

Naga political alternative arrangements and beyond: A critical analogous relook

SAMSON S. CHIRU

Principal

Mt. Everest College (Affiliated to Manipur University)
Senapati (Manipur) India

Key Words : Naga sovereign movement, United nation, Indigenous communities, Simon commission

INTRODUCTION

We have in erstwhile sub-continent—Mahatma Gandhi, Subhash Chandra Bose, A.Z. Phizo, Rani Gaidinliu, the present collective leadership of National Socialist Council of Nagalim (I-M), and many others. We have B.R. Ambedkar, Gopinath Bordoloi and team, who designed Northeast India (Sixth Schedule of the constitution of India) in a parochial approach analogous to the framework of United States of American constitution for the Red Indians.

A paradigm shift, in fact, parallel contemporary approach was adopted in Naga sovereign movement in the mid-forties of the twentieth century A.D., which is to be critically relooked at along the lines of “United Nations declaration for self-determination” in the Nagas quest for political alternatives. Can the country go not in line with international covenants? The UN mandated declarations advocate that when the countries enact a law, particularly, pertaining to indigenous communities, they are to enact in accordance to the UN. As much as the states in the federal relationship, to do the same with the centre.

Objectives, Research Questions, and Scope :

The objective of the paper is to focus on alternative political arrangement for the Nagas. The paper raised interrogations such as if the signatory country does not adhere to the UN mandated advocacy for championing the cause for the communities concerned, they are termed a violators of the agreed principles. India is signatory to many UN declarations, but never adhere to the multilateral agreements by being a party to it. Human rights violation is rampant with the draconian Arm Forces Special Powers Act of the 50s twentieth century. The debate attempted here would centre on the much publicized pertinent questions, such as: Is underdevelopment caused by militancy or underdevelopment is the main cause of insurgency in Northeast India? Other pertinent question that crops up time and again, is: India is champion of non-violence, is non-violence a tool to provoke others to resort to violent methods? Is it wrong, to be violent as the proponents rightly advocate that given a choice between cowardice and violence, the latter is preferred? In this context, when the parallel independent movements of India and Nagalim began, it was armed-chair method. In Nagas' case, until 1929 of Simon Commission, all grievances and promises were dumped in the “dust bin of

betrayal history” committed by the Colonial India and later by Independent India, they were forced to take up armed militancy to “defend” their stance as independent territory as Nagas did in all conquest of different civilizations *i.e.*, Ahoms, Mughal dynasty or British imperialist along with Independent India from 1212 till 1947.

Meanwhile, connect of the Northeast Nagas in India and the Ahoms (Thais) has been there from time immemorial. This is recorded, as Thais stand as evidential witness to the disputes and conflicts of the warring tribes of the Northeast India, particularly, the Nagas and the Assamese. The chronicles of Ahom Kings, Buranjis, throw some light on the relations with Ahoms.

There is academia debate as to whether Ahoms are from Thailand or China or even Burma. There are also innumerable literatures available that Ahoms are from Thailand. The focus of the paper is about the Nagas of India’s Northeast, and so, one may wonder why Assam figures out here. The answer is simple, that the entire Northeast India was under Assam province during the British time. Therefore, for easy understanding and convenience of study, it is referred as such.

The Ahoms were the first outsiders who came into contact with the Nagas. A Naga scholar, Thohe writes about the Ahoms that they never considered the Nagas as conquered subjects in their association for nearly 600 years (1228-1819 A.D.). Whereas, Verrier Elwin writes a bit different about the Ahoms in that he said that Ahom king regarded the Nagas as their subjects and took taxes from them in the form of slaves, elephant tusks, spears, hand-woven cloth and cotton. However, it is believed that only some section of the Naga villages who lived in the periphery of present Assam state came into contact with Ahoms, while the rest of the Naga villages were not into contact with the Ahom king. Therefore, it is not sure, which were those Naga villages that encountered the Ahoms.

In British time too such similar nature of administration was also adopted where some part of the Naga areas remained ‘unadministered’. This was so done as the Nagas were so possessive and protective of their territory which the mighty British were not allowed to infiltrate fully in their land.

Theoretical Framework :

The Nagas as understood in different perspectives :

The Nagas, they claimed, have their own history. There is Naga perspective, Burmese perspective and Indian perspective about Naga nationalism which are mutually contradictory (Chiru, S.S., 2007). The underground Naga national movement observes: “The truth is with us and it shall stand untarnished beyond the interests of the power politics that has overshadowed the magnitude of the Indo-Naga case for scores of years. To the Naga underground point of view, the truth they uphold has been the historical fact which India has been undermining by its consistent affirming that India has inherited Nagalim from the British Imperialists, and the claim made after 18 years that the Nagas “accepted the Indian constitution.” The Nagas reject these contentions and have critically expressed their anger by stating that India “shamelessly installed puppet state in 1963 and with the help of over 200000 occupational armed forces and few traitors who were in the pay roll of the Indian Government have controlled the region (Souvenir NSCN-IM, 2009)

Meanwhile, Indian and Burmese Governments are committed to uphold the sovereignty of state and federal unit. Therefore, the Nagas who live in India and Burma had the only option of evolving themselves into Indian and Burmese state system. Any independence movement of Naga was presumed anti-national and anti-state. Freedom and statehood for the Nagas was envisaged within the framework of Indian Constitution and federal system. Thus there emerges a conflict and

violence between Naga national movement and Indian state (Chiru, 2007). The recent Indo-Naga Peace Treaty (Pan Naga Framework) is one of the theories evolved analogous to European Union. In that member countries came together for common cause. India shares sovereignty with the Nagas, wherein certain common security related would be shared with between India and the Naga state. This Framework Treaty is aimed at establishing Pan Naga without any boundary being drawn, but to benefit all Naga inhabited areas in the Northeast India. But Nagas insisted for integration of the Nagas contiguous areas in Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, and Nagaland state. This paper deals with all possible political alternatives for the Nagas in India and beyond. To my mind, all demands from India by federal units roughly take fifty years to realised as average time duration. Except that Sixth Schedule of the Indian constitution for Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland (Nagas in Nagaland refused and adopted analogous Commutization system of their own) etc. which were created in 1950s of the 20th century by Independent India.

