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Nigeria is a country on edge. Its rampant political corruption, inefficient use of resources, provincial rivalries and profound ethno-sectarian schisms—especially between the predominantly Christian south and predominantly Muslim north—have placed Nigeria in the headlines for all the wrong reasons. From these grounds, Boko Haram, a radical Islamist organization, has emerged. Its attacks, which primarily though not exclusively target the Nigerian state and the north’s Christians, have resulted in excess of 1,000 deaths in the past two years alone. This paper will trace the origins and evolution of Boko Haram from its inception to the present.

In 2010, Nigeria celebrated 50 years as an independent state. For Nigerians, this milestone offered an opportunity to reflect on the country’s successes and shortcomings. On the positive side, over the last half-century, Nigeria has become one of Africa’s three giants along with Egypt and South Africa, thereby gaining considerable clout on the regional and global arenas. It is Africa’s largest oil producer and recent finds ensure Nigeria’s significance in the energy market for the foreseeable future. With a population in excess of 170 million people, Nigeria is home to Africa’s largest population, thus providing an ample labor force.

This paper provides an overview of the historical and cultural environment that has allowed the militant jihadist group Boko Haram to flourish. It examines the strategy that the Nigerian government has adopted and the challenges it faces to restore peace.

The population boom, however, is a double-edged sword for a still developing Nigeria. An inability or an unwillingness to distribute economic resources and development programs equitably may cause unrest. Moreover, rapid population growth can put enormous stress on a developing country’s infrastructure. The UN predicts that Nigeria’s population will exceed 400 million by 2050; such explosive growth will inevitably strain government resources.

Furthermore, though democratic, Nigeria still suffers from high rates of corruption and cronyism within the political system. Both federal and state governments are under-resourced and often lack sufficient numbers of personnel, adequate budgets, or financial oversight. Unsurprisingly, Nigerians throughout the country (and particularly in the North) have suffered from what they perceive to be discrimination in the provision of resources and basic infrastructure.

The country is no stranger to ethno-sectarian violence and secessionist movements. One of the most brutal and deadly civil wars in Africa — the Biafran War — took place in Nigeria between 1967-1970 when the Igbo people in the south-western part of the country established a secessionist republic of Biafra. The Nigerian government crushed the incipient Biafran state and reintegrated its people but only after the deaths of tens of thousands of people. In the oil-producing Niger Delta, the secessionist Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND) emerged. Its leaders accused the Federal Government in the capital Abuja of conniving with foreign oil corporations to deprive the impoverished region of its rightful share of the oil wealth. Niger Delta inhabitants complained of corruption, poverty, inequality and a lack of development. During the unrest in 2008 alone, over 1,000 people were killed and nearly 300 others were taken hostage. The cumulative cost of the conflict, either through pipeline sabotage or oil theft, is estimated to be roughly USD 24 million.
billion. In 2009, the Nigerian government offered a comprehensive amnesty program, replete with an unconditional pardon, cash, and vocational training. Though 26,000 fighters have accepted the program, with a majority pursuing the educational opportunities offered, tension in the Niger Delta remains. It remains unclear whether the federal government resolved the conflict out of a genuine desire for peace, or out of necessity for access to the oil resources.

**Historical and Political Background to the Emergence of Boko Haram**

Currently, the most pressing problem in Nigeria is an ethnic and sectarian divide between the north and south of the country. Nigeria’s population is split almost equally between Christians (40%) and Muslims (50%). Northern Nigeria has been a stronghold of Islam since the 11th century when Arab traders introduced Islam to the Kanuri, Hausa and Fulani peoples. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Islam became a major political force. In 1810, Uthman dan Fodio, a *mallam* or Islamic teacher, established the Caliphate of Sokoto in present-day northwestern Nigeria through a prudent use of charisma and ruthlessness. His self-styled *jihad* against the previous rulers serves as an inspiration to Boko Haram till this day. When the British colonized Nigeria, they allowed the northerners, whom they viewed as more 'advanced' culturally, more autonomy and Islam continued to dominate political and social life. This stood in sharp contrast to British rule in the south.

