1. Please give a brief update on the situation for Chakmas in Bangladesh, in particular: (a) communities in the Chittagong Hills Tract (CHT); and (b) Chakmas living elsewhere (eg. Dhaka, Gazipur).

Sources indicate that Chakma and other indigenous Hill people in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) continue to come under attack from Bengali settlers and have also been mistreated by authorities in recent years. In addition, reports suggest that security forces have failed to provide adequate protection for indigenous Hill people against settler violence.

Little information was found on the situation for Chakmas living elsewhere in Bangladesh, but the US State Department has noted that ethnic minorities occasionally become targets for violence, and members of religious minorities may be subject to societal and official discrimination.¹ This may apply to Chakmas, who are not only an ethnic minority but also a religious one, since the majority of them are Buddhist, while Bangladesh is predominantly Muslim.²

**Chakma communities in the Chittagong Hills Tracts (CHT)**

The majority of reports on the CHT refer to indigenous Hill people in general, rather than the Chakma community in particular. The Chakma are one of the largest tribes of indigenous Hill people, who are collectively known as the “Jumma people”.³ Due to the relatively limited number of reports regarding Chakmas specifically, this response draws on recent reports about Chakmas and the Jumma people as a larger group.

Although there were some positive developments for the CHT in 2009 – including the country’s return to democratic rule and the beginning of the disbanding of major army
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camps in the CHT\(^4\) – sources indicate that Jumma people in this part of the country are still at risk of harm from security forces and Bengali settlers.

Regarding security forces’ treatment of Jumma people, the US State Department’s 2009 Human Rights Report states that tribal organisations and “NGOs continued to allege that security forces abused the indigenous population of the CHT”.\(^5\) Specific incidents include the Bangladeshi Army’s opening fire on a group of Jumma protestors in February 2010, resulting in the deaths of at least two of them.\(^6\) In addition, in July 2009 the World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT) reported that it had received “reliable information” indicating that the Bangladeshi military had murdered a member of the Chakma community and “active supporter” of the indigenous political party Parbatya Chattagram Jana Samhati Samiti (PCJSS).\(^7\) (For more information on the PCJSS, please see question two.) The victim was reportedly “pursued and shot by a group of soldiers” after being released from detention earlier that day.\(^8\) His body showed signs of torture.\(^9\)

Jumma people including Chakmas have also been subject to violent attacks by Bengali settlers. There were a series of settler attacks on Jumma people in February 2010, for instance,\(^10\) about which the AFP reported:

> Hundreds of ethnic Chakma, a Buddhist tribal group indigenous to the Chittagong Hill Tracts, lost their homes…when violence broke out between them and Muslim Bengali settlers, prompting a harsh army crackdown.\(^11\)
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\(^7\) World Organisation Against Torture 2009, “BANGLADESH: Reported extrajudicial killing in the Chakma Community, Chittagong Hill Tracts”, World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT) website, 10 July, [http://www.omct.org/index.php?id=&lang=eng&actionPageNumber=1&amp;articleSet=Appeal&amp;articleId=8669&amp;PHPSESSID=b32869351f08e83ea82dde6c4797f2ed5](http://www.omct.org/index.php?id=&lang=eng&actionPageNumber=1&amp;articleSet=Appeal&amp;articleId=8669&amp;PHPSESSID=b32869351f08e83ea82dde6c4797f2ed5) Added: 17/07/2009 (CISNET) – Attachment 7.

\(^8\) World Organisation Against Torture 2009, “BANGLADESH: Reported extrajudicial killing in the Chakma Community, Chittagong Hill Tracts”, World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT) website, 10 July, [http://www.omct.org/index.php?id=&lang=eng&actionPageNumber=1&amp;articleSet=Appeal&amp;articleId=8669&amp;PHPSESSID=b32869351f08e83ea82dde6c4797f2ed5](http://www.omct.org/index.php?id=&lang=eng&actionPageNumber=1&amp;articleSet=Appeal&amp;articleId=8669&amp;PHPSESSID=b32869351f08e83ea82dde6c4797f2ed5) Added: 17/07/2009 (CISNET) – Attachment 7.