Preceding Acts to the Sixth Schedule or Autonomous District Council Acts :

Following some tribal unrest developed arising out of internal quarrels among the Zamindars on collection of revenues, in 1815 the Company's apex authorities at Calcutta appointed David Scot, a Magistrate of Rangpur, to make an enquiry into the tribal unrest in Garo Hills and to get an understanding of the administrative problems in the region. The Report of Scot submitted in August 1816, recommended, among other things, to separate certain tribal areas from the district of Rangpur and to place them under the charge of a separate officer to be designated as 'Civil Commissioner of North-East Rangpur'. This Recommendation of Scot was accepted and approved by the Governor General-in-Council, and was implemented.

Soon after, this scheme for separate administration of the tribal areas and Regulation was considered to have laid the foundation for a separate pattern of administration of tribal areas of the north east India under the British rule.

The Regulation X of 1822: The Scot Recommendation for separate treatment of the tribal backward tracts of the north east India was incorporated into the Regulation X of 1822. The Regulation opened with these words: "There exist in different part of territories subordinate to the Presidency of Fort William races of people entirely distinct from the ordinary population, and to whose circumstances therefore the system of Government established by the General Regulation is wholly inapplicable." The Regulation stated that the tribes inhabiting the 'North-Eastern Frontier' including "the Garrows and similar rude tribes" required different system of treatment from the general Regulations and that the tribes should not be made dependent on the Zamindars of the British provinces. Therefore the Regulation laid down that "With a view, therefore, to promote the desirable object of reclaiming these races to the habit of civilized life, it seems necessary that a special plan for the administration of justice, of a kind adapted to their peculiar customs and prejudices, should be arranged and concerted with the headman, and that the measures should at the same time be taken for forcing them from any dependence on the Zamindars of the British provinces". The Regulation deemed it indispensable to suspend the operation of the existing rules for the administration of civil and criminal justice, and generally of the Regulations of Government within the tract of country comprised in or bordering on the hills and jungles occupied by these tribes, and to appoint a Commissioner with full power to conclude arrangements with the chiefs, and to conduct the entire administration of the tract in question, subject only to such orders and instructions as he may receive from time to time, from the Governor-General-in-Council." To this end, the Regulation laid down Rules to govern the specified hill tracts and "the race of mountaineers and rude tribes"

inhabiting therein. This Regulation of 1822 clearly indicated a policy for a different pattern of administration for the tribal areas of north-east India (separated from the general population under general Act and law) to be followed by the British administration. On the basis of this Regulation, a new form of administration was introduced, described as the ‘Non-Regulated System’ – in which the powers of Collectors, Magistrates and Judges were centralized in the same hands.

Government of India Act of 1833 and 1853: It appeared that the Government of British India had strong inclination to acquire more control over the ‘backward tracts’ though these tracts were then under the authority of the East India Company (till 1858). The British government enacted the Government of India Act of 1833 and 1853 which entrusted the Governor-General-in-Council to make laws for the ‘backward tracts’ (tribal territories of the north east India) although the territories were not yet under the British sovereign. Actually the British government took over the said backward tracts from the Company in 1858, following the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. Naturally, question was raised about the legality of such laws made by the Governor-General-in-Council in respect of the tribal areas which were under the Company (and not under the British sovereign). Therefore the Indian Councils Act of 1861 was enacted, with provisions validating such impugned laws.

The Garo Hills Act, 1869: The next step of the British policy of exclusion of tribal areas from the general administrative set up (initiated by the Regulation of 1822) took place in the form the Garo Hills Act, 1869. The Act removed the Garo Hills “from operation of general Regulations and Acts” and “from the jurisdiction of the Courts of Civil and Criminal Judicature and from the control of the offices of revenue constituted by the Regulations of the Bengal Code”. The responsibility of administration of Civil and Criminal justice, the superintendence of settlement and realization of the public revenue within the said territory were vested in the officers to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor. The Act also provided that the Lieutenant Governor had the powers to extend any of the provisions of this Act to the Jaintia Hills, the Naga Hills, and the Khasi Hills. This was indicative of the British intension to exclude all the tribal areas from the purview of general Regulations and Acts, and to put them under a different pattern of administration and create separate procedural machinery for the administration of criminal and civil justice in the tribal areas of the northeast.

