

[My own reflections on Care Sri Lanka's Council of Reference's rebuttal to Pastors Cooke and Mullins' report](#)

The Council of Reference (CoR) write: "From the outset it was deemed by the investigators to be necessary to conduct an independent "thorough investigation" into various allegations which have been made against PJK."

Is the necessity of a proper investigation still in any doubt?

The charges members of the CoR have known about (in some cases for over a decade) include covering up a repeated child rape by his own staff, the obstruction of justice, intimidation, physical violence, wilful vandalism, kidnap, bribing officials including policeman & politicians, seduction & at least 10 separately alleged cases of adultery, on at least two occasions with direct evidence, and other even more serious charges, not all of which have been possible to investigate, for lack of access to witnesses.

Doesn't that list merit objective investigation? If the reader learned such allegations were laid at the charge of a former colleague, by over 10 different individual pastors of different traditions and of quite different outlooks, wouldn't they want to know if there was any substance in the charges?

Sadly, the investigations by CSL/LEF we have seen before, have been cursory, partial and superficial. One of the latest was on a beach, in public, in the rain, with 6 complainants together in an hour. None have involved external, third parties, sceptical of JK's claims. None have been performed with forensic expertise, and in some cases the defects have been glaring, as the report also highlights.

Many pastors in Sri Lanka have repeatedly personally appealed to Jeyakanth's supporters over 17 years, directly and in writing many times to implement proper investigation. So have many others. Independent, external investigators have been offered. Again and again and again, CSL and the CoR, and other supporting agencies, have stonewalled these requests & refused cooperation and insisted on their own internal examination. The claim that the pastors' investigation eschewed 'forming a consensus among those who had knowledge and experience of the matters' consequently rings very hollow. I'm afraid it is reminiscent of Jeyakanth acting to delay judicial proceedings against his own colleagues, including bribery of the police and court officials, according to the High Court judge, then afterward complaining through lawyers acting for the appeal by the felons, when the conviction was eventually obtained 10 years later, that because the prosecution's case was delayed, it was frivolous and may be dismissed.

Mark Mullins is a serving criminal barrister, David Cooke a chartered accountant, both are experienced serving pastors. Both went to Sri Lanka at personal expense or being supported by their churches and at the appeal of many brethren in the country from different backgrounds. They have meticulously weighed and tested the testimony they have heard, examined inconsistencies and documented their findings clearly.

The response of CSL/LEF is inadequate & typically defensive. There is no detailed rebuttal. There is no acknowledgement of fault, even when the Council of Reference and officers of CSL

have rejected the Supreme Court findings, for an appeal, which they themselves approved of. What often passes for a rebuttal in the minds of the brethren at CSL is the tiny possibility of an alternative explanation, with flimsy evidence to substantiate it, often while a great deal of evidence points in the opposite direction. As to the suggestion that brother Muralee, who has repeatedly been libelled by Jeyakanth and his supporters, instigated or drove the investigation, from my perspective, the claim is risible. In addition, he has not been my primary source for most assertions, and he has never been my only one. I can prove this from my own written records.

Anyone with doubts about the matter should read the two pastors' own report, its appendices carefully and their later questions, which add a great deal more. Much of the report was written in response to this June reply, though CSL has only now published its early reply, to anachronistically 'address' the publication of the report.

The report itself carefully exposes the many weaknesses of CSL's response, as an objective reader will soon discover, especially in the light of published documents. I am not surprised CSL has not released the fuller document which I suspect will manifest this yet more amply. A signatory and other officials, former & current, in LEF/CSL have apologised privately for their deficiencies in past 'investigations', but there's no sign of this contrition in the public statement.

Proper repentance involves owning up to wrong, apologising, leaving it behind, addressing the serious crimes that have been committed and providing restitution to the victims who have been wronged, not covering tracks, making excuses and badmouthing the Lord's servants.