

## Peacebuilding Compared Working Paper

### Cascades of Violence in Bangladesh

*John Braithwaite*

*Bina D'Costa*<sup>1</sup>

#### Abstract

Imperial domination cascaded down to a politics of separation of India from the Mughal and British Empires, which cascaded further down to a violent politics of separation of Pakistan from India, cascading to a war of separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan, which cascaded through layers of internal conflict within Bangladesh. The South Asian cascade of partitions delivered homogeneity without peace to Bangladesh. We argue that this was because the comparative homogeneity was achieved by a cascade of violence.

We find evidence that modern wars can cascade to the creation of Hobbesian rural spaces where sexual violence becomes a strategy, revenge is indulged, rule of law is in abeyance, insurgents have morphed into gangs of organised criminals. These anomic spaces are in the market for a supplier of order. That supply might come from one organised crime group dominating, from an armed rule of law movement like the Taliban, UN peacekeepers, a state that supplies community policing and a rule of law, or a state military that allows enough pacification to justify its presence and enough anarchy to itself profit from organised crime. The Chittagong Hill Tracts is seen as fitting the last description. Its descent into this condition is viewed through a lens that points from the Chittagong Hill Tracts back through the layers of the above cascades.

#### *Layers of violence*

The Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) conflict had been raging for 25 years when a peace agreement was signed in 1997. This was a conflict that pitted the indigenous peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts against ethnically Bengali settlers and Bangladesh security forces defending the settlers' right to land in the CHT. The indigenous peoples of the CHT were concerned about a sequence of policies, including flooding 40 per cent of the arable land in the CHT and displacing 100,000 mostly indigenous people in 1961 for the Kapitai Dam, unsustainable exploitation of forests, and state incentives for Bengalis to settle in the CHT to make indigenous hill peoples minorities in their own lands. In 1947 indigenous people were 98 per cent of the CHT population, 51 per cent in 1991, thereafter becoming a minority, falling constantly for the past 65 years (Mohsin 2002:119), perhaps to 35 per cent today. The latter is only a guess informed by interviews with donors as the state stopped collecting these statistics when the figure hit 51 per cent. In this sense, the conflict has been like the struggle of the people of West Papua to resist transmigration that recently passed the tipping point of non-Papuan Indonesians becoming a majority (Braithwaite et al 2010). The key difference, however, is that the armed conflict was not a struggle for the independence of the CHT from Bangladesh. Rather the objective was a comparable level of autonomy to that which the CHT enjoyed

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors thank the Australian Research Council for its support for this research.

in British colonial times and return of Bengali settlers who had arrived in recent decades. The European Union has offered to fund resettlement incentives for limited returns to the plains by recent settlers. This offer has been spurned by the Bangladesh government.<sup>2</sup>

The CHT conflict is still very much alive today because the government has either been unable or unwilling to implement key clauses of the 1997 CHT Accord. To the indigenous political leaders and the insurgency factions of the CHT, the government of Bangladesh and the international community, especially India, tricked them into handing in their weapons, then walked away from the CHT Accord that motivated their leaders to sign it. Many insightful analyses have been written on this conflict (eg CHT Commission 2000; Mohsin 2002, 2003; Fortna 2008). This essay interprets the conflict as the end point of a cascade of violence, while incorporating local drivers of conflict into the analysis. The cascade concept gives the work its distinctiveness. As in the cascading of water, violence can cascade down from commanding heights of state power (as in waterfalls), up from powerless peripheries, and can undulate to spread horizontally (flowing from one space to another). The cascade concept has not been applied to violence in this way, though it has been used before in the social sciences, as in Sunstein's (1997) norm cascades and Sikkink's (2011) cascades of criminal enforcement for crimes against humanity. Fieldwork for this research comprised 110 interviews, some with more than one stakeholder in the CHT conflict, mainly conducted in the CHT in September-October 2010 and October 2011 trips to the region.<sup>3</sup>

Cascades of violence spread across South Asia even as the most influential political voice in resistance to British colonialism, Gandhi's, was nonviolent (Ackerman & Duvall 2000: 61-111). Perhaps as many as two million murdered in the separation of India, certainly many hundreds of thousands, are crucial to understanding why Pakistan became a militarised state (Jalal 1995). Military domination of East by West Pakistan ensued. The separation of India from Britain, of Pakistan from India, Bangladesh from Pakistan, the civil war of indigenous peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) against Bengali settlers, and violence between more and less dominant indigenous groups and spoiler factions within the CHT encouraged by the Bangladesh military and intelligence operatives (Mohsin 2002, 2003; Fortna 2008) constituted this cascade of violence. At each level of the cascade, violence from the previous level created a political niche for escalated violence at the next level down.

The lowest level of multiple cascades of violence that we can identify in the history of 'greater India' (Majumdar et al 1960) is many localised Maoist/Naxalite insurgencies. Some Naxalites continue to have a foothold in Bangladesh. In fact, the Naxalite movement started in Naxalbari in Indian West Bengal. To some extent, similar to the indigenous struggles in the CHT (for an overview of land rights in the CHT see Shapan Adnan 2004; Shapan Adnan and Ranjit Dastidar 2011), the Naxalite movement was also generated as a conflict over land rights and very poor people in the rural periphery of rapidly developing countries resenting oppression from metropolitan elites. These are factors that the CHT armed struggles share with Naxalite struggles in India as motives of bottom-up conflict. Another trajectory of the South Asian cascade of violence leads from India to Pakistan to Northwest Pakistan Pashtuns joining hands with Afghan Pashtuns to

---

<sup>2</sup> Interviews with donors

<sup>3</sup> Our ethics approval required anonymous quotation of informants unless they specifically requested being named as the source of a quote.

inflict progressive waves of violence on Afghanistan at a cost of a million lives. This cascades more violently because it connects up to two other global cascades. One is Middle East violence spilling into Iran's sponsorship of Shi'ite militias in Afghanistan. The other is cascades of Soviet violence, and reactive CIA-inspired violence; these continue to cascade as Tajikistan and Uzbekistan militants who resisted the Soviets in their homelands then fought across borders, fighting in Afghanistan with and against the Taliban. Cold War cascades of violence contribute to this cascade on the western side of South Asia, just as they do to the cascade we study in this essay on the eastern periphery of South Asia.

So we wish to tell a story of South Asian history as one of cascades of violence. We particularly bring the cascades idea into focus by looking at them from the end-point of conflict within the CHT. We begin the analysis at the other end, however, with the break-up of India. Greater India before partition was a hugely diverse nation. It remained almost as diverse after partition, with India including a larger Muslim population than Pakistan, and also with large Buddhist, Sikh, Christian and other minorities. Pakistan was rendered more homogeneously Islamic, with over 90 per cent of the population Muslim, yet ethnically diverse with more than 60 language groups. Ethnic and language differences contributed to the separation of East from West Pakistan in 1971. After this sequence of two bloody partitions, Bangladesh was left as one of the most homogeneous nations in the world - 90 per cent Muslim, 98 per cent ethnically Bengali, with almost all its citizens able to speak the Bengali language. In spite of this, it could still suffer a civil war in which ethnic minorities constituting barely half of one per cent of the population took up arms against the majority. The South Asian cascade of partitions delivered homogeneity without peace to Bangladesh. We argue that this was because the comparative homogeneity was achieved by a cascade of violence.

Let us now seek to understand something of the dynamics of each layer of a cascade that we will characterise first as a cascade of militarisation. First we consider militarisation in imperial pacification, then in the partition of India and Pakistan, then in the partition of Pakistan and Bangladesh, then in autonomy struggles within Bangladesh, and finally militarisation in the resistance to the resistance within the CHT.

#### *Militarisation in imperial pacification*

The Mughal Empire and the British East India Company can be conceived as imperial protection rackets oriented to squeezing maximum tax in return for protection from other armies (Van Schendel 2009). This was the first of a number of cascades of domination that our narrative will conceive as washing over South Asia. It is hard to underestimate the importance of the Mughal Empire (1560-1710 CE) to the history of greater India. There was no continuity in state formation in India as there was in China after 200 BCE. While the Portuguese settlement in Goa in 1510 was strategic to control the sea trade across Asia and between Asia and Europe, it was nearly a century after that the Dutch, French, Danish and British began to establish their trading ports by setting up alliances with local power brokers (Sheppard et al:355). However, following Babar's invasion in 1526, the Mughals financed the establishment of the entire empire through a system of taxation on land and internal trade. Soldiers were needed to build, control and maintain hold of the empire. Desai (2009:7) concludes that the Mughal Empire was the first time one dynasty had controlled up to 80 per cent of India since the Maurya period of 400-300 BCE. By the 1590s, the Mughal Emperor 'commanded more than four million warriors -

a force bigger than any army in Europe until the twentieth century' (Boot 2006: 82-3). It was not a power the British Empire could defeat head on.

Neither the Mughal nor the British empires ruled India in the direct sense of a contemporary state. While the rule of both empires was in most regions limited to collecting tax to enrich the rulers and fund their indirect administration and their military domination, the British East India Company differed from the Mughal Empire in that its modus operandi was 'not just *collecting* but *maximizing* the revenue' (Desai 2009:54). East India Company profit maximisation was to satisfy the extravagant expectations created to raise capital from shareholders (Mill 1826:307). In comparison, Mughal revenue raising was haphazard, often flexible and tradition-bound. During wars and good years of harvesting the tax was higher compared to other times of poor harvest. The Company was therefore oppressive, exacerbating the poverty of the ordinary people of India. Rigid insistence on tax collection in response to a succession of droughts then floods in 1769-70, combined with unbridled profiteering in grain markets, led to a famine in which a third of Bengal's population, 10 million people, perished (Van Schendel 2009: 57).<sup>4</sup> Tax collection in Bengal had been outsourced to *zamindars* (landlords) who were primarily Muslims during Mughal hegemony, but later replaced by mostly Hindus under the British imperium. The East India Company<sup>5</sup> was also corrupt, driven by greed and failed to create institutions that would allow economic development and good governance. It was an example of Acemoglu et al's (2004) conclusion that in the wealthiest parts of the early modern world, such as India, colonialism imposed exploitative, extractive military control that farmed and manipulated the formidable regimes that had created their wealth, while in the poor lands of early modernity, such as North America, Australia, New Zealand, colonialism created white settler economies designed to benefit the settlers through good institutions. Keay (2010:414-5) argues that Pax Britannica not only devastated the Indian rural economy because it was Tax Britannica, but also because it was Axe Britannica, deforesting the continent from 1780, disrupting ecological balances on which rural livelihoods depended. This critique became less true as British influence in India passed from the company to the British state (the company was wound up in 1857). It built many enduringly valuable institutions such as law courts and a legal profession and a fine university system by 19<sup>th</sup> century standards.