The Scheduled Districts Act, 1874: In February 1874, the management of Assam was taken out from the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, and Assam was formed into a separate administrative unit called the ‘Chief Commissionership of Assam’. Soon after this separation, the Scheduled Districts Act 1874 was enacted in April, the same year. The main objective of this Act was to remove the uncertainty which had existed regarding the actual operation of a number of laws in various parts of the British India. The uncertainty had related to the local enforceability of the enactments and even as regards their being in operation or not. The Act sought to remove such uncertainty and confusion. In this Act, the term ‘Scheduled Districts’ was introduced and used to mean “those remote or backward tracts or provinces of British India which had never been brought within or had from time to time been removed from the operation of the general Acts and Regulations and jurisdiction of ordinary courts or in which that operation was not complete, and officers were supposed to be guided by the spirit of indispensable laws, or were actually guided by such laws as had somehow or other been considered to be in force.” The Act vested in the local government the power to declare as to which laws were in force or not in force in certain specific areas in question, and also the power to extend to any Scheduled District or to any part thereof, any enactment which was in force in British India. Under this Act, the entire Chief Commissionership of Assam was declared as a ‘Scheduled District’; and along with it ‘Garo Hills’, ‘North Lushai Hills’, ‘Mokokchang

Subdivision of Naga Hills District', and 'South Lushai Hills', and parts of Chittagong Hill-tracts, were also made Scheduled Districts.

The Assam Frontier Tracts Regulation 1880 empowered the Chief Commissioner of Assam to remove any part of that area from the operation of the laws and Regulations in force therein. The Preamble of the Act stated that it was expedient "to provide for the removal of certain frontier tracts in Assam inhabited or frequented by barbarous or semi civilized tribes from the operation of enactments in force." In other words, the stage of backwardness of the tribes of such tracts was given as the reason for such separate treatment of them.

The Montague-Chelmsford Report of 1918 which recommended for reforms in the British India, was in favour of continuance of the erstwhile British policy of separation of the tribal tracts from the operation of general laws and Regulations. The Report stated that there were certain backward areas (tribal hill tracts) to which the political reforms could not apply as the people of these areas were primitive and "there was no material on which to found political institutions." The Report recommended that such tracts should be administered by the Governors.

The Government of India Act 1919 incorporated the recommendations of the Montague-Chelmsford Report. The accepted recommendation in respect of the 'backward tracts' was framed and inserted as 'Section: 52A' into the pre-existing Government of India Act 1915, and by inserting this Section (52A) into the Act of 1915, it became the Government of India Act 1919. Section:52A clause (2) of the Act of 1919 provided that "the Governor-General in Council may declare any territory in British India to be 'backward tract' and that any Act of the India legislature shall not apply to the territory (declared as backward tract) in question, or any part thereof."

In exercise of the powers provided under Section: 52A of the Act of 1919, the Governor-General in Council specified and declared the following tribal inhabited territories of Assam as "backward tracts":

- (1) The Garo Hills District.
- (2) The British portions of Khasi and Jaintia Hills District (other than the Shillong Municipality and Cantonment).
- (3) The Mikir Hills (in Nowgong and Sibsagar Districts).
- (4) The North Cachar Hills (in Cachar District).
- (5) The Naga Hills District.
- (6) The Lushai Hills District.
- (7) The Sadiya Frontier Tract.
- (8) The Balipara Frontier Tract.
- (9) The Lakhimpur Frontier Tract.

This specification of the tribal territories as "backward tract" as a separate category of area different from the general population under the British administration, may be considered as the seed for the future "Tribal Areas" specified under the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution of independent India.

It may be noted here that the consolidation of the British colonial rule and administration in north east India from 1765 onward, took a long time – different parts of the region came under the British rule at different point of time. The Britishers established their rule over the Assam Plains in 1826, Cachar Plains in 1830, Khasi Hills in 1833, Jaintia Plains in 1835, Mikir Hills (now, Karbi Anglong) in 1838, North Cachar Hills in 1854, Naga Hills (now, Nagaland) during 1866-1904, Garo Hills in 1872-73 and Lushai Hills (now Mizoram) in 1890. A number of changes took place in the form of administration over Assam. On February 6, 1874 the management of Assam was taken out

from the Lt. Governor of Bengal and put it under a separate Chief Commissioner. In 1905, when Bengal was partitioned, Assam was made a part of the Province of Eastern Bengal. In 1912, Assam was once again made a separate unit under a Chief Commissioner. Finally, under the provision of the Government Act of 1919, Assam became a Governor's Province in 1921. All throughout these stages of administrative, political and constitutional development, the British had a continuity of policy for a separate management of tribal affairs and tribal areas of the north east India.

The Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, otherwise commonly known as the Simon Commission, examined in details, among other things, the political and administrative status of the tribal areas called the 'backward tracts' which were specified and declared under the Act of 1919. In its Report, the Commission stated that there were 'backward tracts' (as specified and declared under the Act of 1919) in five of the eight Provinces of British India, namely, Assam, Bengal, Bihar & Orissa, Punjab and Madras, comprising 120000 square miles with a population 11.25 millions. [The rest three provinces (*viz.*, Bombay, the United Province and the Central Province) did not have backward tracts.] Of these, the whole of Assam backward tracts alone covered 50,000 square miles with a population of half a million tribesmen.

The Commission found that these backward tracts were not included within any constituency and had no vote for election to the provincial legislatures. However, the Commission considered that these backward tracts needed to continue to be excluded from the general constitutional arrangements. The Commission reasoned that "the stage of development reached by the inhabitants of these areas prevents the possibility of applying to them methods of representation adopted elsewhere. They do not ask for self-determination, but for security of land tenure, freedom in to pursue their traditional method of livelihood, and the reasonable exercise of their ancestral customs. Their contentment does not depend so much on rapid political advance as on experienced and sympathetic handling, and on protection from economic subjugation by their neighbours."