When Nigeria obtained independence from Britain in 1960, some northern politicians considered using Islam as a rallying point for entry into the political process in the former capital of Lagos. This proved unnecessary when Nigeria’s nascent democracy collapsed and the northern dominated military took over. Islam flourished in both the cultural and educational contexts as northern elites and politicians deepened their relationships with the wider Islamic world and received financial support from oil-rich Arab countries for the promotion of Islam.

These mainstream political religious forces of Islam are entirely distinct from the rise of a militant and extremist strain of Islam that has risen in recent decades. Indeed the Muslim northern elite, which include the current Caliph of Sokoto who claims to be a direct descendent of Uthman dan Fodio, are viewed negatively by radical Islamist forces of which Boko Haram is only the latest and deadliest manifestation. Worsening socio-economic conditions and mounting tensions between Christians and Muslims fueled the popularity of radical Islam. Despite the national problems discussed earlier, the south continues to boom as the north falls ever more behind; nearly three-quarters of northerners live on less than USD 200 a year, far below the poverty line. The few government programs designed to assist the region are marred by inefficiency and corruption.

Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan is a Christian and widely disliked by the Muslim north. Northerners perceive him as unresponsive to their needs and prone to adopt hard-line and violent strategies to solve the lack of law and order in the north. Demographic changes have exacerbated these tensions. Increasingly, Christians from the south are migrating northwards. In the city of Kano, southerners, particularly Ibos, began to threaten economic interests of the Hausa commercial class. In Jos, a city that lies on the Muslim-Christian fault-line, Muslim settlers have encroached into traditionally Christian areas. Rivalries between the Christian Berom tribe and the Muslim Hausa and Fulani settlers over farmland and local chieftaincy titles culminated in major incidents of mutual bloodletting in 2010.

These structural problems have caused the unfortunate but unsurprising rise of vigilante groups that claim to protect populations from a variety of deprivations. One such group is Boko
Haram, which claims to act in the interests of Muslim northerners. In Hausa, the main language of the north, Boko Haram means literally “(Western) Book is Forbidden.” Though outsiders gave this name to the organization, it accurately summarizes the group’s political agenda, which decries Western ways in education, culture and science as sinful. Indeed the ideological goal of Boko Haram is to establish an Islamic state that implements a strict interpretation of Shari’a or Islamic law throughout the entirety of the Nigerian state. (Currently, Sharia is technically applied in the 12 northern states, however Boko Haram does not accept the validity of these local governments.)

Jamiat Ahlus-Sunna lil-dawati wal Jihad, Boko Haram’s actual name, first appeared in 2002 in the north-eastern city of Maiduguri, located close to the Chadian border. Mohammad Yusuf, the group’s founder, expressed disgust with secular and ‘godless’ nature of Nigerian society. The sect initially wished to stay under the radar of the security services while it organized itself. It began to arm itself, prompting warnings from security officials that something was amiss in the north. In 2004, this small sect clashed with security forces in a series of bloody riots. These riots failed to awaken the government to the gravity of the situation. However, things had changed five years later. By 2009, the small group had expanded considerably and launched attacks against police in the city of Bauchi. Police retaliation and tit-for-tat attacks followed and claimed over 700 lives. Mohammad Yusuf and some of his key followers were killed, likely in an extra-judicial way. Yusuf’s death, far from weakening the movement allowed it to metastasize. After a wave of attacks on banks and prisons in late 2010, a vengeful and revitalized Boko Haram murdered politicians and poll workers in the run-up to the presidential elections in March and April 2011. In August 2011, it conducted its first suicide attack when it targeted the UN offices in Abuja.
Boko Haram’s increased potency has governments, not only the Nigerian government, scrambling to understand the group. While initially a solely Nigerian problem, Boko Haram likely maintains transnational links with like-minded Islamist groups across Africa. Reports of dozens of Boko Haram members assisting the Tuareg Islamist group Ansar Dine in the Malian city of Gao surfaced in April 2012. General Carter Ham, the head of the United States’ Africa Command, has repeatedly warned of Boko Haram’s cooperation with Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). Some of the tactics, weapons and equipment captured from Boko Haram suggest links with well-established militant groups. AQIM leader Abu Musab Abdel Wadoud, also known as Abdelmalek Droukdel, has openly stated his group’s willingness to equip and support Boko Haram. Nigeria’s government, keen to win support as a front-line ally in the West’s “global war on terror,” has encouraged these perceptions.