On the other hand, the militarisation of greater India by the British Raj was more oppressive as time went on. It was beyond the power of the British to subdue and fragment a military power so formidable as the Mughal Empire without turning other local rulers against the Mughals and assisting their armies to resist. British sovereignty, like British taxation, could only be achieved indirectly by opening up divisions in the country, enrolling weaker rulers to be British puppets and usurp through violence stronger rulers who might challenge British control. Enmities the British Raj intentionally created continued to create flashpoints of conflict for centuries afterwards. In sowing of fragmentation to underwrite indirect rule, the British were taking a page from the Mughal Empire playbook. Divide and conquer was not the only tyranny that cascaded from the

---

<sup>4</sup> The first Governor General of India, Warren Hastings and some of his colleagues in 1772 reflected on the East India Company's key role in meeting revenue demands that was sent back to Britain (Sheppard et al 2009:366).

<sup>5</sup> The decisive Battle of Plassey in 1757 was the first major clash of arms between the Moghuls and the British following which the British became masters of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and eventually the master of most of India (R. C. Butalia 1998:144-154).

Mughals to the British, to the present. When General Dyer fired on peaceful demonstrators in Amritsar, a week after Gandhi's first hartal (withdrawal of the cooperation of people with their governors through strikes, shop closings) on 13 April 1919, it provided a role model for how South Asian states later in the century would respond to Gandhian tactics of resistance.

So we conclude that the first cascades of violence that rolled across greater India and across the centuries, and the first cascades of corruption, cronyism and money politics that crippled the whole of greater India were at the hands of the haphazard yet responsive tax exploitation of the Mughals and the systematic, destructive tax exploitation of the British. While the cost of these cascades in institutionalising violence and in crippling institutions of economic development were inestimable, progressively through the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the British began to build other institutions like the courts, the education system and a national bureaucracy that were constructive contributions to the development of modern India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Gandhi, after all, was as much a product of these institutions, of a British education and British legal professionalism, as he was a product of spiritual traditions of nonviolent ethos and citizenship that were Indian. In Gandhi's *satyagraha* (truthful resistance) denoting a legitimate, authentic and moral form of political action against state's oppression (Chakrabarty and Pandey 2009:40) one crucial variable was *ahimsa* (nonviolence) that drew on the strength of persuasion (Chakrabarty and Pandey 2009:51). Even with his nonviolence, Gandhi learnt via his vegetarian socialist circle in London from the radical, patient, solidaristic, tactical nonviolence of the Chartists (Desai 2009:135).

Gandhi was one great sometime resident of Bangladesh (where he organised the weavers, whose struggle is symbolised at the centre of the Indian flag), a leader who saw the possibility of cascades of reconciliation. We will come back to a discussion of cascades of reconciliation at the end of the essay.

#### *Militarisation in the partition of Pakistan*

At first, Gandhi, who assumed the leadership of the Congress Party in 1921, attempted to cultivate Muslim solidarity with the Congress Party. He did this by exposing the Sykes-Picot Agreements, revealed by the Bolsheviks, to put Palestine under British colonial rule that would remove Islam's holiest sites from Muslim control (Desai 2009:142). However, instead of increasing Hindu-Muslim solidarity, his strategies deepened the hold of the Ulemas, thereby alienating secular Muslim leaders including Jinnah (Parekh 1997:18-19). There was a perception that Muslims suffered the greatest sacrifices from Gandhi's nonviolent tactics which required boycotting education institutions and career restrictions; and because Gandhi denounced and spurned them when they sometimes resisted with violence the terrible oppression the British inflicted on them, Muslim engagement with the Congress Party eroded rapidly between the two world wars. Some scholars also argue that the idea of Pakistan as a separate state of the *Paks*, the pure, came very late in the Muslim resistance to British colonialism (Keay 2010:496). During most of the anti-colonial struggle, the majority of Muslim leaders, including M.A. Jinnah, the first prime minister of Pakistan, favoured a greater Indian federation with a number of autonomous Muslim democracies scattered across India ruled by Sharia principles more than British law.

Many in the Congress Party resisted this devolution of power. They believed in a secular state that had one rule of law for all. Some others were Hindu fundamentalists who resisted Muslim autonomy because of a will to religious hegemony. Most of all, the Congress Party had become a hierarchy under the control of a few Hindu leaders who did not want to share power with Jinnah and Muslim leaders, preferring 'to rule India on its own terms' (Desai 2009:450), even if only 75 per cent of the population of greater India. So the Congress Party elite could in the end be persuaded by Lord Mountbatten to surrender to the 'inevitability' of partition. It was Congress Party resistance to power-sharing with Muslim leaders that had given birth late in the struggle to thoughts of the two-state solution. Once the idea was conceived, ambitious Muslim politicians could see that the Pakistan idea could give them power over what could become one of the most powerful states in the world. Indeed Pakistan did become a geopolitically important state, a nuclear power. Had Pakistan and Bangladesh continued to be unified today, it would be the third largest state in the world after China and India. The temptation of this kind of geopolitical Muslim leadership was great to ambitious Muslim politicians and military officers.

In the lead up to independence for India, contestation of top-down religious separatist ideas of course gave platforms to all manner of bottom-up religious rabble rousers. Sikhs and Christians also began to fear some of the fundamentalist utterances they heard about building Hindu or Muslim states in their homelands. The tensions were particularly great in regions where Muslim and Hindu populations were both large and both aggressively contesting political and economic opportunities. Some political leaders sought to make their mark during this period of anomie (when the rules of the political game were unsettled, and about to be resettled in an independence settlement) by preaching religious violence. They led mobs in attacks on the religious other. Stories of riots from Noakhali (in southeastern East Pakistan), Bihar and Rawalpindi spread like wildfire throughout India (D'Costa 2011:51).

However, it did not always take word spreading of many of these religious riots before all religious communities felt they might be in a security dilemma. People worried how their community could inherit political control of their district after independence. They calculated that perhaps it would be better to drive out the religious other before they were driven out themselves. The decaying post-war British colonial security sector did not have the capacity to manage these security dilemmas. They did not have the personnel to guarantee the security of religious communities living in fear of attack by the religious other. Hobbesian anarchy and violent self-help was the result, to Gandhi's despair, though it did abate from the shock of Gandhi himself being murdered by this religious violence in 1948. Instead of solving the security dilemma through good policing, the British state took the seemingly cheaper, convenient path of giving in to separatism and announcing that Pakistan would be created as a separate Muslim state of two halves on opposite sides of the sub-continent.

This weak decision executed by Lord Mountbatten was the decisive one in giving ambitious leaders total sway over large areas where they enjoyed religious majority support. Dividing and spoiling (for spoiler classifications, see Stedman, 2000) caused another series of cascades of violence as debates raged about where the precise boundaries between Muslim and Hindu sovereignty should go, about which way Sikhs should move. The announcement of partition only worsened the security dilemmas of local communities; millions of Muslim refugees headed for Pakistan and millions of

Hindus from Pakistan to India. The large Muslim enclave left behind in Hyderabad in the heart of India created a civil war there that took years to resolve. The population pressures of the stream of refugees seeking somewhere to settle, especially the seven million Muslims pouring into Pakistan, created new cascades of Muslim-Muslim and Hindu-Hindu violence of a more ethnic character.

In sum, these various cascades of violence triggered by a combination of bottom-up mob violence and top-down political ambition and miscalculation cost perhaps two million lives. It was the responsibility of the British state to make the security sector investment to quell these security dilemmas at the final curtain of the Raj. It failed in that responsibility, struggling as it was to recover from even worse cascades of violence that had washed over Europe during World War II. If this level of religious slaughter had occurred in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, one would hope that the United Nations would demand of the British state that it honour its responsibility to protect (Evans 2008) its citizens, and if it were unable to meet that responsibility, the international community would mobilise its responsibility to protect innocents from religious slaughter by deploying peacekeepers. Today we know that international peacekeepers are not always effective, but on average, in the best multivariate studies, appear effective in ending civil violence and preventing future civil wars (Doyle and Sambanis 2006; Fortna 2008). With the wisdom of historical hindsight we can see that had it been politically possible, it certainly would have been a good investment for other major powers to support Britain in mobilising to resolve these security dilemmas not only to prevent the loss of two million lives, but to prevent cascades from them to future costs. Such as those which are part of the war economy that would be heavily felt by countries such as the US and Russia in an Afghanistan today that supplies 90 per cent of the world's heroin. For example, an estimated 90 per cent of heroin consumed in Russia is trafficked from Afghanistan via Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. According to the Federal Drug Control Service of Russia, Afghan opium causes the deaths of around 100,000 people around the world annually. In Russia alone, Afghan heroin kills around 30,000 young people each year. Another source on heroin trafficking suggests that it costs 14,000 young Russian lives each year (Paoli et al 2009:238).

In what ways was the cost of failing to make international humanitarian intervention in India in the 1940s much greater than two million lives? It was the cost of lives we saw in Sikh separatism, particularly in Punjab in the 1990s, that took the life of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the cost that we see today in Kashmir, that we find in the conflict in Afghanistan fuelled by Pakistani intelligence agents that now blows back into Pakistan through the agency of the Pakistani Taliban. And there is the potential future cost to the world of a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan, or of nuclear terrorism, a risk that is greater in South Asia than in any part of the world. In addition, there was the cascade of the Bangladesh war of liberation, to which we turn in the next section, that also cost 200,000 to 1.5 million lives (LaPorte, 1972:105), doubtless fewer than the official Bangladeshi estimate of 3 million, but possibly as high as 1.7 million (Rummel 1998:153-63). It was the cost of a huge foreign aid burden to fight the famine of 1974 (for details see Sen (1981)) that Bangladeshi state institutions razed by the war could not counter. In addition, the food politics of the Cold War period made Bangladesh vulnerable to political pressure from states such as the US, which used food aid to manipulate economic policies (Sobhan, 1979) that also contributed to severe consequences afterwards. That 1974 famine cost another 1.5 million lives.