The Commission also suggested certain principle of policy that "the responsibility of Parliament for the backward tracts will not be discharged merely by securing to them protection from exploitation and by preventing those outbreaks which have from time to time occurred within their border. The principal duty of the administration is to educate these peoples to stand on their own feet, and this is a process which has scarcely begun." Considering the question as to what kind of arrangement should be made for the backward tracts in connection with the constitutional changes which the commission was going to propose, the Commission recommended that a strong centralized administration would be desirable for the backward tracts for the reason that "the typical backward tract being a deficit area, no provincial legislature is likely to possess either the will or the means to devote special attention to its particular requirements."

The Government of India Act, 1935: Consequent to the Simon Commission Report, the Government of India Act, 1935 was enacted. In this Act a chapter was devoted for the matter of backward tracts (tribal areas).

Accepting the recommendation of the Simon Commission Report, the Act of 1935 abandoned the terminology of "backward tract" and replaced by a new terminology for the tribal areas as "Excluded Areas" and "Partially Excluded Areas" — thereby specifying them into two categories. These tribal areas were excluded from the purview of the provincial legislature. The "Excluded Areas" were to be administered by the Governor himself in his discretion (without the advice of his ministers); and the "Partially Excluded Areas" were to be special responsibility of the Governor, despite the advice of his Ministers. "No Act of the Federal Legislature or of the Provincial

Legislatures shall apply to an excluded area or a partially excluded area”, unless the Governor directs its application to any part of the areas. The Act of 1935 also empowered the Governor to make regulations for the “peace and good governance” for any part of the Excluded or Partially-Excluded Areas, with prior sanction from the Governor-General. Under the Act of 1935, ‘The Government of India (Excluded and Partially Excluded Areas) Order, 1936’ was promulgated which specified the following tribal areas as Excluded areas and Partially-excluded areas:

The Excluded Areas were:

- 1) North-East Frontier (Sadiya, Balipara and Lakhimpur) Tracts.
- 2) The Naga Hills District.
- 3) The Lushai Hills District.
- 4) The North Cachar Hills Sub-Division of Cachar District.

The Partially Excluded were:

- 1) The Garo Hills District.
- 2) The Mikir Hills in the Nowgong and Sibsagar District.
- 3) The British portion of the Khasi and Jaintia Hills District,
(Other than the Shillong Municipality and Cantonment.)

The Indian (Provisional Constitutional) Order, 1947: In the wake of Indian Independence, the Indian (Provisional Constitutional) Order was promulgated. In respect of the ‘Excluded Areas’ and ‘Partially Excluded Areas’, this Order retained by and large all the provisions of the Act of 1935, except that the discretionary power of the Governor over the Excluded Areas was omitted. Under the provisions of this Order, the position of the excluded areas and partially excluded areas during the interim period (1947-1950) just prior to the enactment the new Constitution of free India, may be described – 1) that the laws enacted by the Federal or Provisional legislatures did not apply ipso facto to these areas; 2) that a specific procedure was provided to apply such laws with or without modification; and 3) that the Governor was vested with wide powers to make regulation.

A critical analogous relook : Analysis :

Nehru is seen in children’s books setting free a bird from the cage as lesson to be learnt in freeing India from British bondage. In contrast to this, for Naga freedom, he said, “Even if heavens fall Nagas will not be given Independence.” I have the liberty to start with Mahatma Gandhi and his famous quotation:” Nagas have every right to be independent. We did not want to live under the domination of the British and they are now leaving us. I want you to feel that India is yours. I feel that Naga Hills are mine just as they are yours, but if you say, ‘It is not mine’ then the matter stops there. I believe in the brotherhood of man, but I do not believe in force or forced Unions. If you do not wish to join the Union of India nobody will force you to do that.” Perhaps, Gandhi never wanted India being created in forced Union. When United States of America was created, it was created through the voluntary federation of the units and the Union, each having its own constitution (Except that she never expected India would be heading for successful democracy. But again, democracy is not only holding regular periodical elections through successful management of mammoth electorate). Whereas, in India’s case it was purely forced Union. Some states were reluctant to join Indian Union. Pandit Nehru, the first Prime Minister of free India forced them at gun point to sign the instrument of accession into Indian Union (A section of Manipuris reject the state’s merger with the Union of India in 1949 as a pact signed ‘under duress’). That time, Nagas were located at different geographical areas (continues to be so: Nagas wanted and demanded since the start of their independence movement in the early twentieth century, their contiguous areas to be carved

out as their ancestral geographic location, which was promised in 1963) as some settling in Myanmar in the erstwhile Indian sub-continent and some others in Assam Province, and yet still some in the Princely state of Manipur, which was independent of itself from the British India and also in Independent India till 1949. Nagas along with the Meeteis in Manipur were subjugated in 1826 through the Treaty of Yandabu signed between the British India and the Burma (Ava). And even in the Princely state of Manipur, Nagas were never administered by the Maharaja of Manipur. So was Nagas in erstwhile province of Assam during British India.

