CHAPTER - V
CONCLUSION

Contemporary ethnic conflicts in state and international system are a part of heritage of imperial conquest, colonial rule and frontier settlements. The enormous diversity within the societies like India, ethnic based issues and demands have brought fundamental changes. These are evident from the ongoing ethnic tensions and conflicts. Each ethnic conflict arises in a distinctive historical and social setting, because of culture, association with a specific territory and solidarity. The sense of separate identity and grievances that results from imperial conquest and colonial rule persist for many years. This has provided the fuel of present political ethnic movements.

The study aims at developing expertise in map making on Indo-Naga issues so that tools of conflict resolution and peace building can be effectively employed. It suggests that the hegemonic strategy by India has not been helpful on the Naga side. The study sees an opportunity for leaders who are committed to peace and stability but also understand the sources of power in Naga society and can control the continuing strategic element in the process of negotiation. There is need also to constantly stretch the Naga intellectual horizon for understanding the different tracts of international and national
progress towards peace, and also tackle the more fundamental social
class inequalities prevailing in Naga societies. The Naga movements
should articulate the need to monitor violation of human rights by the
states and the militant groups. Since such a violations are no longer
tolerated by the world community.

In the context of the Nagas, their early societies have
characterized by practice of head-hunting between and within the
tribes. The Nagas were neither in a position to be united nor did they
reach or felt the need to organise themselves under one banner. They
remained untouched and cut off from the higher civilization.

But the advent of the British and their administrative system
has created the sense of ethnic consciousness and separate identity
amongst the Nagas. They felt themselves to be bound together by
common ties of race, history and culture. Thus ethnic consciousness
is a dynamic factors of the growth of Naga Nationalism.

Interestingly, during the British colonial rule in India, they
hardly attempted to conquer and control over the Naga hills. From
1879 to 1945 they could not make any agreement with the Nagas as
their subject. They occupied only some parts of Naga Hills for their
administrative convenience, loosely administered and treated
separately the Nagas as a different ethnic stock with the plain people.
This feelings of ethnic identity or consciousness of their being
different from others was largely responsible for the Naga National
Movement. Also at the same time on the eve of First and Second World War the Nagas got opportunities to come in contact with the civilized countries. The experiences gained from the war, while fighting for their national pride, enlightened the spirit of the Nagas to strengthen their oneness and also emphasized the differences with the rest of India. This has contributed to the Nagas struggle for the independence.

The post independent India is marked by the beginning of the Naga’s National Movement. The Naga problem surfaced with the withdrawal of the British India Government. At the time of the British departure, the Naga National Council (NNC) requested for an Interim Government for a specific period of ten years. However, the British India Government refused to interfere in the matter and left the fate of the Nagas in a situation of uncertainty. This has created a vacuum between the Nagas and the Government of India.

In such situation, in an attempt to decide the future of the Nagas, the 9-Point Hydari Agreement was signed in June 1947 between NNC and the Government of India. But the agreement failed to meet the Nagas aspirations. In clause 9 of the agreement, both the parties adopted opposing views to decide the future of the Nagas after the ten years. Whatever the controversy it involves an interpretation of that particular clauses, and therefore this part of the agreement has not been implemented by the then Nehru Government.
It may be said that this has been the turning point in the Naga problem. Had the Government been implemented the agreement, it would have resulted in some concrete outcome shape towards the solution of the Nagas problem. But this opportunity was missed out. Instead it resulted into complication of the issue and widened the gap between the Nagas and the Government of India.

Later on the Naga Hill was included under Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution, without any consultation with the Nagas. But this was considered by the NNC as betrayal of the Nagas by the Government. It is argued that this was contrary to or inconsistent with the 9-Point Hydari Agreement. Resentment to the above arrangement the NNC under the aegis of A.Z.Phizo conducted 'plebiscite' on 16 March 1951 throughout the Naga Hills to decide the fate of the Nagas, as to whether to remain within Indian domination or to go for Nagas Independence. Results showed that 99.9% of the Nagas opted for an independent state.

However the Government of India could not accept this plebiscite results. Instead they viewed that some extremist Nagas were asking for Independence. Indeed, the results of the plebiscite which was tabulated on 16 May 1952 was seen by the Nagas as a people's mandate. Even Eastern Nagas who could not participate also supported the Naga peoples mandate to go for Independent country including all the Naga inhabited areas of India and Burma. Ever since
the Naga problem not only confined to Naga Hills of Assam but also extended to the free Naga Hills.

After this development, the problem spread throughout the Naga Hills. The Government of India however, maintained that Naga hills are a part of India, which has been inherited from the British India Government. On the contrary, the Nagas asserted that it has never been a part of India, and that the Nagas themselves defended their rights, from the time immemorial, free from any alien rule. They further justified their claim that even during the British colonial rule in India they occupied only some parts of the Naga Hills bordering Assam and Manipur and the rest was called the free Naga Hills. Here the agreement arises, this clearly shows that the Britishers had done injustice to the Nagas by handing over the Nagas hills as their own property to the Indian Government. It can thus rightly be concluded that the Naga problem is a legacy of the British Indian Government.

