of their own folly? Or actually weren't they the result of clever machinations of US agents?

If proof is required Mohammad al Barade himself has recently provided the material we require for it. I was perhaps too hasty in accusing him of complicity with the US in hiding the true situation about Israel's nuclear operation. He has now revealed a more vital secret, i.e. the fact that George W. Bush decided to invade Iraq even after he was categorically warned about the absence of the so-called WMD in the country by his organization the IAEA. In a document titled 'Age of Deception' Barade has charged the US of human rights violations in Iraq. That is the saint of international affairs that tries to set standards of behavior for lesser countries and accuses them of their violation. Ban ki-Moon is prepared to dance to its tune hoping against hope that his prayers will be answered soon.

Wasn't there someone to remind Moon about the famous Picasso painting 'Guernica' that was hidden from view when Colin Powel stunned the whole world by his 'revelations ' of hidden weapons in the possession of Saddam Hussein, trying to convince the UN of the need to invade Iraq. Or is Moon following the example set by his predecessor Kofi Annan who kept quiet when LTTE terrorists assassinated the Tamil member of the Sri Lanka Cabinet, the respected gentleman by the name Laksman Kadiramar while jumping to the defense of the LTTE by condemning the killing of a noted terrorist in the East.

Not only is Moon reluctant to see anything bad about the behavior of the US, he is equally reluctant to admit the record of his 'benefactor' (this again is a mere fragment of his imagination) in the international scene, starting with Hiroshima. Cuban leader is still living thanks to his stars and because US agents failed more than thirty times to put an end to his life. If they succeeded it would have gone down in history as an act of preserving world peace and democracy. No one seems to remember or think of reminding the US of these strange tactics and utter failures. How can one expect a man like Moon to raise the issue of human rights violations against this 'Big Power.'

At the same time Ban ki - Moon seems to be looking for some activity to apparently justify his existence. Look for some simple exercise to make a big noise. That seems to be what he did in this case.

Moon's exercise raises the more relevant question as to the role and purpose of the world body we call the United Nations. Why was it set up in the first place? Was it to go round looking for culprits to be brought to book or mainly for the purpose of promoting and maintaining world peace? If it is the latter one has to ask its Secretary General a simple question. Are you there representing all member countries or are you been paid by member countries to serve the interests of a few powerful bosses?

If at all he is paid by member countries to work in maintaining and promoting world peace, his main focus ought to be on the trouble spots that have to be identified and quickly sorted out without letting them grow into world problems. A man with his intelligence and expertise, would have easily seen the sore spots staring in the eye calling for immediate solution. He would also have discovered the genesis of the Arab hostility towards the US that led to the vicious attack we refer to as 9/11. He would also have understood the background which generated the animosity and determination for a group of Muslim youths to conduct such a daring operation resulting in a chain reaction from the US. The current involvement by the US in a supposed mission of eradicating world terrorism may even been prevented if the UN had the benefit of a more discerning and assertive Chief Executive than a week-kneed yes-man serving the interests of a few big bosses. Such a leader would not have failed to see the origin of that initial hostility. That type of leader would have called the US bluff and taken more positive steps in solving the continuing problem of Palestinians who were thrown out of their homes and homeland by the creation of the State of Israel.

Apart from the fact that Ban ki- Moon went about selecting LTTE supporters for his panel in the first place, negative feelings and attitudes generated by a number of factors have contributed to the current situation accentuated now by Moon's operation.

No right thinking person would expect the disappearance of Israel from the map. What a reasonable UN chief is expected to do is finding answers to an utterly difficult problem, i. e. helping the displaced Palestinians to become decent citizens of a land they can call their own, and live in peace with Israel as dignified neighbors. True this is a long order, but world problems are never child plays, and calls for mature approaches and well- thought out solutions. An organizattio9n like the UN is there precisely for the type of complicated operations. Whoever aspires to be its head ought to have foreseen the difficulties well n advance. That person also should have had the intelligence to gauge the mood of the US and its commitment to look after the interests of Israel at any cost. The stark reality in this context is that changing the leader of US means nothing as far as its bias towards Israel is concerned. Obama would not be able to go against American public opinion that always favors Israel. In short, most difficult international situations are ultimately the creation of direct or indirect American actions and omissions.

The most pressing issue facing the world right now is world terrorism, the eradication of which is one of the chief objectives of the US as well as the UN. Has Ban ki-Moon given sufficient thought to this vital issue? If so he would have seen that many of these groups called terrorists have cropped up due to the actions of the US, either directly or indirectly. Who created the Al Queda? Who was responsible for its growth and initial operations? When Soviet Russia invaded Afghanistan 'at the invitation of its leader,' the US, a country in another part of the world, got excited as Afghanistan was bordering Iran. The US feared existence of a Communist country allied to USSR. Iran had by that time chased out the American puppet the Shah and installed Ayatolla Khomeini as its leader. US were keen to prevent the Ayatolla becoming more powerful. They looked for an ally from within Afghanistan and found the convenient Al Queda group which they nurtured and supported mainly with the objective of getting rid of the Soviet menaced. The rest of the story is history.

It is this erstwhile friend and ally that US is now vowed to eradicate from the world. One excuse George Bush gave for invading Iraq was the existence of Al Queda forces in the land. At the end it turned out that Bush invasion provided the breeding ground for Al Queda terrorists who had no connection whatever with Hussein or Iraq until then. Hamas is another terrorist group labeled and hated by the US. Who created the situation for the rise of such a group? It was not due to direct action by the US, but their attitude towards Israel and favoritism certainly accentuated the growth of forces prepared to disrupt and fight Israel.

Hamas has right now posed the second problem to the UIN and US, by agreeing to share power with the legally accepted party led by Abbas. It is true the US is not directly involved in a fight against Hamas, but that is one terrorist group they would like to eliminate. Their main occupation at the moment, however, is the defeat of Al Queda. LTTE on the other hand, can safely be called a terrorist group with no links to the US operatives. However, the entire world had accepted the basic truth about the LTTE, which is, or at least was, the most dangerous terrorist outfit anywhere. Its strength and capacity was such that even experts were warning the world in general and Sri Lankan Government in particular, about its invincibility with the advice to come to agreement with the group.

A number of administrations under both parties had been groping in the dark as to what should be done with the LTTE until the current president came to office. He had the determination and the excellent backing from his brother Gotabhaya to take a stand after initial attempts in peace-making failed. No doubt, the