For South Asia, the largest problem was that the cascade of violence produced a cascade of militarisation in Pakistan (for studies on Pakistan's military, see Siddiqua, 2007; Aziz, 2008). Border disputes, particularly Kashmir, created a perceived imperative for the weaker of the two states to build a large military to match its giant adversary. The new India and Pakistan both had larger problems than most new states, because of their size and many language groups, in holding together a diverse and fragmented society. In terms of holding fragmentation together, India inherited the advantage of the administrative centre and infrastructure of greater India in Delhi, the old centre in Kolkata, as well as nearly all of its industrial capacity (Desai 2009:295). It also inherited greater revenue, and administrative capacity to collect it, and so the state could buy loyalty from dissenting regions by supporting them economically. Pakistan could not afford to do that in its early years. So it chose the path of holding the country together by buying the loyalty of a strong military to keep the lid on dissident regions and groups. Between 1947 and 1970 over 50 per cent of Pakistani central state expenditure was on defence (Van Schendel 2009:135) and in some periods was over 60 per cent (Moshin 2002:152).

As conflict in Kashmir imposed ever greater military buildup burdens, the military became even more politically indispensable and an ever-greater fiscal burden that made it ever more difficult to buy peace from dissident regions. This was reinforced by the fact that in Pakistan, unlike India, the brightest and best-sought careers were in the military rather than in business or the professions. Both the state and the elite became militarised. By militarisation, we are referring both to increasing power and influence of the military in the society, and/or the spread of militaristic behaviour/ideologies/values in society (Batchelor 2004:77; Ross 1987:564); and of military build-up with rapid increase of military spending, armed forces, arms imports and arms production (Batchelor 2004:78). These processes positioned the military to make itself even more indispensable, first to their Pakistan political masters, by fomenting security threats in Kashmir, in Afghanistan and from terrorism. Later it made itself valuable to foreign clients in China to achieve regional power balance after India and Afghanistan became aligned with the Soviet Union, and later still with the United States when the US became interested in destabilising the Soviet Union by causing it to bleed in Afghanistan. Pakistan military leaders benefited from equipment and training, including nuclear knowhow, these great powers could provide, and became wealthy men by corruptly creaming foreign military aid.

Their budgets also gave them the wealth to buy politicians, as did massive funding that the ISI collected from benefactors in Arab states of the mujahidin fighting in Afghanistan. As Pakistan became progressively militarised, military control of politicians was exercised through sticks as well as carrots. Leaders the military-intelligence commanders did not 'like' were assassinated by their agents posing as terrorists and entire regimes were overthrown by military coups followed by execution or imprisonment of selected leaders of the old regime (usually for corruption). Military patronage passed control of industry and finance to crony families. Just twenty-two families monopolised two-thirds of the country's industrial assets, and controlled 87 per cent of the assets of the banking and insurance industries (D'Costa 2011:84). It is worth noting for the next step in our analysis that none of these families were Bengalis.

Put another way, the creation of Pakistan by partitioning India left the smaller state more impoverished, even though its fertile land saw it start out with a higher per capita income



than the rest of greater India, and more militarised, while India enjoyed a relatively stable democracy with a military continuously under democratic civilian control. Worse was to come when all this cascaded into a civil war that tore Pakistan in half.

### *Militarisation in the partition of Bangladesh*

Most international scholars opine that it was the folly of Pakistan's militarised competition with India that caused it to lose Bangladesh (for a critique of this view, see D'Costa, 2011, chapter 3). There were other aspects of Pakistan's militarisation that contributed to the Bangladesh Liberation War. For various reasons, British colonialism had cultivated Punjab as 'our Prussia', Punjabis as a loyal 'military race' useful for the control of more pacific peoples of greater India (particularly Bengalis during and after the 1857 rebellion against British rule). Approximately 75% of the Pakistan army is drawn from three districts in Punjab (Siddiq, 2007:59). Resultant inheritance of military traditions and familial reproduction of military opportunity structures in Punjab province meant that when the military progressively came to control the Pakistan state, Punjabis increasingly controlled the state, with Punjab politicians and senior civil servants often chosen by the military to be its clients. Punjab being a center of power in West Pakistan left Bengalis in East Pakistan feeling excluded from the militarised state power. East Pakistan had a majority of the population but only 3 per cent of the higher ranks of the armed forces (Van Schendel 2009:119). Western control of the state for the greater benefit of the west also captured most foreign aid, with five times as much American aid going to West compared to East Pakistan before the War of Liberation (Brecher and Abaas 1972:62). Bengalis most deeply resented the displacement of Bengali by Urdu as the official language of state. The war of liberation actually started from a grassroots (Bengali) language movement.

In March 1971 after a near unanimous victory by the reformist Awami League in East Pakistan, it had the numbers in the national parliament to dictate sweeping constitutional reform to empower the East. As West Pakistan leaders feigned talks over this political crisis, they secretly mounted a military solution. Pakistan troops streamed into Dhaka and started targeted killings of Bengali leaders and political activists that then spread all over East Pakistan. Some Bengali units managed to either kill or overthrow their Pakistani officers and with Bengali police began to organise military resistance, the Mukti Bahini, to which young combatants flocked as arms and training flowed to them from India. The Soviet Union also supplied and supported the resistance.

India decided to teach Pakistan a lesson in the East that it was more militarily difficult to do in the West. Indian troops marched in to support Mukti Bahini and deliver a humiliating defeat to Pakistan. One of the Indian terms for return of Pakistani prisoner of wars (POWs) was return of land beyond the then line of control that had been recently occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir. India took this West Pakistani territory as damages and held 93,000 POWs until 1973. So Pakistan's defeat in the Bangladesh War of Liberation was a continuation of the cascade of violence that had started with partition and the subsequent military contests over Kashmir.

The 1971 war was also a continuation of Cold War competition that had cascaded violence across Asia and Africa, with the Soviet Union backing Bangladesh and the United States and China supporting Pakistan. President Nixon saw working together with China and Pakistan as a step toward the US-China thaw that he and Kissinger were

executing. Nixon's handling of the Bangladesh crisis had a detrimental effect on the US-India bilateral relationship that was compounded by the mutual dislike and animosity between Indira Gandhi and Nixon. The 1971 war and the emergence of a third sovereign state in the subcontinent shifted the South Asian regional balance of power decisively in India's favor.

In the aftermath of Pakistan's military retreat, there was a cascade of retribution for those, sometimes wrongly, accused of collaborating with the occupation, including in the CHT. Many of those targeted fled to West Pakistan, where they were not welcome, cascading to further internal conflict there. Thousands of non-Bengalis, mainly Biharis, were killed in this counter slaughter and more than a million who had fled their homes ended up huddled in refugee slum settlements inside Bangladesh where they received some help and protection from the international community. Many of these described themselves as 'stranded Pakistanis' and demanded repatriation to Pakistan. This never happened; they remained in their slums and/or camps, ostracized, stateless, impoverished, living to old age in neverending limbo. The High Court in November 2007 issued a rule on a writ petition filed by seven Biharis living in Bangladesh that stated that around 300,000 'Urdu-speaking people' have been living in Bangladesh; and finally approved citizenship and voting rights for about 150,000 refugees who were minors at the time of Bangladesh's war of independence in 1971, and those who were born after would also gain the right to vote in May 2008 (D'Costa 2009:13).

By 1975 corruption and nepotism in the Awami League that formed the new government of Bangladesh, combined with widespread concern over undue Indian influence over the new nation and economic decline in the aftermath of war and famine had caused a rapid decline of the popularity of the government. The cronyism that characterised Pakistan had cascaded to Bangladesh. Emulation or modeling was the cascade mechanism in play here. Import licences, smuggling, extortion and industrial opportunities went to Awami League cronies. Steps toward a renewed militarisation were taken with Awami League leaders forming a paramilitary force, the Jatiyo Rakkhi Bahini (National Defence Force). Its 30,000 troops terrorized and tortured opponents. The military resented the level of funding Rakkhi Bahini received while the military budget for 1975-76 was set at 13 per cent of the national budget, a shock compared to the 50-60 per cent they had enjoyed under Pakistan. Most of the officers of the Bangladesh military had been trained in Pakistan and retained its praetorian culture of the need for the military to dominate the nation and cleanse corruption by greedy civilian leaders. In fact, the bitter rift between the military and civilian personnel repatriated from West Pakistan and those who fought on the frontline resulted in some serious security tensions in postwar Bangladesh. A group of middle-ranking army officers, most of whom were repatriates, assassinated Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, popularly known as Bangabandhu (Friend of Bengal) the Prime Minister (and later President) and the leader of the Awami League (AL) along with more than 40 members of his family on 15 August 1975. Saudi Arabia and China recognised Bangladesh only after Mujib's death.

While Mujib's assassination sent shockwaves throughout the region, the coup was also perceived to be politically popular, at least among some segments of Bangladeshi society in urban areas. The alleged coup leader, Major General Ziaur Rahman, during his rule between 1977-May 1981 delivered economic development and pushed for administrative reforms. Jagodal, Zia's national front was consolidated later in 1978 to form a new political alliance, the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) which emerged as a key

political player along with the AL. Zia, however began to lose popularity and there was another military coup that put Lieutenant General Hussain Muhammad Ershad in power from 1982-90. This had followed an earlier failed coup attempt in November 1975 by a pro-AL Chief of general staff, which had triggered murder of four of the most respected and senior leaders of the AL inside a Dhaka prison. While during Mujib era, the Rokkhi Bahini killed an estimated 40,000 people, the extrajudicial killings and disappearances within the armed forces during Zia's rule remain an all-time high. Colonel Abu Taher, a Liberation wartime sector commander who subsequently appeared as a left-leaning leader on retirement from the Army, was the first Bangladeshi to walk to the gallows in independent Bangladesh as he was hanged immediately after a controversial military court trial along with 16 others, mostly belonging to the left-leaning Jatiya Samajtantrik Dal (JSD) on treason charges in July 1976. In a bizarre twist during a plane hijacking drama by the Japanese Red Army in Bangladesh that kept Zia and his senior commanders busy in Dhaka, an army battalion mutiny in Bogura in southwest Bangladesh cost the lives of 200 more soldiers. This uprising was ruthlessly crushed with 1,100 soldiers either hanged or shot in the next two months. Militarisation cascaded on.