\(^11\) Agence France Presse 2010, “BANGLADESH: Tribal anger rises in Bangladesh’s volatile hills”, 6 May, [http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hWFv6FK0WPX2mYF4-zV1pKPN-YBg](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hWFv6FK0WPX2mYF4-zV1pKPN-YBg), accessed on 7 May, 2010 (CISNET) – Attachment 8.
Amnesty International provided more details on the attacks, noting that multiple villages were affected and settlers had burned down hundreds of Jumma homes.12 Another AFP report said it was “the worst unrest since the [1997] peace treaty, when three people died, dozens were injured and hundreds of houses torched to the ground”.13

Pro-Jumma sources have also reported a number of smaller-scale settler attacks on indigenous Hill people over the last few years, for example:

- an attack on a CHT activist groups’ sit-in protest in June 2010;14

- attacks on villages in the Longadu upazila sub-district of Rangamati in August 2009 – in which at least four Jumma people were allegedly beaten and had their homes looted,15 and

- attacks on seven Jumma villages in Rangamati in April 2008 in which hundreds of homes were destroyed, several people were injured and an “unknown number” of women were raped.16

A notable feature of reports regarding settler violence against Jumma people is that authorities or security forces are often accused of assisting in these attacks or failing to stop them.17 For example, an Amnesty International report on the February 2010 violence noted Jumma allegations that “state officials including army personnel may have acted in support of the Bengalee settlers”.18 The AFP quoted a Jumma woman who lost her home in the attacks as saying that “With the assistance of the army, the settlers came here to
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13 “Bangladesh court deals blow to peace deal: attorney”, Agence France Presse, 14 April – Attachment 9.
attack us…Last year, there were 78 houses burned down by the settlers, helped by the army”. The report also included comments from a Jumma academic based in England:

The militarisation of the Chittagong Hill Tracts and the Bengali settlement policy means “ethnic cleansing is going on and in a way which is rather indirect and gradual, but effective,” [said Bhumitra Chakma, a tribal academic who teaches politics at England’s Hull University].

The February violence was a textbook example of the type of army-backed settler-led violence that has for decades underpinned all land grabs in the region, and which goes ignored by central and local authorities, he said.

Reports indicate that security forces have often failed to act in defence of Jumma communities during Bengali settler attacks. In relation to a settler attack on Jumma villages on 19 February 2010, for instance, the US State Department noted the advice of the CHT Commission (an indigenous rights NGO) that “security forces were present during the attacks and did nothing to stop the violence”. Similarly, victims of a settler attack on a Jumma village in 2008 claimed that the Army was present at the time, but made little effort to intervene.

### Chakmas elsewhere in Bangladesh

Very few sources were found to comment on the situation of Chakma people living elsewhere in Bangladesh. The US State Department has indicated that members of religious minorities may experience societal and official discrimination in Bangladesh, and ethnic minorities are occasionally targets of violence. This broad assessment may be applicable to Chakmas, who are both an ethnic and religious minority in Bangladesh, since they are predominantly Buddhists. The US State Department’s Human Rights Report stated that:

Discrimination against members of religious minorities, such as Hindus, Christians, and Buddhists, existed at both the governmental and societal levels, and religious minorities were disadvantaged in practice in such areas as access to government jobs, political office, and justice.
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The International Religious Freedom report noted that religious minorities experienced “discrimination and sometimes violence from the Muslim majority” in particular.26 Both reports suggested that the situation appeared to be improving in relation to access to government jobs and political offices.27

2. Please provide brief snapshots of the Hills Women’s Federation, Pahari Chhatra Parishad (PCP), and the Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS); their missions, relationship with one another and whether members are known to be at risk of mistreatment.

The Hill Women’s Federation (HWF), student organisation Pahari Chhatra Parishad (PCP) and political party Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS) are pro-Jumma (indigenous Hills people) groups in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT). The PCJSS was founded in 1972, while the HWF and PCP were established in the late 1980s to “[campaign] for the PCJSS’s demands and Jumma people’s rights”.28 Some sources suggest that the PCP’s association with the PCJSS continues, but other reports indicate that the HWF and PCP both opposed the PCJSS’s support for the 1997 Chittagong Hill Tracts Peace Accord and are now affiliated with rival CHT activist group, the United Peoples Democratic Front (UPDF). Reports indicate that some members of these groups have been arrested and/or mistreated by Bangladeshi authorities in recent years.