The Nagas maintained a separate administration, run in the village republic, somewhat akin to the Greek city states of both the Athens and of the Spartans. Nagas resembled Athenians in administration and Sports. But they were headhunters. In this war loving aspect, they resemble Spartans. They hunted each other's head for fertility of humans, crops, prosperity, and women's hair for decorative motif on attackers' side. And on the defenders' side reduction of population in humans and crops as they were defeated weaklings. They were war-like, and to that end, they resembled Spartans (Spartans were fond of war contrast to Athenians, who were not known but for their games and sports including Olympics originating from Athens). In these resemblances with the great civilization, though there were other world civilizations having similarities and dissimilarities, Nagas were stiffly resistant or opposed to anything outsiders. These included outside their villages, keeping aside or forget about other non-Naga communities. In defense of this independent attitude and outlook, Nagas under the liberal leadership of the Naga leaders who were forced to expose to foreign countries of Europe as Labour Corps in First and Second World Wars, formed a Naga Club with the British patronage in 1918 and submitted a memorandum to Simon Commission in 1929. After the Second World War, similar organization called Naga Hills District Tribal Council was formed by Charles Pawsey, Deputy Commissioner of Naga Hills in 1945, but later in 1946 this Council was changed into Naga National Council (NNC).

Naga Independent Movement :

During this period of Armed-Chair method of Naga freedom movement in first half of the 20th century A.D. till the formation of Naga National Council under A.Z. Phizo, Naga Raj theory under Jadonang who claimed as Messiah King also existed. This movement was a synthesis of animism and Hinduism called 'Haraka Cult' which was religious movement opposing British rule in India. Coincidentally, it was during Gandhi Civil Disobedience movement. Later Rani Gaidinliu played a gallant role in continuation of the movement till she was jailed. Pandit Nehru gave her the title 'Rani', thus Rani Gaidinliu. In mid 1990s her stamp was released by the Government of India, which was initiated by the then Minister of State for Home Affairs, Government of India, Prof. M. Kamson. She was also a Tamrapatra recipient. Recently her coin was released by the Government of India, after Prime Minister, Narendra Modi visited Northeast India.

Nagas were fighting independence movement parallel with Indian independence movement. Mahatma Gandhi wanted to win independence in a peaceful manner through non-violence. He spearheaded the cause of Apartheid i.e., racial discrimination in South Africa by minority Whites over majority Blacks. He came to be known as champion of non-violence. In India, Gandhian philosophy was widely accepted, particularly by the liberal Nagas in its freedom movement. Gandhi visited Assam province in 1921 for advocacy of non-cooperation and khadi movement (it also coincided with Montague-Chelmsford reforms). Personality like Gandhi who saved Assam and Assamese entity from sinister Grouping Plan of the Cabinet Mission (Assam with West Bengal) re-visited in 1926, where he declared self-determination for India and did not a quince the Montague-

Chelmsford Reforms and grant of Indian self-government in driblets in the form of diarchy or double governments in 1918.

In the Naga home front, personalities like Rev. Longri imbibed principles of Gandhi (Gandhi was an associate of Leo Tolstoy, who was an advocate of Jesus Christ's principles of non-violence and peace). Later, in Silver Jubilee Celebration of India's independence in 1972, Longri cited Gandhi's saying: "If I were appointed a dictator for a one hour for all India, the first thing I would do is to close down all liquor shops without compensation" (Longri, 1970) Rev Longri denounced violent method of A.Z. Phizo in the later part of 1940s. Naga Church under him played balanced role between Naga rebels and the regular Indian army till his death in early eighties of the 20th century A.D.

On the other hand, A.Z. Phizo made a debut in 1946. He joined Indian National Army of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and aligned with Axis Powers in the Second World War. He resigned from NNC and formed Naga Clan Council in 1948 with the aim to demand complete independence from India. Again in 1950 he became President of Naga National Council and took plebiscite claiming 99 per cent were for Naga Independence. This was conducted in 1950 after all memoranda of the Nagas were all dumped in from 1929-1947.

His much criticized violent method emerged out of the ill-treatment of the various memoranda submitted to British India and later Independent India, with immediate cause of violent method was reaction of draconian measures like violation of human rights through imposition of 1950s Arms Acts in the Northeast India (Assam). India has been devising divide and rule theory in dealing with the Nagas insurgents. And this is a similar case applicable too in territorial demarcation of the Naga contiguous areas scattered to different geo-political nations (Nehru seemed to have devised Swiss pattern of inter-locking and over-lapping case of the Nagas settlement in different states and countries).

But for the first time Indian government applied unite and rule policy as Naga insurgent groups were asked to solve their differences and come to negotiating table as Prime Minister, Atal Behari Vajpayee was keen in solving the Naga issue. This keenness of the then Prime Minister of India was revealed when in interview of T. Muiva as it appeared in the *Northeast Sun*, January 1-14, 2002 which goes this way: "Sure we have started discussing the substantive issues," remarked the Underground leader, T. Muiva. On the uniqueness of the Naga issue, he said, "... it means that India has to understand that and if they participate in the talks and they approach the Naga issue from their (Indian) constitutional perspective that is not acceptable to us. It is not a case of separation, and it is not a case of secession. It must be understood by them. And we have managed to make this point clear to the Prime Minister, Vajpayee" (*Northeast Sun*, 2002) Added to this latest Magazine report that 30-paged point was submitted and was under the scrutiny of the Home Ministry and Law Ministry. Among others the points to be discussed include Foreign Affairs, Security, Citizenship, flag etc. With Chief Minister, Jamir withdrawing all cases pending against Muiva in Nagaland and T. Muiva's visit to the state was seen as a satisfactory process of talks with India thus far (*Northeast Sun*, 2002; Chiru, S. S., 2007). With cease fire extended till today and the same holds true with Khaplang faction the unity among the factions also somewhat improved. However, recently in April 2015 this faction has abrogated the cease-fire with the government of India (Khaplang faction of Burmese based joining hands with Meetei militant factions like KYKL and KCP claiming that they neither joined India nor Burma as their respective land was independent of itself). Whereas, so far NSCN(I-M) is concerned, the inter-governmental talks between the various parties, particularly the NSCN(I-M) and government of India, headed by the Modi government appointed interlocutor,

which presently parleying in hectic impromptu meetings and discussions revealed in the recent media report, Nation, that Modi government would take 11 months to solve the Naga issue including integration of the contiguous areas, which was promised in 1940s and in 1963, respectively (Modi kept his word and signed Pan Naga Peace Treaty Framework).