There was also a cascade of liberation politics, anti-militarisation politics, from below throughout the entirety of Bangladesh history. The University of Dhaka was one hotbed of it, as were elements of a media that were for the most part clients of the military and the regime. The way surges of republican politics in defence of a democratic constitution worked in Bangladesh were similar to Pakistan. They were rather Gandhian at first – hartals that mobilised large proportions of the population onto the streets, pledging their refusal to cooperate with military regimes, especially in 1990 when people power ended the long military rule from 1975-90. Hartals in recent decades became enforced (by the political party that calls a certain hartal) and much more violent forms of protest. But December 1990 was very much about people power. People massed demanding the resignation of President Ershad and calling for free elections in rallies and strikes organised by the All-Parties Student Union and supported by the major political parties. Ershad's generals deserted him when he asked for their support to restore order (military interviews, 2010). While West (as well as East) Pakistan had had such moments of people power in 1969 and 1981 (Milam 2010:89), in Bangladesh people power has been historically somewhat stronger in surging back to check military power than in Pakistan. As in Pakistan, many ordinary people were rather supportive of military leaders who took over if they seemed to bring competence and integrity to the management of the country, if money power and dirty deals in politics seemed to reduce, if the economy seemed to provide increased opportunity for them and their children. But when coup leaders slipped into corruption and cronyism themselves, when things starting going badly for the country, people power had its opportunities to mobilise for constitutional values.

Generals and party leaders alike live in heightened fear that they will suffer the assassin's bullet or the noose when people power is on the march. People power creates great opportunities for competitors to rally military elites to replace incumbents, including competitors who make more credible commitments to restore the Constitution than incumbents do. Consequently, often generals judge that the best bet is to relent to surges of liberation that call for a return to electoral politics. One reason they make this call is that in both Bangladesh and Pakistan the culture of politics has become so militarised that generals can sustain great influence over elected leaders. Just as military coup leaders fear the assassin's bullet in a militarised polity, so do elected leaders. They fear the

military, especially its intelligence elite, as those who might hire the assassin, and they crave the loyalty of the military to protect them from other potential assassins. Elected leaders fear coups in the same way as coup leaders fear counter-coups.

Until the end of 1990, the political power of the military has been sustained in a similar way in Bangladesh to the formula in Pakistan. General Zia-ul-Haq came to power in a Pakistan military coup in which he raised the banner of Islam against corrupt secular government. He built an Islamist civil society base for his regime: ‘Militarism and Islam were to be the twin pillars of the Zia regime’ (Jalal 1995:101). In the same period, in Bangladesh, both the Zia and Ershad regimes militarised a state created with democratic, rule of law aspirations and also Islamised a state founded with secular aspirations in revulsion at the widespread slaughter of Hindus by the Pakistan army during the War of Liberation. Zia militarised the national police system by firing thousands of police on charges of corruption and appointing army officers to oversee the system (US Library of Congress, 1988: ch 3), a legacy that continued during the Ershad period and afterwards.

Quite unlike the 1970s and 80s, even when such opportunities arose, the military elite did not take over until 2007. Electoral deadlock between the AL and the BNP in 2007, violent clashes and subsequent mass protests led to a military intervention, but of a much more subtle kind, where it took over behind the scenes and led a caretaker civilian government that was in power from January 2007 until December 2008. The military strategy was to reconfigure political power bases through forcing Sheikh Hasina and Khaleda Zia into exile, and allowing others to emerge as alternative and viable options in that leadership vacuum. The 29 December, 2008 election made it clear that it was not so easy to do this; the AL won 229 seats out of 300 seats. By punishing, marginalising or removing many of those actors from the political and economic space, Sheikh Hasina silenced (and continues to silence) these dissenting voices.

The Bangladesh military also exercises power through civilian facades: journalists, newspaper editors, intellectuals, politicians, business leaders, for example, who are in their pay, in their fear, or who respect them as a source of stability or of Islamic ideals. Another path has been colonisation of other institutions by retired military officers. As in Pakistan, the dual strategy of militarisation and Islamisation provided a broader base for the power of generals than a pure militarisation strategy could have provided without the support of religious networks in civil society. When General Ershad was President (1982-1990) he broadened his political support through a local mosque-building program.

JB interview: ‘Who is the more influential, the two major political parties or the military?’

Senior leader in the CHT: ‘This country is ruled by the military and the DGFI [the intelligence agency]’.

Bangladesh has a vibrant two-party political system today, more vibrant and somewhat less controlled by the military than in Pakistan. The AL is less Islamised than its competitor, the BNP, that was founded by a military man and is led today by Begum Khaleda Zia, the wife of Zia. Yet how the state-founding AL has changed is a tribute to the dual appeal of militarisation and Islamisation for securing hegemony. This was the party whose grassroots leadership pulled on the crisis that led Bangladesh to independence. It was a determinedly secular party in the 1970s that assumed power with

the military firmly under its control. Nevertheless today it is a considerably Islamised party that works with the military as partners.

Khaleda Zia first took the BNP to an election victory in 1991. The AL is led by Sheikh Hasina, daughter of the AL leader Sheikh Mujib. Both parties are dynastic. Both Hasina and Khaleda have alternated as prime minister and opposition leader, both serving in each role twice, monopolising these leadership positions since 1991. Both have sons who they have groomed to succeed them. The dynastic quality of the leadership plays into the dynamics of militarisation.

Insiders from both dynasties reported to us that their leaders feel the chill of their family biographies. They both have a highly developed fear of the assassin's bullet and the coup that caused so much pain to their father, their husband, and extended family. They also remember other unsuccessful assassination attempts by elements of the military against the male family members who founded their parties.

Both incumbent party leaders at the same time have a robust contest with the military. In power, they promote the generals most likely to be loyal to them. 'Sure you promote your own men from a party point of view, but you know those passed over are a danger to you. So you seek to maintain good relations with everyone in the military including those you pass over and you keep them in good positions' (interview with former BNP minister, 2011). Junior and middle ranking officers wish to stay on good terms with both dynasties. But at the end game of their careers the most senior among them only make it right to the top by backing the incumbent dynasty or the dynasty they believe will soon succeed it. Once they take sides in dynastic politics to boost a surge to the top, they might only last at the top as long as that side remains in power, unless they are clever in the way they change sides at the right moment to assist the successor dynasty back to power.

This game of course makes it difficult for third parties to draw on the considerable power of the military. Obversely, the praetorian culture of the military is reinforced by what insiders from both major parties reported as a preference of both party leaders for being displaced by a non-violent military coup over being replaced by the other party leader. The militarised two-party system is also reinforced by money politics. Our interviews with business leaders and lobby groups indicate that they best serve the interests of their business by not supporting third parties and by making large payments when asked by both dynastic parties. Many of them make larger payments to one than another to reinforce the better crony networks they have with that party for securing government contracts, favourable tax treatment, and rapid project approvals when its favoured party is in power. Business leaders also cultivate military leaders who might help them persuade the civilian government to do deals with them and who can help guarantee their own security as members of the elite.

This symbiosis between military politics and money politics engenders a two-class system or a 'two-networks' system as one senior supporter of the current government put it. Yes there is a professional class, an intellectual class, the glamour classes of stage, screen and fashion, traditional castes, religious and NGO elites. Notwithstanding these and other nuances of elite composition, the deep structure of the Bangladesh class structure is bifurcated into a military class who do military politics and a business-political class who do money politics. 'In the 1973 parliament, 10 per cent of the members were businessmen; today the figure is 70 per cent and increasing' (newspaper

editor interview, 2011). However accurate these numbers are, there were no informants who did not agree that the monied business class has progressively taken over parliamentary politics since the War of Liberation. 'In Bangladesh, politics is a continuation of business by other means' (Political insider interview, Dhaka, 2011). 'Politics is the best business in Bangladesh' (indigenous leader interview, CHT, 2010). Few military leaders go into politics. They can be more influential as a general who guides the dynasties than as a member of parliament who seeks to influence them. 'They [the military] don't tell us what to do. They offer us guidance' (former minister interview, 2011).

The military class is reproduced through an elite system of cadet schools that was initially inherited from Pakistan, with new cadet schools emulating Pakistan's following independence. The Pakistan military in turn had modeled these schools on Eton College in England. Today there are two elite cadet schools for girls as well as ten for boys. While maintaining a façade of low profile, these are some of the wealthiest schools in Bangladesh, highly competitive to get into, though easier for military families with the right connections. Graduation from these schools is the best route into graduation from the best universities. Bangladesh military officers are extremely well educated compared to the officers of western militaries. In our interviews with dozens of them, we learnt that many have multiple masters degrees from good universities.

For most of Bangladeshi history, the military has been the safest path to wealth, status and power. This has begun to change in recent years as the economy has boomed, creating much more lucrative business opportunities today than in the past. Yet it continues to be the case that many of the brightest and the best young people are inducted into the military rather than business through the portals of the cadet schools. This underwrites the hegemonic class power of the military. Politicians often respect senior military officers as more educated, more sophisticated, urbane, broader in their understanding of the rest of the world, compared to themselves. This respect for the good preparation the military class has had for rule, in comparison to those who have come up through money politics, also infects the perceptions of ordinary people. When money politics becomes so incompetent, so corrupt, so debilitating that the people want change, a cleaner, more highly educated, religiously pious general has been a politically credible option.