The Response of the Nigerian Federal Government

The Nigerian military and security forces are no strangers to domestic chaos and lawlessness. Despite the recent success scored by a Nigerian Joint Task Force (JTF) unit that arrested senior Boko Haram operational commander Suleiman Mohammad in May 2012, the track record in resolving these internal problems has not been robust. Though Nigeria won the Biafra War, the lessons of counter-insurgency were not institutionalized or internalized. The armed forces maintained an identity of a typical conventional army. When the Nigerian Chief of the Army Staff, Lt. General Azubuike Ihejirika, organized a defence conference, it concluded that the armed forces were not equipped or trained to handle this hybrid terror insurgent threat.

Goodluck Jonathan’s adoption of a hard-line approach devoid of political sophistication threatens to worsen the situation. The armed forces and police have near absolute jurisdiction in the north and can conduct large-scale operations with impunity. The brutality of some elements in the security forces, particularly the JTF, have embittered locals who in some cases fear the JTF more than Boko Haram. President Jonathan has already designated an astonishing twenty percent of the federal budget on security this year. Attempts at negotiation ended prematurely in March 2012 when Boko Haram backed out. Several commentators, including the primary negotiator Datti Ahmed, blamed the government for lacking sincerity during the negotiations.

The Jonathan administration has recently announced a new strategy to combat Boko Haram. President Jonathan replaced his Defense Minister and National Security Advisor in June 2012 and declared that “the solution lies in stronger laws, fear of God, transparency and accountability.” These gestures are moves in the right direction but similar reshufflings and platitudes have occurred before with little consequence. Boko Haram is not only a menace in and of itself, but it is a manifestation of the deeper ills that afflict Nigeria. Whether President Jonathan can affect these underlying structural problems remains to be seen.
India–Pakistan: Why Peace?

By Antara Desai and Abdul Basit

This article highlights the hindrances in the India-Pakistan peace process and emphasizes the need for cooperation between the two countries in view of the emerging geopolitical and economic changes in the South Asian region.

In 2009, Pakistani Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh issued a joint statement to the effect that from then on, terrorism would be separated from the composite dialogue which had started in 2004 between India and Pakistan under the leadership of President Musharraf and Prime Minister Vajpayee. The dialogue was an initiative to resolve all outstanding issues between the two countries and while the talks in 2004 did not yield any substantial results, they were considered a start to the peace process.

Resumption of talks between the two countries in 2009 was considered a major milestone for the relations between the two countries, given the increase in animosity in the aftermath of the Mumbai attacks in November 2008. This was followed by the composite dialogues in 2010 with a view to resolve issues that have strained the relationship between India and Pakistan over the years.

Since independence from British rule and partition of the Indian sub-continent, India and Pakistan have fought three major wars (1948, 1965 and 1971 wars) and have faced several situations of crisis and conflict. The enduring Indo-Pak rivalry has had negative implications not only for the two neighbouring countries but for the whole South Asian region.

In the present environment, the South Asian geopolitical and geo-economic realities demand a certain level of cooperation between two hostile countries. The different levels of challenges that exist in the international system cannot be resolved by one country alone. Any turmoil or crisis erupting in one country would have a spill-over effect across the border, creating instability in the entire region. However, despite various Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) and bilateral negotiations, peace remains an elusive dream between the two countries.

Though in the past, CBMs have often been initiated by both sides, these measures have been sporadic and have not yielded the expected results primarily because whenever a terrorist attack or similar incident occurs, the entire process gets derailed. This was the context against which Pakistan’s Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar called the India-Pakistan relationship one of ‘lost opportunities’ at the “Aman ki Asha” Indo-Pak Economic Conference in Lahore in May 2012.

Cooperation and Conflict in India–Pakistan Relationship

An example of cooperation on non-security matters was the 1960 water sharing agreement between the two countries namely the Indus Water Treaty. It is interesting to note that despite the wars and conflicts that followed the treaty, for the most part it has been successful in achieving its purpose.