Conclusion :

Learnt from the history of the Northeast India, parochial analogous American constitution of the affirmative action plan for the Red Indian was adopted by B.R. Ambedkar, the framer of the constitution of India. Later in due course of time, other reasonable offers were extended to the Nagas, but were turned down by Naga underground leaders in the hope of sovereign country for the Nagas. The issues discussed in this paper are random, sketchy recommendation for alternative political arrangements for the Nagas. It may be further pointed out that for Nagas, who formed sizable numbers in Manipur, some kind of administrative status may be evolved to address the disparity in development issues, and Sixth Schedule of the Indian constitution or separate administrative mechanism that forms upgraded Article 371 C of the constitution of (probably Jammu and Kashmir Status under the provision of exemption of Article 238 (This Article which was included in PART VII has been repealed by the Constitution Seventh Amendment Act, 1956, Sec. 29 and sch. w.e.f., 1-11-1956, and the power of Parliament is limited to make laws for the State on some transitory matter in Article 370) India. Another way of looking at Naga political alternative arrangements could be confederation of Naga areas without being disrupted of the existing boundaries. This can be either dealt by Articles 2, 3, and 4 or some other administrative mechanism that can be evolved. Still another form of administrative mechanism for alternative political arrangement of Manipur hills could be even in the form of Union Territory status for the Manipur Hills. Above all, the most longstanding demand of Nagas is the promised merger of Naga contiguous areas. This can be dealt with Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the constitution of India or Protectorate Status which still holds relevance. The present Pan Naga Peace Treaty Framework may be relooked at analogous to European Union and other similar transnational citizenship, identity, and culture where shared sovereignty in security, communications, and defense so on and so forth can possibly resulted into.

REFERENCES

- Adhikari, O.S. (1988). Four Immigrants Tribes of Tripura. Tripura: Directorate of Research, Government of Tripura.
- Aggarwal and Kailash, S. (1999)(eds.). Dynamics of Identity and Inter-group Relations in North-East India. Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla.
- Ahmed, Mehtabuddin *et al.* (1996)(eds.). The Turbulent North East, New Delhi.
- Allen, B.C. (1905). Gazetteer of Naga Hills and Manipur. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.
- Ao, Lanunungsang, A., (2002). From Phizo to Muivah: The Naga National Question in North-East India. Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
- Balwally, Darshan (2003). Growth of Totalitarianism in Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Nagaland. Spectrum Publications, Guwahati: Delhi.
- Banerjee, Amalesh (2004) (eds.). Decentralised Planning and Development. Kanishka Publishers, Distributors, New Delhi.
- Barman, Debapriya Deb (1983). Treatise on Traditional Social Institutions of the Tripuri Community. Directorate

of Research, Government of Tripura, Tripura.

- Barpujari, H.K. (1996). *Assam in the Days of the Company*. North Eastern Hill University Publications, Shillong.
- Barua, Hem (1954). *The Red River & The Blue Hill*. Laywer's Book Stall, Guwahati.
- Baruah, Sanjib (1999). *India against itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Basu, Pradip Kumar (1996). *The Communist Movement in Tripura*. Progressive Publishers, Calcutta.
- Bathla, Har Bhagwan (1994). *Panchayati Raj and Political Parties: An Empirical Study at Grass-roots Level in Haryana*. Nirmal Book Agency, Kurukshetra.
- Bhan, Susheela (1999). *Impact of Ethnic Violence on Youth: A Study of Tribal-Nontribal Violence in Kokrajhar, Assam*. Shipra Publications, New Delhi.
- Bhattacharjee, Chandana (1996). *Ethnicity and Autonomy Movement*. Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Bhattacharjee, Prodip Nath (1987). *The Garos of Tripura*. Directorate of Research Tribal Welfare Department, Government of Tripura, Agartala.
- Bhattacharjee, Prodip Nath (1983). *The Jamatiyas of Tripura*. Directorate of Research, Agartala.
- Bhattacharjee, Prodip Nath (1983). *The Jamatiyas of Tripura*. Directorate of Research, Government of Tripura, Tripura.
- Bhattacharjee, Pravas Ranjan (1993). *Economic Transition in Tripura*. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Bhattacharyya, Hiranya Kumar (2001). *The Silent Invasion: Assam Versus Infiltration*. Spectrum Publications, Guwahati: Delhi.
- Bhaumik, Subir (1996). *Insurgent Cross Fire: North-East India*. Lancer Publishers, New Delhi.
- Bhuyan, B.C. (2003). *Political Development of the North East*. Omsons Publications, New Delhi.
- Bhuyan, *et al.* (1999) (eds.). *Political History of Assam*. Vol. III. (1940-47). Publication Board Assam, Guwahati.
- Bhuyan *et al.* (1999) (eds.). *Political History of Assam* Vol. II 1920-1939. Publication Board Assam, Guwahati.
- Bhuyan *et al.* (1999) (eds.). *Political History of Assam* Vol. I 1926-1919. Publication Board Assam, Guwahati.
- Bordoloi, B.N. (1972). *District Handbook: United Mikir and North Cachar Hills*. Tribal Research Institute, Shillong.
- Bordoloi, B.N. (1984). *The Dimasa Kacharis of Assam*. Tribal Research Institute, Assam.
- Bordoloi, B.N. *et al.* (1987). *Tribes of Assam Part- I*. Tribal Research Institute, Guwahati.
- Bordoloi, B.N. *et al.* (1988). *Tribes of Assam Part-II*. Tribal Research Institute, Guwahati.
- Bordoloi, B.N. (1991). *Tribes of Assam Part-III*. Assam Institute of Research for Tribals and Scheduled Castes, Guwahati.
- Brown, R. (2001). *Statistical Account of Manipur*, Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
- Burman, B.K. Roy (1995). *Bhuria Committee Report: A Critique*, Panchayati Raj Update, Institute of Social Science, New Delhi, May- June.
- Chaube, S.K. (1973). *Hill Politics in Northeast India*. Orient Longman Limited, Patna.
- Chatterjee, Suhas (1994). *Making of Mizoram: Role of Laldenga* Vol. I, M D Publications Pvt Ltd., New Delhi.
- Chatterjee, Suhas (1994). *Making of Mizoram: Role of Laldenga* Vol. II. M D Publications Pvt Ltd., New Delhi.
- Chakravarti, Mahadev. *The Tribal Areas Autonomous District Council and the Tribal Problems: A perspective* (Agartala: Information, Cultural Affairs and Tourism Department, Government of Tripura)
- Chauhan, Abha (1999). *Tribal Women and Panchayati Raj in the Scheduled Areas of Madhya Pradesh*,