Understanding this symbiosis and dialectic between a distinct military class and a business/political class is necessary for understanding the dynamics of the next cascade of violence down into the CHT. Because military politics and money politics cascaded across time and across space (from Pakistan) in Bangladesh history, violence cascaded down to a civil war in the CHT and from the instability there across to insurgencies back in India where all these cascades began, and into Burma.

### *Militarisation in the Chittagong Hill Tracts*

We have seen that the sequenced breakaway of Pakistan from India, Bangladesh from Pakistan, left Bangladesh an unusually homogeneous state, 90 per cent Muslim and 98 per cent Bengali. Even with that degree of homogeneity, an internal armed conflict with its indigenous minorities in the CHT risked further fragmentation of the Bangladeshi state. The CHT civil war is interpreted as an outcome of the earlier cascades of violence.

Within the CHT, we find a further cascade of domination. This is partly military domination, but also of other indigenous minorities by the largest minority, the Chakma. When a CHT Accord was finally signed in 1997, spoiler factions broke away – the lowest level of our cascade of violence.

The domination dynamics that cascade down to CHT take many forms: cascades of exclusion, militarism, cronyism, corruption and money politics, cascades of mob violence, of land grabs in an overpopulated, flooded country, cascades of class politics, among other domination dynamics that flow down to the CHT. These cascades of domination are met from below by brave surges of liberation, surges of resistance to domination, of self-help and self-education, of nonviolence, of human rights activism, surges of empowerment and participatory village and NGO politics. So we can conceive the nest of conflicts in the CHT and across South Asia in terms of contests between cascades of violence and surges of liberation. This will move us in the conclusion onto decentring violence in surges of liberation from the bottom up.

Our conclusion also embraces alternative top-down cascades of rights discourse, of separations of powers, of constitutional inclusion (as opposed to the exclusion of indigenous rights in the current constitution), of respect for and responsiveness to the ethnic other and rule of law. We conclude that South Asian insurgency groups, such as those we find in the CHT, the Sharbahara Party (the Proletarian Party of East Bengal) in the 1960s and 70s in the southwest and the JMB, JMJB in the northwest of Bangladesh in late 1990s until 2006, have taken root where top-down law and order has broken down, allowing insurgents/militants to move in (the Taliban being another example in 1994), promising a parallel state structure that works in providing personal security or addressing personal grievances such as those related to land disputes.

This essay does not seek to replicate the excellent analyses of the grievances that led the indigenous peoples of the CHT to take up arms against the government of Bangladesh; land rights and migration; the gendered peace process; and the critiques of the Accord that can be found in the work of scholars like Amena Mohsin (2002, 2003); Devasish Roy (2007, 2011); Meghna Guhathakurta (2004); Shapan Adnan (2004); and Bhumitra Chakma (2010). In comparison, our narrative is brief and thin on this score. The non-Bengali indigenous peoples of the CHT, of which the three largest groups are the Chakma, Marma, Tripura, with others being Bawm, Khumi, Khyang, Lushai, Mru, Pangkho, Chaak and Tanchangya, hoped that the secular AL government of 1972-75 might be more open to their rights as non-Islamic minorities than the militarised Islamic regime of Pakistan had been. Their hopes were dashed when Prime Minister Sheikh Mujibur Rahman implored them to ‘join the mainstream of Bengali culture’ in 1973.

The military was deeply distrustful of the indigenous people of the CHT. At the time of partition from India, some CHT leaders had raised the Indian flag to signal their preference for staying loyal to India, because the CHT was a 95 percent non-Muslim region (predominantly Buddhist, but there were also some Hindus, Christians and Animists). They backed the wrong side as the boundary commission forced the CHT to go with Pakistan under the guns of the Pakistan military. Then in the war of partition of Bangladesh from Pakistan, the most important CHT leader, the Chakma king, Raja Tridiv Roy, who was also the local member of parliament, sided with Pakistan for strategic reasons to protect non-Bengali ethnic minority interests as the war was being fought primarily on the ground of Bengali nationalism and secularism. He became a minister in

the Pakistan government and left for Pakistan after the war. In our military interviews there was bristling intolerance of this history of disloyalty. Adibashis had failed in their eyes to come to terms with the fact that they live in a Bengali society: 'Its called the Bay of Bengal, not the Bay of Chakma' (Brigadier interview, 2011).

The military coup of 1975 led the (largely Chakma) political leadership of the CHT to believe that under military control there would be even less chance of regaining the level of autonomy the CHT had secured during indirect British colonial rule of the remote CHT. The leader of the United Peoples Party of the CHT (Parbattya Chattagram Janashonghoti Samity – PCJSS or JSS), Manobendra Narayan Larma, was forced to flee to India in 1975. The Indian government, which had backed the AL and feared the coup leaders who it saw as anti-Indian, welcomed JSS to the Indian state of Tripura just across the border from the CHT. Indeed it was the Indian intelligence agency, RAW, that approached Larma on 16 August 1975, the day after the coup (interviews with indigenous leadership, 2010, 2011). India supplied arms, training and allowed bases for the JSS military wing (Shanti Bahini – Peace Force) to conduct cross-border raids. The first major attack by Shanti Bahini on a Bangladesh military convoy did not occur until 1976, though there had been minor engagements back to 1972 when Shanti Bahini was originally formed to protect CHT villages from atrocities committed by the liberation army. Supporting Shanti Bahini was a way for India to remind Bangladesh, especially its military, that Bangladesh remained in the Indian sphere of influence. India was not interested in supporting JSS if it became an independence movement, because an independent CHT would have weakened Indian leverage over the Bangladeshi government.

The insurgency continued with many failed peace negotiations until the 1997 CHT Accord. It was not a high intensity conflict, with the number of lives lost uncertain, but not counting more than thousands. Nonetheless, the continual violence in the CHT deeply affected indigenous peoples' security at every level. Between 1979 and 1997, there were 11 major massacres in which several thousand indigenous Hill people were killed (CHT Commission 2000). One of the terrible features of the 1971 War of Liberation was the militarisation of rape, with the Pakistan military using rape as a strategic tool of warfare, with more than 25,000 officially recorded cases of forced impregnation (D'Costa 2011). The militarisation of rape also cascaded, with 94 per cent of reported rapes of Hill women between 1991-93 being committed by security personnel (Mohsin 2003:54). A senior official from an indigenous women's organisation observed 'before 1980 we never heard of rape incidents. With the increase in the number of army posts and Bengali settlements, rape of women and children have increased, with some alarming events of pahari (hill) girls between 5-8 years of age being raped' (interview, 2010). In 2012, newspapers also reported rapes of indigenous women committed by indigenous men. Indigenous men, in particular indigenous youth are extremely intolerant of indigenous women who chose to marry outside indigenous communities (most often to Bengali Muslims). The deep hatred towards the Bengali other and gender insensitivity have created various cascades of prejudice.

Rape of indigenous women and girls and forced marriages in the CHT persists as an endemic residue of these cascades today. Women were heavily involved in the politics of PCJSS and UPDF and in fighting (interviews with female combatants, 2010 and with women activists from various factions, 2011). Sexual and gender based violence by the security personnel was the single most motivating factor for forming the Hill Women's



Federation (Guhathakurta, 2004:11). Some revisions to the Hill District Act were made after the signing of the 'Peace' Accord to include three female representatives (2 indigenous and one non-indigenous) in the 34 member Hill District Councils. The CHT Regional Council also reserves 3 ((2 indigenous and one non-indigenous)) out of 25 seats for women. The HDCs are not able to function adequately as the ruling party members and loyalists run these institutions. Appropriation of the HDCs for party politics and meagre representation of indigenous women in the upper echelon of formal politics added to the deeply embedded traditional and patriarchal structure of the CHT. Our research in the CHT suggests that women's peace initiatives and peace leadership from women's NGOs and networks, on the other hand, was less a feature for this conflict than in all others we have studied to date. When a retired general who led one of the most prominent peace processes of the 1980s referred to 'tribals who went to the insurgents and said please come in and talk', we asked if there were many women involved in this kind of shuttle diplomacy: 'No. Hardly one woman among 99 gentlemen' (interview, 2010).

What was decisive in making the 1997 peace process succeed where earlier efforts had failed was that it was negotiated by the first elected AL government that had enjoyed power since 1975. To India's relief, Sheikh Hasina was elected as the prime minister in the 1996 election. India hoped the AL would provide a secular government that would be less militarised, less Islamised, less hostile to India. It showed its support to the new prime minister by telling the JSS leadership that its military aid had come to an end, that it would have to reach a peace agreement with its government that would include handing in Shanti Bahini's weapons (Interview with negotiators and political leaders 2010, 2011). Their bases in India would be closed. JSS cadres and refugees were forcibly returned to Bangladesh as part of the peace accord. India immediately stopped food supplies to hungry refugees to pressure the deal. A shift in Indian policy to curb insurgencies through peace deals with groups in the Northeast was also a motivating factor for India to push for stability in the CHT.

This put Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina in a strong negotiating position. She also enjoyed and used a good relationship with Jyoti Basu, Chief Minister of West Bengal (indigenous leader interview, 2010). That strength was especially profound because Shanti Bahini and the Bangladesh military were both war weary after 25 years of fighting since the Liberation War. The military in 1996-7 was a strong supporter of reaching a peace agreement. 'The Accord would have been impossible without that support from the military' (JSS Peace Accord negotiator interview, 2011). But the military proved a bad faith supporter of the peace. Once its objectives of surrender of most weapons, closure of the Tripura insurgent bases, and return of the JSS leadership to their martial control and surveillance was accomplished, successive military leaderships from 1998 to the present mobilised the political power of the military to defer, delay and ultimately deny implementation of key elements of the 1997 agreement. Initially, dozens of temporary military camps were closed in the CHT to implement the demilitarisation part of the agreement, but effective re-militarisation of the CHT was ultimately asserted with slightly fewer military and more police, intelligence and auxiliaries under military control.