The 1965 Rann of Kutch Agreement was another example of such cooperation. This region shares a border with the Southern part of Sindh which is situated in Pakistan. Rival claims over the territory led to a limited war in April 1965 leading to the signing of this agreement which has been followed by both parties till date.

After yet another war in September 1965 in Jammu & Kashmir, India and Pakistan signed the Tashkent agreement in 1966. The Indian empha-
sis at this time was more on resolving the territorial disputes between the two countries. In 1971, a civil war broke out in Pakistan with East Pakistan demanding a separate state. India was militarily involved in the conflict which ended with creation of Bangladesh and signing of the Simla Agreement of 1972. It was under this agreement that both countries decided that third party intervention would be avoided and the issues between them would be resolved bilaterally.

Pakistan believes that the Simla agreement was more of an immediate remedy, since a quick fix was needed to avoid further chaos and instability, than a long term commitment between the two countries. At the time, Pakistan was bargaining from a position of weakness as it had lost the Eastern part of its territory. In 1988, both the countries entered an agreement regarding their nuclear infrastructure and to exercise refrain from attacking the adversary’s nuclear facilities. However, to what extent this has been successful is difficult to judge as no major war has taken place since then. Similarly, the agreement signed in 1992 calls for prohibition of chemical weapons. At the time of signing the agreement, both parties had stated that they did not possess chemical weapons. Again in 1997, Pakistan proposed signing of a mutual agreement for non-aggression relating to nuclear weapons, however, this too proved to be insignificant in context of the nuclear weapon programmes which both the countries continued to develop resulting in nuclear tests in 1998.

When the Bharatiya Janata Party came to power in India in 1998, it was believed that the relations between India and Pakistan would be further strained due to their perceived leaning towards Hindu nationalist discourse. However, this period proved to be very positive in bilateral relations between India and Pakistan.

The Lahore Declaration was signed on 21 February 1999. The Declaration highlighted the need for both countries to avoid confrontation in
view of the nuclear dimension in their relationship. It also emphasized a commitment to intensify the composite dialogue between them. However, the Kargil crisis which began in May 1999 once again led to a complete breakdown of the peace dialogue and resulted in renewed trust deficit. This crisis erupted due to infiltration by Pakistani backed militants into the Kargil district of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Agra Summit which took place on 15 and 16 July 2001 was another failure primarily because of the focus on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir. A settlement could not be reached and other issues took a back seat while the territorial dispute loomed large on the minds of the decision makers.

The next phase of negotiations and peace building began after the 2001 attack on the Indian Parliament. The nuclear angle in the India-Pakistan relationship became a risk factor for the region and the world. Moreover, due to the US war in Afghanistan against the Taliban and Al Qaeda, any escalation of hostility between India and Pakistan was viewed with alarm.

The meeting held by the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) in 2004 paved the way for a composite dialogue between India and Pakistan but this did not show much result in terms of confidence building or bridging the gaps caused by history.

It is evident therefore that in the past, there has been no substantial progress in terms of establishing sustainable peace between the two arch foes. The efforts from both sides have been sporadic and any irritant that comes in the way leads to a complete breakdown of communication and trust. Some of the major irritants have been:

- Proxy Wars
- Kashmir Dispute
- China factor
- India’s involvement in Afghanistan

Proxy Wars

The problem of terrorism and proxy war continues to be a hindrance for both countries. For instance, New Delhi has been blaming Pakistan for sponsoring or supporting groups to carry out attacks not only in Jammu & Kashmir but all over India. This became more contentious especially after the November 2008 Mumbai attacks. At the same time, Pakistan blames India for providing assistance to the Baloch separatists through Afghanistan. Pakistan views the establishment of more than fourteen Indian consulates in Afghanistan in this perspective.

Kashmir Dispute

The border issue of Jammu and Kashmir has remained unresolved since the creation of Pakistan. Unfortunately, whenever the peace dialogue is initiated between the two countries, other issues take a back seat to this territorial dispute. The underlying political motivations have ensured that this issue is constantly highlighted making it difficult to negotiate or find a lasting solution for peace.

China Factor

Indian belief that Pakistan is giving control to China in the Gilgit Baltistan area is another issue that hinders the peace between India and Pakistan. The construction of the Gwadar port and other infrastructure by China has caused further concerns for India.