Hill Women’s Federation

The Hill Women’s Federation (HWF) was formed in 1989 by women students at Chittagong University.29 Human Rights Watch describes it as “an organization working in the [CHT] on the rights of women belonging to ethnic minority groups”.30 Several other sources also underline that the group’s focus is on Jumma women. For example, NGO workers Jenneke Arens and Kirti Chakma say that the HWF is particularly occupied with addressing the oppression of indigenous women in the CHT conflict “as well as the issue of equality and respect for women within their own societies”,31 and the website of the United Peoples Democratic Front (UPDF) states:


HWF’s activities focus on raising consciousness among the Jumma women about their rights and duties as the most repressed section of the Jumma society in the CHT. HWF is highly vocal against military repression on the Jumma women and organises protest demonstrations against every incident of human rights violations against Jumma women. 32

As suggested by Arens and Chakma, throughout much of the 1990s the HWF worked to advance PCJSS demands in the CHT. 33 However, several sources indicate that the HWF disagreed with the PCJSS’s support for the 1997 CHT Peace Accord, 34 and a number of recent reports link the HWF with the UPDF rather than the PCJSS. 35 A 2010 news story, for example, describes the HWF as “a front of the United People’s Democratic Front”. 36

The highest profile case of a HWF member being targeted for mistreatment by Bangladeshi authorities is that of Kalpana Chakma. 37 In June 1996, Chakma, then “organizing secretary of the HWF”, was abducted by a group of “armed men” including at least one identified as a military officer. 38 She remains missing to this day. 39

More current reports indicate that some HWF members have been arrested in recent years. An August 2010 story in the *Daily Star*, for example, said that army personnel had arrested two “leaders” of the HWF and two UPDF activists, allegedly for possession of firearms. No reports were found on the outcome of these arrests. In 2009, *CHT News* reported that two members of the HWF had been arrested while returning from “a rally held in protest against harassment of a group of Buddhist monks” in Rangamati district. Another report indicated that the women were subsequently released.

**Pahari Chhatra Parishad (PCP)**

The Pahari Chhatra Parishad (PCP), or Hills Student Council, was formed by “tribal students” in 1989 to advance indigenous CHT rights and causes. Like the HWF, the PCP appears to have been linked to the PCJSS throughout much of the 1990s, but sources are mixed regarding the group’s current relationship with the PCJSS. On the one hand, several reports indicate that the group did not support the 1997 Peace Accord and is now part of the UPDF. For example, two 2010 news articles describe the PCP as the student wing of the UPDF and the website of the UPDF identifies the PCP as one of its front organisations. By contrast, some sources indicate that the PCP is still affiliated with the
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PCJSS and that the UPDF has been antagonistic toward the PCP. In June 2010, for instance, *The Financial Express Bangladesh* reported that a member of the PCP, a “student front of Parbattya Chattagram Jana Samhati Samiti (PCJSS)”, had been “gunned down and another wounded seriously…allegedly by the armed cadres of [the] anti-peace accord [UPDF]”. No explanation was found for this apparent discrepancy in accounts of the PCP’s relationship with the PCJSS and the UPDF.

Reports indicate that some PCP activists have been targeted or harmed by Bangladeshi authorities in the CHT in recent years. In December 2010, for example, *CHTnews* and *The Daily Star* reported that “dozens” of PCP activists had been “injured in Khagrachari when police attacked them with gun shots, rubber bullets, tear gas and clubs” while they were attempting to conduct a “peaceful procession”. Another report indicated that PCP activists were arrested and subsequently jailed in connection with this incident. The PCP and its supporters protested the police action with a road blockade, according to *South Asia Media Net*.

**Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS)**

The Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS), or Chittagong Hill Tracts People’s Solidarity Association, was formed in the period 1972 – 1973 to “fight for autonomy and the recognition of the rights and identity of the Jumma…in the [CHT]”. In 1973, the PCJSS established a military wing, the *Shanti Bahini* (Army of Peace).}
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which played an active role in CHT’s long-running insurgency against the Bangladeshi government.\textsuperscript{55}

In the 1990s the PCJSS entered into negotiations with Bangladeshi authorities which eventually culminated in the 1997 Chittagong Peace Accord.\textsuperscript{56} Following the peace deal, the PCJSS abolished the Shanti Bahini and became a mainstream political party.\textsuperscript{57} Elements within the PCJSS – “[s]ome of the more militant Chakma guerrillas” – opposed the peace accord,\textsuperscript{58} and in December 1998 these PCJSS discontents helped to form the UPDF.\textsuperscript{59} Despite their common roots, the PCJSS and UPDF have an antagonistic relationship – one marked by “fratricidal killings and human rights violations” on both sides.\textsuperscript{60}