A majority of the Bangladeshi army inside the country continues to be based in the CHT. The clause in the agreement to establish an autonomous indigenous police force in the CHT has never been realised. Most critically, Accord provisions on return of lands confiscated from indigenous people during the war have been ignored (Adnan and

Dastidar 2011:23-26), as have unwritten agreements between the Prime Minister and Shantu Larma concerning repatriation of Bengali settlers (indigenous leaders and member of parliament interviews 2010, 2011). It is important to note that the Bengali settlers in the CHT also distinguish between old Bengali settlements (permanent Bengalis) predating Bangladesh and natural migrations before early 1980s 'who is not a tribal and possesses land legally in the Hill district' and the government sponsored illegal Bengali settlements (interview with Bengali settlers 2010). In our interviews the old Bengali settler community leaders indicated that the new (post 1980) settlers should leave the CHT. However, in our conversations with Imams of several mosques we found that Muslim religious leaders support a strong Bengali Muslim presence and expansion in the CHT (interviews 2010). Both the religious leaders and Bengali settlers of all categories share (both formal and informal) information with the security sector in the CHT.

Successive governments all tacitly supported the military's policy of Bengalisation of the CHT through state-assisted transmigration of Bengali settlers, though through consolidation rather than escalation in recent years. One reason the major parties supported Bengalisation was that the CHT is a strategically important region with resource riches that they believed should not be held hostage to indigenous insurgents who one day might decide again to work with India. 'If we misbehave with India, the Chittagong Hill Tracts will be burning again' (interview with retired general, 2010). Basically, all parties do not wish to implement the Accord because that would inflame the army as well as Bengali settlers, who now have strong majorities in CHT electorates. Stories of continuing 'terrorism' in the CHT, from either the spoiler factions or by the 'others' such as Bengali settlers and various extremist groups and Rohingyas from neighbouring Burma has eroded support for implementation of the 1997 Accord in the wider Bangladesh electorate. District and Regional Councils were never given the autonomy from the central government agreed in the Accord, nor control over many of the specific domains of governance nominated in the Accord. Amnesties for insurgents provided for in the peace deal were generally honoured and refugees were provided with modest resettlement funding.

The founding leader of JSS, Manobendra Narayan Larma, was killed in 1983 and succeeded by his brother, Shantu Larma who had been imprisoned for five years. Shantu Larma's strong hold as an underground leader and later as the sole legitimate political leader of the CHT delivered peace but in a rather fragile form due to competing interests, factional politics and the government's carefully manufactured peace offerings. What were delivered in the peace package were plenty of 'personal sweeteners' (interview with breakaway faction leader from the PCJSS, 2011) for Shantu Larma, including a government salary as Chairman of the CHT Regional Council (CHTRC), a government car and driver, personal security provided by the government, and patrimonial control of a limited set of autonomous government functions in the CHT, though with promise of more to come (they never did) as the peace process progressed. These rather limited concessions generated a strong resentment that was expressed during our interviews with indigenous leaders. Some of them associated this cascade of unequal distribution of power with Chakma domination; and some held a strong view that even the limited set of functions over which Shantu Larma was given personal control were enough for him to dole out many government jobs mainly to the elite of his Chakma ethnic group and education scholarships. These went overwhelmingly for the children of his Chakma elite, leaving the Chakma, and to a lesser extent the other two dominant CHT groups, the Marma and the Tripura, with higher levels of education and literacy than many ethnic

Bengalis today, while some the other indigenous groups continued to languish with shockingly low levels of access to education, with literacy in some cases only one tenth that of the Chakma (interviews, 2010 and 2011). In aggregate, however, affirmative action (or as it is sarcastically called the ‘Larma quota’) with educational scholarships for Hill students is one way the Accord has delivered.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 are useful to understand the power discrepancies and resulting resentment brewing in the CHT.

**Table 1: Membership Composition of the Hill District Councils**

Position	Class/Type	Ethnicity	Bandarban HDC	Khagrachari HDC	Rangamati HDC
Chairperson	Indigenous		1	1	1
Members:					
	Indigenous Members:				
		Marma	10	6	4
		Khyang			1
		Mro	3		
		Tripura	1	6	1
		Tongchangya	1		2
		Bawm**	1		
		Lusai			1
		Pangkho			1
		Chakma	1	9	10
		Khumi	1		
		Chaak	1		
	Non-Indigenous Members:				
		Non- Indigenous	11	9	10
	Women Members:				
		Indigenous	2	2	2
		Non- indigenous	1	1	1
<b>Total:</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>

*\*For Bandarban HDC, 10 seats are for Marma & Khyang together*

*\*\*For Bandarban HDC, 1 seat is for Bawm, Lusai and Pangkho together*

**Table 2: Membership Composition of CHTRC:**

a. Chairperson (indigenous)	01
b. Indigenous member	12
c. Non-indigenous member	06
d. Indigenous women	02
e. Non-indigenous woman	01
f. Chairperson of three HDCs	03 (ex-officio)
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>

**Table 3: Indigenous group representation in CHTRC**

a. Chakma	05
b. Marma	03
c. Tripura	02
d. Mro (Murang) and Tanchangya	01
e. Lusai, Baum, Pangkho, Khumi, Khyang, and Chaak	01

The power politics aspects of the peace deal cascaded to a politics of resistance to PCJSS's local power from non-Chakma indigenous groups, but also from excluded Chakma factions. CHT civil society saw it as a peace that benefitted a few, 'peace without justice' (Moshin 2003), and a militarised peace at that, regularly punctuated by violence. One might go further and say the CHT has only a partial negative peace without truth, justice or reconciliation. The 1997 peace agreement was not a best practice process. It was an elite deal that totally excluded wider civil society participation. There was no international engagement or monitoring to ensure that marginalised voices were not suppressed in the process (apart from Indian manipulation behind the scenes). The Accord was not discussed in the parliament prior to its signing, contributing to opposition to the Accord by all three opposition parties in the 1997 parliament. A naïve international community applauded the peace agreement, showering plaudits on Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, who was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for the accomplishment.

Three civil society groupings had been pre-eminent in the PCJSS struggles. These were the Hill Student's Forum (Pahari Chatra Parishad – PCP), the Hill People's Council (Pahari Gono Parishad – PGP), and the Hill Women's Federation (HWF). Some of the prominent leaders from these groups who had done much of the work of sensitising wider civil society networks across Bangladesh to the grievances of Hill people, walked out of PCJSS protesting the way the deal was negotiated and repudiating the peace agreement. Large fractions of the memberships of these three groups split from PCJSS to form a new resistance party, the UPDF (the United People's Democratic Front), demanding 'full autonomy'. Later, other factions broke away from Shantu Larma's PCJSS. To them, Larma seemed to be allowed, 'unlike anyone else', to speak out against the military and the government without being arrested, because he could be tolerated by the government to use tight personal control of PCJSS to prevent any more effective leadership against the government from taking root. He had a cosy mandate to bluster, seemingly bravely, but not to threaten the regime (Interview with a senior indigenous leader, 2010).

### *Militarisation of the resistance to the CHT resistance*

Our interviews suggest that at various times, Bangladesh intelligence (DGFI) has found it helpful to provide funding or weapons to the UPDF. The UPDF having been created, the military decided to use it to divide the CHT resistance. At times UPDF and PCJSS have used force of arms to murder or kidnap one another. As local commands of these parties became more criminalised, police and military informants allege that each party used firefights with the other as an excuse to eliminate their own in ‘crossfire’. At the height of the civil war, another neglected element of the cascading of violence was the use of civil war to exact revenge for conflicts that had nothing to do with the autonomy struggles of indigenous peoples. Likewise, critics of the military allege that they find PCJSS-UPDF conflict a useful pretext for them to murder troublesome members of both groups and then blame the killing on the other group (CHT Commission 2000:27). Shantu Larma and some of the senior leaders of the PCJSS regularly refer to UPDF as ‘terrorists’. In this, they do useful work for the military in justifying its continued militarisation of the CHT. On the other hand, a senior UPDF leader thinly disguised his threat and noted ‘Mr Larma says that UPDF must be banned. Well we could do more damage if we want to. And we could just take him off the equation. But he is getting old, and we have time, plenty of time to wait...’ (interview, 2010). UPDF members also have their linkages with the military which uses these personal and ideological differences to maintain control over the CHT. Killing between PCJSS and UPDF is easier for the military to use force to manage than killing between indigenous people and Bengali settlers.

During the 1980s, one of the smaller CHT ethnic groups, the Mru, deserted Shanti Bahini, forming the Mru Bahini, which engaged in some fighting with Shanti Bahini forces. This occurred because of excessive taxation of Mru villages by Shanti Bahini, disrespectful treatment of the Mru by Chakma officers, including an incident of rape of a Mru woman after they had demanded that she husk paddy for them, and other allegations of sexual assault. The military seized the opportunity of this cascading down to inter-ethnic conflict, providing weapons training and funding for the Mru Bahini, and using Mru who defected from PCJSS to lead them to PCJSS hideouts (CHT Commission 2000:28; Shelley, 1992:117).

During the civil war, there were also armed clashes between different Shanti Bahini factions which divided on ideological and tactical questions. As we raised above, in one of these the founding leader of the insurgency, M.N. Larma, was killed by the breakaway JSS-Preeti faction.

We have begun to explain why the Bangladesh military sees the CHT as a strategically important zone. It has repeatedly been a scene of heavy fighting in the history of wars of the region, including in the most recent major war in 1971. As an insecure enough zone, the military can justify heavy state expenditure in keeping a large military presence there. It can thereby keep on the table the options of allowing insurgents from India and Burma to locate bases there if that suits its strategic interests, or the strategic interests of a potential ally such as the United States, China or Pakistan. During the Pakistan era, the CHT was used this way, with the Mizo National Front, the Meitei rebels of Manipur and the Tripuri rebels of Tripura being well entrenched in the CHT for the conduct of hostile operations into India (Mohsin 2003:89). Burmese insurgents still inhabit the CHT to a degree today.

Assam was broken up into the seven sisters. In 1997 the sisters were suffering from more than 30 insurgent organisations. That has reduced somewhat today. At the tri-junction where the borders of Bangladesh, Burma and India join, there were 24 known insurgent groups in 1990 (interview with retired Bangladeshi general, 2010).