India’s involvement in Afghanistan

India’s involvement in Afghanistan and the trilateral dialogue between India, United States and Afghanistan is not viewed positively by Pakistan. This is especially in context of Pakistan’s declining ties with the US. In addition, Pakistan is also apprehensive about India’s presence in Afghanistan as it will be at the cost of its own strategic influence there.
Why the Current Composite Dialogue is Different from the Previous Peace Overtures?

In the changing geopolitical and geo-strategic environment of the South Asia region, one factor which compels both India and Pakistan to cooperate with each other is the approaching end game in Afghanistan. Despite relentless efforts of US-led NATO/ISAF forces stretched over a decade, Afghanistan's unpredictable governing structures, volatile security landscape, defunct and corrupt political system, fractured economy with booming opium crops and resilient Taliban insurgent groups point to a bleak picture.

In such a situation, the draw down, in July 2011, and ultimate withdrawal by 2014, of US forces from Afghanistan will have far reaching consequences for regional countries. An unstable Afghanistan — where India and Pakistan have high stakes — is in nobody's favour. To avoid a volatile post-US Afghanistan with an uncertain future, joint approaches within regional structures become essential. This will require both India and Pakistan to mend their fences.

From New Delhi’s perspective, mending fences with Pakistan is important particularly at a time when India is vying for permanent membership of United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Therefore, India's softened, rather well calculated, policies towards Jammu and Kashmir and extension of an olive branch to Pakistan for re-initiating the composite dialogue speaks volume of underlying Indian intent to cultivate cordial relations with its South Asian neighbours, especially Pakistan.

Another compelling factor is the common threat of militancy and extremism. Militancy and terrorism is a regional problem and warrants regionally coordinated approaches to overcome this menace. In the context that Pakistan itself is bearing the major brunt of terrorism, repeated allegations and demonization of Pakistan will only isolate the country; thus further weakening...
its already fragile economy and fractured social fabric which in turn will strengthen the hands of peace spoilers and terrorists.

It has therefore become important to adopt a functional approach in the India-Pakistan peace process. The issues of conflict and cooperation need to be compartmentalized in a manner that political issues, territorial disputes and terrorism do not always take the limelight. Instead, a focus should be made on issues of trade and commerce. Even in the case of conflict, channels of communication with regard to economy should be kept open. Therefore, ensuring that there is no overlap of issues becomes a necessary component of the peace building process.

Conclusion

India and Pakistan need to make the peace process more meaningful and sustainable by utilizing multiple channels of interaction like enhanced trade cooperation, dialogue on all forums, state to civil society as well as people to people contacts. Mutual cooperation and a positive outlook by both India and Pakistan coupled with a will and intent on both sides to sustain the peace process leading to conclusive outcomes would serve the interests of the entire region.

GLOBAL PATHFINDER

The ICPVTR Terrorism Database – Global Pathfinder - is a one-stop repository for information on the current and emerging terrorist threats. The database focuses on terrorism and political violence in the Asia-Pacific region – comprising of Southeast Asia, North Asia, South Asia, Central Asia and Oceania.

Global Pathfinder is an integrated database containing comprehensive profiles of terrorist groups, key terrorist personalities, terrorist and counter-terrorist incidents as well as terrorist training camps. It also contains specific details and analyses of significant terrorist attacks in the form of terrorist attack profiles.

For further inquiries regarding subscription and access to the Global Pathfinder database, please email Ms. Elena Ho Wei Ling at the following email address: isewlho@ntu.edu.sg
The Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA), 1958, was introduced in India as an emergency measure for one year in 1958 to deal with the Naga insurgency in the North Eastern part of India. The Act comprises of provisions which give protection to the armed forces to carry out operations in the concerned states. Since 1958, it has been used in all conflict-prone areas wherever the army was deployed.