- Women's Link, July- September, 1999.
- Chiru, S.S. (2007). American Baptist Mission: An Integrating Agent of the Nagas into Indian Union, Sunrise Publications, New Delhi.
- Constitution of India: The Fifth Schedule and the Sixth Schedule / and relevant Provisions of the Constitution.
- Datta, P.S. (1993) (eds.). Autonomy Movements in Assam. Omsons Publications, New Delhi.
- Dutta, N.C. (1997)(eds.) Politics of Identity and Nation Building in North-East India. South Asian Press, New Delhi.
- Darlong, Letthuama, The Darlongs of Tripura (1995). (Agartala: Directorate of Tribal Research Institute, Government of Tripura. Datta, A. M. (1987) A Study on the Lushais of Jampui Hills in Tripura (Tripura: Directorate of Research, Government of Tripura.
- Das, Samir Kumar (1997). Regionalism in Power, Omsons Publications, New Delhi.
- Das, Gurudas (2002) Research Priorities in North-East India: With Special Reference to Arunachal Pradesh. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
- Debates of the Constituent Assembly (1946-47).
- Debates of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha.
- Debates of the State Assemblies of Arunachal, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura.
- Dena, Lal, ed.(1991). History of Modern Manipur 1826-1949. Orbit Publishers-Distributors, New Delhi.
- Deva, Naoroibam (1998). Urban Settlement System of Manipur, R. K. Sachirani, Imphal.
- Endle, S. (1990). The Kacharis. Low Price Publications, New Delhi.
- Gangopadhyay, Niladri Sekhar (2002). Insurgency and Media: A study on Tripura, Agartala: Nabankur.
- Gangopadhyay, D. K. (1990). Revenue Administration in Assam. Revenue Department, Government of Assam, Assam.
- Gassah, L. S. (1999). Survey of Research in Political Science on North-East India 1970-1990. Regency Publication, New Delhi.
- Gassah, L.S. (1997). (eds.) Autonomous District Council. Omsons Publications, New Delhi.
- Gassah, L.S. (1992) (eds.) Regional Political Parties in North East India. Guwahati: Omsons Publications, New Delhi.
- Gassah, L.S. (2001). Research Priorities in North East India: With Special Reference to Mizoram. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
- Gassah, L. S. (1998) Traditional Institutions of Meghalaya: A Study of Doloi and his Administration. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
- Gohain, U. N. (1942) Assam Under the Ahoms. Spectrum Publications, Guwahati.
- Gopalkrishnan, R. (1995). Insurgent North-Eastern Region of India, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Gopalkrishnan, R. (2001). Research Priorities in North-East India: With Special Reference to Assam. Regency Publication, New Delhi.
- Government of India. Report of the Working Group on Development and Welfare of Scheduled Tribes during 8th Five Year Plan, 1990-1995. Ministry of Welfare, P-1.
- Gurdon, P. R. (1990). The Khasis. Low Price Publications, New Delhi.
- Hazarika, Sanjoy (1995). Strangers of the Mist: Tales of War & Peace from India's Northeast. Penguin Books, Assam.
- Hunter, W.W. (1879). A Statistical Account of Assam Vol. I. Spectrum Publications, Guwahati: Delhi.