As a zone that is not totally insecure, development of the believed considerable resource riches of the CHT is possible. Better still for the military, military leaders might personally cash in on such resource opportunities if it is insecure enough for them to be able to demand protection money from investors. The CHT is a land of opportunity and of importunity. Extortion is already a reality with the military extracting healthy rents from illegal logging, tobacco, tourism and other businesses that operate in the CHT. Wives of military officers have often ended up beneficiaries of land stolen from those driven off their land in the CHT or by illegally buying national forest reserves (interviews with indigenous leaders during which we have been shown documents of illegal land acquisition, 2011). A combination of the special conflict zone allowances that soldiers get for serving in the CHT with these protection racket and business opportunities mean CHT is the most lucrative place for postings in Bangladesh. In the past, the collection of protection money from Indian Naxalite and other insurgent groups permitted to use the CHT has been a source of revenue for the military, especially from those groups trading drugs or arms under Bangladesh military protection. The AL governments negotiated agreements to send Indian insurgents back to India. In some cases, interviewed informants said that the top leaders were pushed back, with others being allowed to stay if they paid local Bangladesh military commanders enough. The CHT is also seen as useful training for peacekeepers. Bangladesh is currently the world's largest supplier of UN peacekeepers (military and police); UN peacekeeping is also seen as a good income opportunity for the security sector.

A lot of the insecurity of the CHT is a result of groups of Bengali settlers driving indigenous people off their land. Cascades of mob violence thus enable cascades of land grabs as Bengali settlers are also driven off land by indigenous people or by the military using proxies. Sometimes the military tolerates or foments Bengali land grabs out of sympathy with the settlers or because it creates opportunities for the military to grab land. And the whole insecure scene of bottom-up cascading of violence in pursuit and defence of land grabs justifies a continuation of the militarised cascading of violence across the whole region.

Many of the post 1980 Bengali settlers who have come to the CHT are extremely poor. Some are refugees from the changing flows of watercourses of the surging rivers of the plains. Like indigenous people, they work hard for meager returns and then find they have to pay taxes on what they grow to armed UPDF men when they transport their produce through UPDF controlled areas and to PCJSS men when they move produce through their areas. After decades of fighting, these two groups and the military have generally worked out stable accommodations about where and within what limits each of them can and cannot shake down citizens. As in so many conflicts around the world, such accommodations have transformed former combatant groups who have a presence in the CHT from armies into organised crime gangs extorting taxes, kidnapping people who can pay ransoms, engaging in contract killings and contract violence for the military and for political parties, illegal logging, drug dealing and arms trading. Rather, one should say it is more violent elements among PCJSS, UPDF and foreign insurgent groups who have

morphed to organised crime, rather than the non-violent majorities of the memberships of these political movements against indigenous oppression.

### *Cascades within cascades*

In our rush to move the story of the cascade of violence forward from one cascade to the next within the space of one essay, we have skated quickly over various other cascades that recur at multiple levels. Some we were not expecting to encounter, such as cascades of taxation. Impoverished Indians disliked the taxation of the Mughal Empire. This resentment was a resource the British East India Company could use to persuade Indians to fight alongside the British to sideline the Mughals. Another resource was promising new Indian elites that they could replace Mughal clients as tax collectors (which in Bengal were mainly Hindu landlords who replaced Muslim *zamindars*). At a later cascade, many impoverished Muslim Bengalis were attracted to joining Pakistan in the 1940s in the hope of throwing off the yoke of Hindu landlords. Tax is an issue that cascades; it runs right through to the lowest level of the cascades of violence we document. During our CHT interviews, dozens of poor rural people complained to us of the injustice of having to pay off both PCJSS and UPDF in ‘taxes’ per unit of production. More broadly, we have seen how money politics has cascaded to the point where politics in Bangladesh has become ‘business continued by other means’, where all businesses must do their bit to entrench the two dynasties by monetary tribute to both at election time. We have seen also how the Bangladeshi military elite is intertwined with the business elite, drawing corrupt payments from Dhaka down to insurgents trading illegal logs, to the point where occupation of the CHT is a profitable business for the military.

Moving from the cascading of tax defiance to noting the cascade of money politics is not the most abstract move we should remark here. The more important abstraction is to see cascades of taxation as an instance of cascades of domination. Just as the Mughals, Clive and Hastings wanted to dominate Bengal, so at the bottom of our cascades, UPDF, PCJSS and Arakan insurgency extortionists wish to dominate their local piece of the CHT. Violence such as cutting off the ear of a farmer who does not pay, as people complained the Arakanese insurgents sometimes did in CHT (interview, 2010), is just a tool of domination here.

Cascades of domination also connect to cascades of exclusion. As partition unfolded in the 1940s, Hindus excluded Muslims, Muslims excluded Hindus, both excluded Sikhs. After partition, the Pakistan army dominated East Pakistan and embraced an ideology of exclusion as they slaughtered and raped in 1971, leaving behind many texts about how they saw Easterners as not true Muslims, fake Muslims with ‘Hindu hearts’. In turn, even as the Indian army helped Bangladesh win its liberation war, exclusionary attitudes, indeed contempt, motivated many of its members to loot, brutalise and rape many of the people it had saved, particularly the refugees, leaving a legacy of resentment of India that cascades to the coup against the AL for being too close to India. And this in turn leads to India’s support for the CHT insurgency. At the bottom of the cascade of exclusion, the indigenous people of the CHT were treated as primitive second class citizens by both Bangladesh and India, particularly when India used violence and starvation to drive refugees back to Bangladesh in 1997. Finally, smaller indigenous groups who have been deprived of literacy often feel they are treated contemptuously as primitives by the Chakma, in the case of the Mru resisting the Chakma through the Mru Bahini militia.

In countries that seem to have experienced less civil war than Asia and Africa, such as Australia and the United States, we find the same dynamics in near misses that did not become bigger wars. In Australia, the same policies of transmigration to make indigenous people a minority in their own land did not have to be enforced by a large war machine because European diseases did most of the decimation, as also happened in North America. And of course tax (at the Boston tea party) was more than just a spark that lit the American War of Independence from its colonisation. The American Civil War was fought over both slavery as an institution of domination and domination of the rural South by the industrial north. So in these two 'peaceful' societies, we see cascades of colonial exploitation, domination and exclusion, yet a violence that is contained by 'luck', by circumstances that lead to quick capitulation rather than long war, and by a politics of national reconciliation, that we see especially strongly between the US and its colonial master and between Abraham Lincoln's reconciliation attempts of North and South. Lincoln began this with the new national narrative at Gettysberg that North and South, black and white, all 'we Americans' have been victims of a terrible institution called slavery.

In less 'lucky' societies where violence has been cascading in many directions for decades, people become war weary. One of the questions they then ask themselves is 'Who is going to be in charge in five years? Perhaps I should be supporting them for the safety of my family?' We found common people asking this a lot in our 2011 interviews in Afghanistan and indeed throughout Afghan history, as we found in Bangladesh (see generally Braithwaite and Wardak 2013). When violence cascades, ordinary folk can suffer double waves of violence for supporting the wrong side, for being suspected of having done so, or for being in the company of someone who has done so.

An additional abstraction for all this is that when violence cascades, revenge cascades. In making choices to try to minimise their exposure to violence, people can make decisions that expose them to revenge attacks for harbouring sentiments they do not have. Revenge is regulated when spaces are pacified by a rule of law. In more anarchic spaces like the CHT, armed men can get away with revenge. Anomie creates spaces where resentments that have nothing to do with the war, about a property dispute, a sexual relationship, a gesture of disrespect, can trigger a revenge attack. Finally, as so many have observed in Africa (Reno 1995, 1998), in the CHT also we found that war can cascade into the violence of organised crime.

The CHT case study shows cascading down, up and horizontally. The dominant dynamic in our narrative is cascading down. But there are also upwards cascades of mobilisation of mob violence directed against the ethnic or religious other, sometimes revenge attacks, sometimes calculated attempts to grab land. There are other bottom-up cascades that we might have included in our narrative, such as the salafist terrorist group with links to Pakistan's Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), JMB (Jamaat-ul Mujahideen Bangladesh). JMB detonated 500 bombs in all but one of the 64 districts of Bangladesh within half an hour on 17 August, 2005 (International Crisis Group 2010). Violence also cascades horizontally across borders, from Burma to Bangladesh, from Bangladesh to India back to Bangladesh. Cascades of refugee flows across the borders of the CHT, as in Pakistan and Afghanistan and so many modern wars, have facilitated the recruitment of resentful, footloose young fighters motivated by hunger and by the suffering of their refugee family to fuel the next cascade of violence.



### *Halting cascades of violence?*

In a less anomic international system than prevailed in the 1940s (before the rules of the UN game had been settled), one might have hoped that the terrible cascade we have described might have been interrupted at source. One might have hoped that states that were a 'group of friends of India' might have worked to prevent a slapdash British exit, the imposition on Pakistan by Mountbatten and the Congress Party of a 'moth eaten Pakistan' that was unsustainable. There might have been more plural, hardworking preventive diplomacy to craft a more win-win solution for the people of both India and Pakistan. Then for the unfortunate refugees who were still its losers, international peacekeepers might have filled the policing gap that the British felt they could not afford to fill to meet the international community's responsibility to protect victims of a preventable security dilemma.

Imagining such counterfactuals is useful for understanding how the international community must prevent future cascades of violence on other continents. The Bangladesh state at a more micro level has begun to understand that a reason JMB got a foothold in Rajshahi Division is the same reason the Taliban won a foothold in rural Kandahar province in 1994. There was a rule of law vacuum, an absence of any effective governance in these spaces that attracted the most brutal of forces. It was JMB in Rajshahi Division and the Taliban in Kandahar province who were advocating the use of Sharia law to lift ordinary people out of a security dilemma, to assure them that they did not need to yield to armed gangs of criminals. The Bangladesh state began to realise after 2005 that religious extremism is a risk when the state fails to provide the protection of people from security dilemmas with good community policing. In other words, when states and the international community both decide that it is too hard, too expensive, to make the rule of law work in a Hobbesian space, they should not fail to see that such spaces are vacuums that ultimately will attract a provider of order. If the state or the international community declines to fill them, there are 'armed rule of law movements'<sup>6</sup> like the Taliban and JMB that will cascade into them.