The Act was implemented in the North Eastern part (which includes the states of Mizoram, Nagaland, Assam, and Sikkim) and Jammu and Kashmir. In the North East of India, the tensions in late 1950s were rampant. The Naga insurgents were indulging in arson, murder and loot. Deployment of the forces was therefore considered necessary. Also, militancy in Kashmir was at the peak in the late 1980s with rampant infiltration from the neighboring countries. Therefore, the AFSPA was extended and implemented in the state of Jammu and Kashmir in 1990. This article focuses on the impact of AFSPA on various states and analyzes whether AFSPA is necessary today.

The AFSPA endows the armed forces with special powers and immunity which was considered

Protest marches against AFSPA in Jammu & Kashmir led by Mehbooba Mufti, President of Peoples Democratic Party of Kashmir.
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necessary to deal with militancy and insurgency effectively. However, over the years, this Act has led to concerns about human rights violation by the security forces calling for demands for the repeal of the Act. The AFSPA has been criticized for carrying various ambiguous provisions and thus giving arbitrary powers to the armed forces. For example, Section 4 of the AFSPA states that “any commissioned officer, warrant officer, non-commissioned officer or any other person of equivalent rank may, in a disturbed area use force to the extent of even causing death of a person who refuses to follow an order or law made prohibiting the assembly of five or more persons, or the carrying of arms, after such “warning as he may consider necessary”, for the maintenance of public order.”

In addition, the Act gives powers to the army to detain any person who is suspected of any unlawful activity. The person detained could be taken into custody without any warrant and could be interrogated till the officers deem fit to release the person.

From a human rights perspective, these sections are in contravention to the right to life and right to freedom of liberty which is envisaged by the Constitution of India. According to Article 22 of the Constitution of India, if a person is detained, then the same should be produced before a judicial magistrate within 24 hours of the detention. This right is fundamental which the Constitution of India guarantees to every citizen. The above mentioned provisions of the AFSPA clearly are in negation of the provisions of the Constitution. There have been many instances when people have not been put through established judicial procedures. There are also instances of forced abductions and disappearances. The scope of intervention from the normal judicial process is also very limited as the armed forces enjoy immunity against prosecution under the provisions of the AFSPA.

Tensions between the army and the people of Jammu & Kashmir reached its climax, in 2010, leading to women, children and youth retaliating by throwing stones.

Additionally, India is a signatory to many international conventions. One such covenant is the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article 2(3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights makes it obligatory for all member nations to provide for remedies for violations of rights, even if they are carried out by people acting in official capacities. Furthermore, Article 9 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that, “No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile”. It is in these contexts that certain provisions of the AFSPA have attracted international opprobrium particularly when human rights violations are implicated.

There have been many instances when the United Nations (UN) has suggested to the Indian government for the repeal of AFSPA. For example, Christof Heyns, UN Special Envoy, on a visit to Kashmir on 31 March 2012 stated that the AFSPA violates International law and that it has no place in democracy. Moreover, when the Act was being enacted for the first time in 1957, there were lots of criticisms in the parliament about the provisions of the Act. The collective criticism is best summarized by Laishram Achaw Singh, Member of Parliament from Inner Manipur Parliamentary Constituency, in his comment made in 1957. “This is a lawless law. There are various provisions in the Indian Penal Code and in the Criminal Procedure Code and they can easily deal with the law and order situation in these parts.” Nonetheless, the Act was implemented.

Over the years, a number of committees have been constituted to review the Act. In 2005, the Jeevan Reddy Committee recommended that “the AFSPA is too sketchy, too bald and quite inadequate in several particular aspects and therefore it should be repealed or amended at the least.” It has been recommended to the Government of India by the committee that the AFSPA could be replaced by an Act which is on par with the criminal laws of India or the procedural laws. Also, at the same time certain organizations, advocacy groups and concerned states have been demanding for the repeal of the AFSPA. The government had promised to repeal the same, however, no outcome has come so far.

It has been repeatedly stated by various courts and committees and by the Law Commission of India that India no longer requires a law such as the AFSPA. India has a robust criminal procedure and a penal code which cover the gamut of crime and punishments. There are provisions in the Constitution regarding exercising Emergency Rule and the various situations under which army can be deputed and given extraordinary powers. Article 356 of the Indian Constitution is an example of the emergency provisions under the Indian Constitution which provides for guidelines under which Emergency rule should be imposed in a state.