Reports indicate that some PCJSS members have had difficulties with the authorities in recent years, though many of these are unconfirmed and come from pro-Jumma sources. Examples include an online PCJSS report which alleges that in January 2009 Bangladeshi police arrested the “Organising Secretary” of the group without providing a warrant or reason for the arrest.\textsuperscript{61} The man was subsequently sent to jail in Dhaka,\textsuperscript{62} to be granted bail a month later.\textsuperscript{63} It was not clear why authorities had taken him into custody, and later


reports suggest that the man was free and remained active in the PCJSS in 2010. This individual had previously been arrested by authorities on allegedly false charges of possessing firearms in June 2007, along with other PCJSS members. Additional sources indicating that PCJSS activists have been targeted by Bangladeshi authorities in the last few years include:

- In 2009, the “openDemocracy” news website said that a Jumma youth had been murdered by the Army in Rangamati, and the original PCJSS report on the incident said the victim was a “PCJSS supporter”.

- A 2008 entry on a pro-Jumma news blog reported that the Bangladeshi military had attempted to have a PCJSS member arrested in connection with an old murder case after a judge found him not guilty of state of emergency violations, as the army had earlier alleged.

- A 2007 Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network report providing a list of PCJSS personnel who had been “arbitrarily arrested” by security forces.

Today the greatest danger to PCJSS members seems to come not from Bangladeshi authorities but from the UPDF. There are numerous reports of PCJSS members being targeted by the UPDF in the Chittagong Hill Tracts.
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killed or seriously injured by members of the rival group.69 The PCJSS has also been accused of carrying out attacks on the UPDF.70

3. Do reports indicate whether the Bangladeshi Army or others target people involved in political debate or pro-Jumma activism outside the CHT?

Very little information was located on the Bangladeshi Army or other authorities targeting pro-Jumma activists or politicians outside the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) in recent years. Two 2009 reports indicated that a fairly senior member of Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS) was arrested by police in Dhaka; later reports suggested he was released after about a month, and remained free and politically active in 2010.

Arrest of PCJSS Organising Secretary in Dhaka

In 2009 the PCJSS reported the arrest of one of its members by police in Dhaka in January that year.71 The arrest was also noted in a CHT human rights report appearing on the “Indigenous Portal”, an online Indigenous rights website.52 The individual concerned, Mr Shaktipada Tripura, was identified as the “Organising Secretary” of the PCJSS, and the first report said that he had been arrested from “a rented house” in Dhaka where his wife had lived with her children since 2007.73 It was not clear if Tripura resided there too or was only visiting, and the reasons for his arrest were also unclear. He was subsequently jailed for about a month before being released on 16 February 2009, according to the Indigenous Portal report.74 More recent reports from a Bangladeshi human rights group and The Daily Star suggest that Tripura was free and remained active in the PCJSS in 2010.75
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4. Is the Bangladeshi Army known to arrest those who assist the CHT Commission during its visits to CHT locations? (The CHT Commission’s views, and in particular, any comment on their August 2009 visit to Kamalchari, would be particularly useful.)

Two reports were found regarding Jumma people who had provided information to the CHT Commission being subsequently attacked by Bengali settlers, apparently with the help or consent of army personnel. In addition, a recent press statement from the Commission indicated that Bangladeshi authorities attempted to interfere with one of its meetings with members of the Jumma community in September 2010.

Attacks on Jumma villagers providing information to the CHT Commission

Two CHTnews reports posted on the pro-Jumma blog “Hill Watch” indicate that some Jumma villagers who gave interviews to a CHT Commission delegation in 2008 were attacked by Bengali settlers soon afterward, possibly with the help or tacit consent of military forces. The first report, dated 14 August 2008, said that a village in Rangamati had been attacked by Bengali settlers “backed by a strong contingent of army personnel” one day after hosting a visit by the CHT Commission. The report noted:

There are serious allegations that [the] army and settlers have been resorting to vengeful actions against those Jummas who gave interview[s] to the delegation of the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission who visited the three districts of Khagrachari, Rangamati and Bandarban from 7 - 10 August.

Of the five people in the village who had spoken to the CHT Commission, one was beaten and suffered a hand fracture, while the others went into hiding, “fearing arrest and harassment”, according to a village resident quoted in the report. A second report provided further information about the settler attack and iterated that village residents believed it had happened “because…we spoke to the CHT Commission”.