- Hunter, W.W. (1879). *A Statistical Account of Assam Vol. II*. Spectrum Publications, Guwahati: New Delhi.
- Hudson, T. C. (1911) *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*. Low Price Publications, New Delhi.
- Hudson, T. C. (1908). *The Meitheis*. Low Price Publications, New Delhi.
- Hussain, M. (1993). *The Assam Movement: Class, Ideology and Identity*. Manak Publications Pvt. LTD. & Har-Anand Publications, New Delhi.
- Jain, S. C. (2000). *The Constitution of India*, New Delhi.
- Johnstone, James. *Manipur and the Naga Hills*. Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Kyndiah, P. R. (1994). *Mizo Freedom Fighter*. Sanchar Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Kyndiah, P. R. (1999). *Pillars of Mizo Society and Thoughts to Share*. Secretary Law and Parliamentary Affairs Department, Government of Mizoram, Mizoram.
- Luthra, P. N. (1971). *Constitutional and Administrative Growth of the North-East Frontier Agency*. North-East Frontier Agency, Shillong.
- Mackenzie, Alexander (2001). *The North East Frontier of India*. Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
- Marwah, Ved (1995) *Uncivil Wars: Pathology of Terrorism in India*. Harper Collins Publishers India, New Delhi.
- Misra, Udayon (2000). *The Periphery Strikes Back: Challenges to the Nation-State in Assam and Nagaland*. Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla.
- Ministry of Tribal Affairs. Reports of Govt. of India.
- Mukul. Tribal Areas: Transition to Self- governance. *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 3, 1997.
- Nag, Sajal (1998). *India and North-East India: Mind, Politics and the Process of Integration 1946-1950*. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
- Namo, Dalle (1987). *The Prisoner From Nagaland*. United Publisher, Nagaland.
- National Consultation on Draft National Tribal Policy. New Delhi. 2006.
- Nepram, Binalakshmi (2002). *South Asia's Fractured Frontier: Armed Conflict, Narcotics and Small Arms Proliferation in India's North East*. Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
- Nuh, V. K. (1986). *Nagaland Church and Politics*. V. Nuh & Bro., Nagaland
- Parliamentary Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes. Reports.
- Pakem, B. (1997). *Insurgency in North-East India*. Om Sons Publications, New Delhi.
- Pandey, B.B., Duarah *et al.* (1999). *Tribal Village Councils of Arunachal Pradesh*. Itanagar: Directorate of Research, Government of Arunachal.
- Pandey, B. B. (1997). *Status of Women in Tribal Society: Arunachal Pradesh*. Itanagar: Directorate of Research, Government of Arunachal Pradesh.
- Pandey, B. B. (2001). *Wander Land: Arunachal Pradesh*. Itanagar: Directorate of Tourism, Government of Arunachal Pradesh.
- Prasad, R. N. and Agarwal, A.K. (2001). *Administrative Review: Special Issue on Judicial Administration in Mizoram Vol. VI*. The Indian Institute of Public Administration Mizoram Regional Branch, Mizoram.
- Prasad, R. N. and Agarwal, A. K. (1995). *Landmarks: A Study of Public Administration in Mizoram*, Aizawl.
- Rafiabadi, H. N. (1988). *Assam From Agitation to Accord*. Genuine Publications & Media Pvt Ltd., New Delhi
- Ray, A.C. (1972). *States of our Union Mizoram*. Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Roy, Jyotirmoy (1958). *History of Manipur*. Manipur.

- Ray, Animesh (1993). *India-The Land and the People: Mizoram*. National Book Trust of India, New Delhi.
- Savyasaachi (1998). *Tribal Forest dwellers and Self- rule: The Constituent Assembly Debates on the Fifth and Sixth Schedule*, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
- Scheduled Areas And Scheduled Tribes Commission. (1960). *The first Report*
- Scheduled Areas And Scheduled Tribes Commission. (2002-2004). *The second Report*.
- Sema, Piketo (1992). *British Policy and Administration in Nagaland 1881-1947*. New Delhi: Scholar Publishing House.
- Sharma, S. K. *et al.* (1998) *Documents on Sikkim and Bhutan*. Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
- Singh, Bhupinder (2002). *Autonomy Movements and Federal India*. Rawar Publications, Jaipur & New Delhi.
- Singh, K. S., ed., (1996) *People of Tripura Vol. XLI*. Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed., (1994) *People of India: Meghalaya. Vol. XXXII*, Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed. (2003). *People of India: Assam Volume XV Part Two*. Calcutta: Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed. (1993). *People of India: Sikkim Vol. XXXIX*. Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed. (1995) *People of India: Arunachal Pradesh Vol. XIV*. Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed. (1994) *People of India: Nagaland Vol. XXXIV*. Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, K. S., ed. (1995). *People of India: Mizoram Vol. XXXIII* . Seagull Books, Calcutta.
- Singh, Rajkumar Manisana (2000). *A Short Constitutional History of Manipur 1891-1971*. Imphal.
- Singh, R.G. *et al.* (1915) eds., *History of Tripura*. Tripura State Tribal Cultural Research Institute & Museum, Tripura.
- Singh, S.K. (2000). *Panchayats in Scheduled Areas, Status of Panchayati Raj in States and Union Territories*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- Srivastav, Nirankar (2000). *Survey of Research in Economics on North East India 1970-1990*. New Delhi: Regency Publications.
- Syiemlieh, R. David (2000). *Survey of Research in History on North-East India 1970-1990*. Regency Publication, New Delhi.
- Thomas, C. Joshua *et al.* (2001). *Constraints in Development of Manipur*. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
- The Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. *Reports*.
- Verghese, B.G. (1997). *India's North East Resurgent: Ethnicity, Insurgency, Governance, and Development*. Konark Publishers, New Delhi.
- Vision-2020 (2008). *Development of North East Region (DoNER)*.
- Zehol, Lucy (2001). *Research Priorities in North-East India: With Special Reference to Manipur*. Regency Publications, New Delhi.