More fundamentally, cascades of domination, exclusion, corruption, money politics and violence cannot be ended by a ceasefire and surrender of weapons cashed out with an amnesty and reintegration payouts. Preventive diplomacy is not enough at the end of a cascade, even if it can sometimes work to prevent a cascade at source. Not everyone can get what they want in a peace process. Yet war weary people repeatedly grant legitimacy to a peace if it is settled in a process they accept as genuinely giving voice to all sources of grievance and injustice, strenuously seeking peace with justice, even though that ideal is never fully or even fulsomely attained. The CHT peace, precisely because it was at the end of such a long cascade of so many peoples feeling they were victims of dire injustice, had to be a more participatory peace than it was. That participation not only needed to include indigenous civil society, but also Islamist members of parliament in Dhaka who felt deprived of an opportunity to discuss the peace deal in their parliament.

What was needed was not only peace with participation, peace with a search for justice, but also peace with a search for truth and reconciliation. Bangladesh through all its cascades of suffering has practiced a politics of forgetting. Peace with truth and

---

<sup>6</sup> We acknowledge David Kilkullen as the author of this expression at an ANU book launch (see also Kilkullen 2011).

reconciliation requires a different ethos from the money politics that sees nonviolent (Gandhian) tactics of liberation such as the hartal harnessed by corrupt, dynastic political parties to destabilise democracy and institutionalise violence. A politics of truth, justice and reconciliation is not likely to come from practitioners of money politics, but from civil society practitioners of a spiritual politics of grace, humility and forgiveness. These abound in South Asian people power that can join onto the streets to support the students of universities like the University of Dhaka when opportunities arise in the future, as they have in the past, in 1952, 1969, 1971 and 1990.

Finally, we should say that the implications of our cascade analysis are not most importantly about building positive peace with justice, participation, truth and reconciliation at the end of tragic cascades. They are more importantly about securing negative peace preventively at the font of cascades. The error of each President Bush was in seeing their Iraq intervention (in 1990 and 2002) as a single layer of violence to effect a single regime change (removal of President Hussein) rather than seeing it as an intervention that would cause violence to cascade. Good preventive diplomacy could have prevented Saddam Hussein from ever invading Kuwait in 1990 (Salinger with Laurent 1991:47-62); good preventive diplomacy had already persuaded him to dismantle his Weapons of Mass Destruction programs in 2002. Likewise the invasions of Afghanistan by both Moscow (1979) and Washington (2001) were seen as a single layer of violence to effect a single regime change. Yet all four of these interventions cascaded down to many layers of violence across multiple points in space and time. The Soviet invasion triggered US support for Osama bin Laden and the Mujahidin that cascaded in ways neither Moscow nor Washington foresaw. These cascades brought violence to the office towers and theatres of the heartlands of America and Russia, and, as noted earlier, JMB bombs to 63 Districts of Bangladesh on 17 August 2005.

There are many kinds of errors of misplaced realism (Braithwaite et al 2012). One is seeing a clear, achievable objective - like a more powerful nation changing the regime of a less powerful one - as a single-layered objective, rather than as violence that will cascade. The prescription from our analysis of South Asian cascades is that military powers stop and ask: What is the worst case cascade this could trigger, and the most likely cascade? If they insist on thoughtful answers, they will cause less violence. These are only preliminary implications from fine-grained study of cascades of violence such as we have begun to attempt from the Chittagong Hill Tracts to Afghanistan. In our research we are now turning attention to preventive experiences that steer cascades of violence mid-stream to more and less escalating cascades.

## References

Acemoglu, D. Johnson, S. and Robinson, J. (2004) *Institutions as the fundamental cause of long-run growth*, Working Paper No. 10481, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Mass., 66–70.

Ackerman, P. & Duvall, J. (2000) *A Force More Powerful: A century of nonviolent conflict*, New York: Palgrave.

Adnan, S. (2004) *Migration, Land Alienation and Ethnic Conflict: Causes of poverty in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh*, Dhaka: Research and Advisory Services.

Adnan, S. and Dastidar, R. (2011) *Alienation of the Lands of Indigenous Peoples in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh*, Dhaka: CHT Commission.

Aziz, M. (2008) *Military Control in Pakistan: The parallel state*. Routledge: London.

Batchelor, P. (2004) 'The economics of demilitarisation in Southern Africa' in Peter Batchelor & Kees Kingma (eds.), *Demilitarisation and Peacebuilding in Southern Africa*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Boot, M. (2006) *War Made New: Technology, warfare and the course of history 1500 to today*, New York: Gotham Books.

Braithwaite, J., Braithwaite, V., Cookson, M. & Dunn, L. (2010) *Anomie and Violence: Non-truth and reconciliation in Indonesian peacebuilding*, Canberra: ANU E Press.

Braithwaite, J., Charlesworth, H. & Soares, A. (2012) *Networked Governance of Freedom and Tyranny: Peace in East Timor*, Canberra: ANU E Press.

Braithwaite, J. & Wardak, A. (2013) 'Crime and war in Afghanistan part I: the Hobbesian solution', *British Journal of Criminology*,

Brecher, I & Abas, S.A. (1972) *Foreign Aid and Industrial Development in Pakistan*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butalia, R.C. (1998) *The Evolution of the Artillery in India: From the Battle of Plassey to the Revolt of 1857*, Mumbai: Allied Publishers Ltd.

CHT Commission (2000) *Life is Not Ours: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Bangladesh*, Amsterdam: The Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission.

Chakma, B. (2010) 'The post-colonial state and minorities: ethnocide in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh', *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 48(3), 281-300.

Chakrabarty, B. & Pandey, R.K (2009) *Indian Government and Politics*, London: Sage Publishers.

- D'Costa, B. (2009) 'Strangers within our borders: human in(security), refugees, and IDPs in South Asia', issues paper, CIGJ (also under review for journal publication)
- D'Costa, B. (2011) *Nationbuilding, Gender, and War Crimes in South Asia*, London: Routledge.
- Desai, M. (2009) *The Rediscovery of India*, New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Doyle, M. and Sambanis, N. (2006) *Making War and Building Peace*, Princeton: Princeton university Press.
- Evans, G. (2008) *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending mass atrocity crimes once and for all*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings.
- Fortna, V.A. 2008 *Does Peacekeeping Work?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Guhathakurta, M. (2004) *The Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) Accord and After: Gendered dimensions of peace*, Geneva: UNRISD.
- International Crisis Group (2010) *The Threat from Jamaat-ul Mujahideen Bangladesh*, Dhaka and Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- Jalal, A. (1995) *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keay, J. (2010) *India: A History*, New York: Harper Press.
- Kilkullen, D.J (2011) 'Deiokes and the Taliban: local governance, bottom-up state formation and the rule of law in counter-insurgency', in W. Mason (ed.), *The Rule of Law in Afghanistan: Missing in inaction*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- LaPorte, R. Jr. (1972) 'Pakistan in 1971: the disintegration of a nation', *Asian Survey* 12(2), 97-108.
- Majumdar, R.C., Raychaudhuri, H.C. and Datta, K. (1960), 'An Advanced History of India', London: Macmillan and Co.
- Milam, W.B. (2010) *Bangladesh and Pakistan: Flirting with failure in South Asia*, Dhaka: University Press Limited.
- Mill, J. (1826) *The History of British India*, volume 4, Baldwin, Cradock and Joy.
- Mohsin, A. (2002) *The Politics of Nationalism: The Case of the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh*, Dhaka: The University Press Limited.
- Mohsin, A. (2003) *The Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: On the difficult road to peace*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Paoli, L. Greenfield, V. and Reuter, P. (2009) *The World Heroin Market: Can supply be reduced?* New York: Oxford University Press.

- Parekh, B. (1997) *Gandhi*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reno, W. (1995) *Corruption and State Politics in Sierra Leone*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reno, W. (1998) *Warlord Politics and African States*, Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.
- Ross, A. (1987) 'Dimensions of militarization in the third world', *Armed Forces and Society* 13(4), 561-578.
- Roy, D. (2007) 'The discordant accord: challenges in the implementation of the Chittagong Hill Tracts Accord of 1997', in Miek Boltjes (ed.), *Implementing Negotiated Agreements: The Real Challenge to Intrastate Peace*, The Hague: Asser Press, 115-146.
- Roy, D. (2011) Land disputes concerning indigenous peoples in Bangladesh: problems and solutions. Paper prepared for presentation at the National Conference on Land, Forest and Culture of Indigenous Peoples, organised by the Bangladesh Indigenous Peoples Forum in Dhaka, Bangladesh on 6-7 August.
- Rummel, R.J. (1998) *Statistics of Democide: Genocide and mass murder since 1900*, Munster: Lit Verlag.
- Salinger, P. with Laurent, E. (1991) *Secret Dossier: The hidden agenda behind the Gulf War*, London: Penguin Books.
- Sen, A. (1981) *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Shelley, M.R. (1992) *The Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh: The untold story*, University of Dhaka: Centre for Development Research.
- Sheppard, E., Porter, P.W. Faust, D.R. and Nagar, R. (2009) *A World of Difference: Encountering and contesting development*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Siddiqua, A. (2007) *Military Inc. Inside Pakistan's military economy*, Pluto Press.
- Sobhan, R. (1978) 'Politics of food and famine in Bangladesh', *Economic and Political Weekly* 40, 1973-1980.
- Stedman, S. (2000) 'Spoiler problems in peace processes', in Paul C. Stern and Daniel Druckman (eds.) *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War*, Washington, D.C: National Academies Press
- Stephen, J.S. (2000) 'Spoiler problems in peace processes' in Stern, Paul C. and Daniel Druckman (eds.) *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Sikkink, K. (2011) *The Justice Cascade: How human rights prosecutions are changing world politics*, New York: Norton.

Sunstein, C. (1997) *Free Markets and Social Justice*, New York: Oxford University Press.

US Library of Congress (1988) Bangladesh, a country study, Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; edited by James Heitzman and Robert L. Worden, Washington, D.C. : The Division

Van Schendel, W. (2009) *A History of Bangladesh*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.