A CHT Commission press release from October 2010 said that Bangladeshi police and military intelligence had tried to attend one of the CHT Commission’s community meetings in Khagrachhari in the CHT in September that year. The Commission stated:

While the [CHT Commission] members were about to hold a discussion with Pahari [indigenous Hill people] groups on 9 September 2010 at the Upajati Thikadar Samity building in Khagrachhari, several police and military intelligence officials attempted to come inside the meeting room. The mission members objected to their presence since this would intimidate the Paharis and would also constrain them from speaking openly and frankly to the Commission. However, these agencies still insisted on keeping the door of the meeting room ajar and positioning one of their members just outside the door to observe the Commission’s discussion with Pahari participants and
take notes. They also wanted the Commission to give them the names and addresses of the Paharis attending these meetings, but this demand was firmly resisted.80

Request for information from the CHT Commission

On 28 January 2011 Country Advice contacted the CHT Commission’s Copenhagen office to request information regarding whether the Commission was aware that any Jumma people providing information to the Commission or assisting its fact-finding missions in the CHT were subsequently targeted by the Bangladeshi authorities.81 Since no information was found to verify whether the CHT Commission visited Kamalchari in 2009,82 Country Advice also asked if the Commission could confirm that it had made a fact-finding visit there in 2009 – and if it had, whether the Commission would be willing to provide any information about this visit.

The CHT Commission responded to the request for information on 8 February 2011 with a letter dated 7 February 2011 from the CHT Commission Co-Chairs and a copy of a press statement about its August 2009 fact-finding mission to the CHT (which Country Advice had previously located on the Commission’s website).83 The letter from the Commission reads (emphasis added):

The International CHT Commission (CHTC) undertook a mission to the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) in August 2009. Please see the attached press statement from our mission. CHTC members visited all three districts of the CHT and interviewed a number of indigenous people and others about the human rights situation. During that time, we were helped by several indigenous people – some of them identified areas of land dispute in the CHT and others helped us in arranging meetings with members of the civil society, key informants of human rights violations and indigenous victims of land dispossession.

These individuals took great personal risks to help the CHTC with information and by being present with the group. During all CHTC missions they have repeatedly told us that after the members of the CHTC left the area, security and intelligence officials have harassed them by asking detailed questions about the nature and content of our meetings. Earlier the CHTC had visited the area of Gangarammukh, Sajek in Rangamati Hill District in August 2008. The CHTC had interviewed victims of an arson attack in which about 70 houses of indigenous people were burned down, allegedly in the presence of the Army, in April 2008. Indigenous

81 RRT Country Advice 2011, Email to CHT Commission “Request for information for a Bangladeshi case before the Refugee Review Tribunal”, 28 January – Attachment 63.
people who gave us eye-witness accounts of the incident were subsequently questioned by intelligence agency members. There is a significant military presence in the CHT, and there are reports of indigenous people who are in contact with human rights activists being kept under surveillance by security forces. **However, we are not aware of any specific harassment of any individual who had assisted us during our mission to the CHT in August 2009.**

In this context, we raise a material concern regarding the CHTC itself facing threats to its operations from the government. In September of 2010, the CHTC received a letter from the Ministry of CHT Affairs, referring to a letter from the Prime Minister’s Office dated 8 September 2010 which directed the CHTC to abide by certain directives if it wished to carry out further missions. Specifically, it required the CHTC to ensure that government representatives were represented at all our meetings in the CHT, and discouraged us from traveling to the area without the invitation of the government.

The CHTC’s mandate is... “To promote respect for human rights, democracy, and restoration of civil and political rights, participatory development and land rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh, including examination of the implementation of the CHT Peace Accord of 1997. The CHT Commission will build on the work undertaken by the original CHT Commission between 1990 and 2001”. During all our missions we have always held meetings with all groups in the CHT, including the civil and military administration and reported our findings to government ministries and when possible, the Prime Minister herself. We therefore consider this directive by the Prime Minister’s Office a violation the basic rights to freedom of movement, and expression. We are further concerned that the imposition of such restrictions on an independent body of eminent persons and established professionals indicates a rising climate of intolerance and the likelihood of more severe restrictions being imposed on people within the CHT seeking to raise similar issues.84

The press statement included the advice that

[b]etween 11-16 August members of the [Commission] visited all three districts of the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Commission members met with government representatives, the three brigade commanders and their zone commanders, senior police officers, politicians and civil society leaders, including both Pahari and Bengali representatives.85

This press statement did not provide any information specifically regarding a fact-finding visit to Kamalchari in August 2009, nor did the Commission’s letter of 7 February 2011. (The letter of request did offer the Commission the option of responding to some but not all questions, as the Commission saw fit.)
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