It is imperative to understand here that the situation in Jammu & Kashmir and the North East has been ameliorating for a long time. In the case of Jammu & Kashmir, there has not been much unrest after the violent protests in early 2010, resulting in the deaths of hundreds of people. The Kashmir valley was under curfew for half of the year, crippling economic and social activities in the state. The situation after 2010 has been improving and normalcy is returning to the state through an increase in tourism and resumption of business activities as well as educational institutions in the Kashmir valley. The North East has been experiencing similar improvements in their daily lives.

At this point, given the shift towards normalcy, there is no requirement for such an extraordinary law to be in force. Therefore, the AFSPA should be revoked from these places. This will assuage the local sentiments and will help build permanent peace by winning the trust of the local people. In the meantime, it is necessary to explore an alternative for the AFSPA. The alter-
native should be such that will balance the need for the special powers for the security services with the demands for protection of civil rights and liberties of the citizens.
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The deteriorating situation in Syria has been a matter of international concern, not the least for Israel. This is due to the possibility of chemical weapons falling into the hands of entities such as Hezbollah which are hostile to the Jewish state. While the presence of chemical weapons (CW) in Lebanon is still uncertain, defence sources claim that Syria has already moved CW capable Scud missiles to Hezbollah camps in Lebanon and erected advanced surface-to-air missiles in the Lebanese mountains.

Evidence Supporting the Chemical Weapons Threat Scenario

While the presence of CW in Lebanon is still uncertain, Kuwaiti newspaper, *Al-Siyasa* (2009), along with Israeli government and intelligence agencies have previously reported that Hezbollah was keeping CW in arms stockpiles in southern Lebanon. In one instance, three out of the eight Hezbollah operatives who were killed in the blast died after coming in contact with the chemicals. However, Lebanese Army personnel as well as United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) forces were denied access to the blast site in order to cover up any evidence. Israeli defence sources claim that Syria has already moved Scud missiles to Hezbollah camps in Lebanon and erected advanced surface-to-air missiles in the Lebanese mountains. Any scenario in which Hezbollah or any other non-state actor had CW capability, the balance of deterrence between Israel and its regional adversaries...
would shift dramatically.

According to Maj. Gen. Yair Naveh, Israeli Deputy military chief, Syria has the largest CW stocks in the world with missiles and rockets that can reach any point in Israel. He added that if Syria had the chance, it would “treat us the same way it treats its own people.” It is in this context that on 12 June 2012 the Netanyahu government announced that it was going to mass distribute gas masks to protect its population against biological and chemical weaponry. Israel’s Hayom daily (12 June 2012) quoted a senior Israeli Defence official who warned that “the transference of chemical weaponry to Lebanon would be tantamount to a declaration of war by the Lebanese government” and “that Israel would act to prevent such a move”.

The current speculation and belligerent rhetoric comes at a time of renewed internal Lebanese National Dialogue. The National Dialogue facilitates the resumption of formal discussions between the various Lebanese parliamentary blocks that effectively stalled in November 2010 concerning primarily Hezbollah’s weapons and what role, legitimate or otherwise, the Hezbollah’s arsenal plays in Lebanese security.

Hezbollah’s Chemical Weapons Capability

Syria has successfully tested delivery systems for its chemical warheads, namely Scud B-C-D class missiles. Hezbollah has acknowledged that the Scud missile is a major component of its arsenal following the war in 2006. Given that Syria and Hezbollah’s military hardware are strategically linked, they have one of the largest ballistic missile arsenals in the region, made up of hundreds of Scud-derived missile systems.

Israeli intelligence warns that the transfer of unconventional weapons to Hezbollah commenced following the 2006 conflict with Israel. However, the weapons remain in Syrian territory to prevent their destruction in an Israeli strike. In the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missile</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Circular Error Probable (CEP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fateh 110</td>
<td>250 km</td>
<td>100 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or M-600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scud B</td>
<td>300 km</td>
<td>900 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scud C</td>
<td>550-600 km</td>
<td>900 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scud D</td>
<td>600-700 km</td>
<td>50 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This map demonstrates the maximum missile ranges determined from the border of southern Lebanon. It also includes projected missile ranges from South Bequa’a Valley (dotted circles).

event that Hezbollah relocates its Scud D missiles and other advanced weapons, out of undisclosed storage facilities in Syria and transfers them across the border to Lebanon, Israel would be forced to act on its promise and destroy Hezbollah’s Scuds. Hezbollah is rumoured to keep its most advanced hardware in the Syrian Al Hame and Al Zabadani military bases near Damascus. The most intense fighting between Syrian opposition groups and pro-Assad forces has occurred in areas corresponding to Syria's weapons storage facilities (Aleppo, Homs, Hama and Latakia). Hence, securing Assad regime’s military assets has become a priority for Iran and Hezbollah. This situation prompted Tehran and Hezbollah to come up with a new strategy to facilitate relocation of these weapons. Israeli Defence Force officials believe that various jihadist groups — such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad and others — may attempt to divert Israel’s attention from Hezbollah and its arsenal by instigating conflicts on Israel’s western and southern fronts.

A CW attack on one of Israel’s major population centres would be catastrophic. The densely populated areas of Tel Aviv, Haifa or the Galilee would be priority targets for such an attack and within range of Hezbollah’s current missile capability. According to the reports of Council on Foreign Relations (2006) and DEBKAfile (2012), Syria has produced, tested and continues to store VX nerve agents which is the deadliest nerve agent ever created. A fraction of a drop of VX, absorbed through the skin, can fatally disrupt the nervous system. Although an antidote is available, the chemical is absorbed so rapidly that unless victims received immediate medical attention, the casualty rate would be extremely high. Sources claim that Saddam Hussein used VX against Iran during the Iran-Iraq War. He also used chemical weapons on Iraqi Kurds at Halabja in 1988, which resulted in the deaths of 5,000 people. Additionally, thousands more were left with horrific medical side-effects.

Hezbollah was implicated in a series of events in Thailand, India, Azerbaijan and Georgia in 2012. In this year, some individuals associated with Hezbollah were arrested and persecuted in the US. On 21 March 2012, the Republican Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, Peter King, said “the Iranian-backed Lebanese group Hezbollah may have hundreds of operatives based in the United States”, adding that “Hezbollah, and not Al Qaeda, poses the greatest terrorist threat to Americans”. Iran requires that Hezbollah maintain an effective presence in the region especially with the uncertainty facing its operational ally Syria. With officials claiming that a pre-emptive strike on Iran will unleash a barrage onto Israel’s northern border coupled with Nasrallah’s insistence that Tel Aviv is within rocket range, the outcome of renewed IAEA negotiations which commenced in May 2012 has intensified the focus on Hezbollah’s intentions. Israel is concerned with the escalating regional dynamics and a plausible threat from CW attack in which Hezbollah would be a likely perpetrator.
The International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR) is a specialist centre within the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

ICPVTR conducts research, training, and outreach programs aimed at reducing the threat of politically motivated violence and at mitigating its effects on the international system. The Centre seeks to integrate academic theory with practical knowledge, which is essential for a complete and comprehensive understanding of threats from politically-motivated groups.

The Centre is staffed by academic specialists, religious scholars, as well as personnel from the law enforcement, military and intelligence agencies, among others. The Centre is culturally and linguistically diverse, comprising of functional and regional analysts as well as Muslim religious scholars from Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Europe and North America.

Events and Publications

- **Terrorist Rehabilitation: The US Experience in Iraq** (CRC Press Taylor and Francis Group, 2011) by Dr. Ami Angell and Dr. Rohan Gunaratna
- **Pakistan: Terrorism Ground Zero** (Reaktion Books, 2011) by Dr. Rohan Gunaratna and Mr. Khurram Iqbal
- **International Aviation and Terrorism: Evolving Threats, Evolving Security** (Routledge 2009) by Dr. John Harrison

For upcoming events at ICPVTR, visit [www.pvtr.org](http://www.pvtr.org)

- **Ethnic Identity and National Conflict in China** (Palgrave Macmillan 22 June 2010) by Dr. Rohan Gunaratna, Dr. Arabinda Acharya and Mr. Wang Pengxin
- **Targeting Terrorist Financing: International Cooperation and New Regimes** (Routledge 2009) by Dr. Arabinda Acharya