Since the Nagas and the Government of India stood firmly for one right and one wrong, with no meeting points, peace efforts were not successful and remained a pipe dream. It is also argued that the Indian Government was not serious enough to convince the Naga leaders to bring into the fold all contending parties to resolve the problem. Further disagreement with the government of India policy, the Nagas boycotted the first Indian General Elections in 1952. This
was followed up by the Nagas launching non-cooperation movement, protesting to withdraw from the Naga Hills. Following this, in 1953, the two Prime Ministers, Jawaharlal Nehru and U Nu of Burma, visited Kohima, to decide the future of the Nagas of India and Burma. But the Nagas walked out from the public meeting where the two leaders were about to give a speech in front of the Nagas. Such unfortunate incident had broken down any chance of negotiation to settle the Naga issue. Thereafter the punitive measures had been taken up to punish the NNC leaders responsible for the incident by the Government. Despite such measures, the Naga leaders went underground to evade the arrest.

Here it may also be pointed out that the situation was largely created by the inefficiency of the Indian political administrative officers, who could not tackle the problems of the situation in the Naga Hills. Their lack of interaction, judgement and observations of the people created the incidence.

Since then in the early part of 1955 the armed confrontation started between the Naga underground and the Indian security forces from the free un-administered Naga Hills of Tuensang frontier areas. Even during the British colonial rule in India, these areas were not included as theirs and the Nagas were not their subjects.

With a view to crush the Naga resistance, the Nehru Government tried to use the military powers to submit the Nagas. But
when the Nagas revolted against such policy, the full scale Indo-Naga armed conflicts begun throughout the Naga Hills. To subdue the Nagas underground, extensive operations was launched by the Indian security forces. At the same time they mostly committed atrocities on the civilian Nagas without any justification and also hampered the life of the innocent citizens. The argument is that wrong policy was adopted by using the military power to solve political problem in the name of law and order problem, whereas it needed the political solutions. This policy has only aggravated the problems more. The Nagas insurgents started arms and military training from the neighbouring countries to counter the Indian security forces. From this time onward the Naga issue became International, involving neighbours.

However, these confrontationists policy adopted by the Government manoeuvred to win over the educated Nagas and some moderates NNC leaders as well who were protesting against the violent activities in the Naga Hills. Consequently, to that, Nagaland State was created in 1963 by carving out the Naga Hills from Assam, Manipur and NEFA. Those few educated people and moderates Nagas were benefited by the creation of State, but the problems added up throughout the Naga Hills. It may be pointed out that if all these areas were placed under administrative control it could have been much easier to solve the Naga Issues. Indeed the new state was
created but the problems again multiplied within the Nagas as well as with the Indian Government.

Meanwhile, Peace Mission had initiated a dialogue with the Naga underground and Indo-Naga cease-fire agreement was signed for a political dialogue. But peace talks between the Naga underground leaders and the Government of India failed to reach any concrete solution. The main reason of the deadlock was the Nagas wanted only complete independence whereas the Government of India was not willing to grant complete independence to the Nagas. Other reason was if the Government of India considered the Nagas demand, the vacuum would be created which might prove dangerous to the safety of the Indian security which would be filled by the Indian enemies.

Then came the Shillong Accord of 1975, which was signed by some of the underground leaders with the Government of India. But this too also failed to resolve the problem on the grounds that, (1) the signatories were not the true representatives of the Nagas and (2) The Nagas rejected this Accord. This accord led to further complications not only between the Nagas and the Government of India but also amongst the Naga underground. Consequently, misunderstanding arose and the Naga National Movement got fragmented into different groups. NNC, NSCN and NNC-pro-accord and so on. This factionalism led to further confusion among the
Nagas. The consequent mistrust enabled politicians and bureaucrats to ally in some cases patronise a particular factions on specific tribal loyalties, and reinforced tribalism and factionalism.

The Government of India projects the Naga problem as a domestic one. Nevertheless, it involved both India and Burma, politically as well as geographically. For the larger context, the ramification of the Naga movement in both India and Burma involved not only the two big countries but also implicates international actors. The Naga national movement is exploring the possibilities of more and more attention from the International community.

Ethnic conflict can became international on the grounds of:

(a) external power involvement,

(b) security and strategic considerations,

(c) effective humanitarians considerations,

(d) irredentism, and

(e) if the problems are highlighted by international human rights organization.

Like in the case of the Nagas all these factors are involved. Though the Nagas are divided between two countries, India and Burma the demand for a “Greater Nagaland” is clearly linked with the growing tide of Naga nationalism which have succeeded and transcended the inter-tribe differences and rivalries. The word
"Greater Nagaland" includes all the Naga inhabited areas of India and Burma.

The Naga problem is political and not military one and as such it requires political solutions, and should be resolved through peaceful negotiations, mutual understandings and not by armed confrontation. Nagas aspirations and demand cannot be suppressed by armed power nor can the confidence and loyalty be bought through half-hearted developments. This is evident from the continuing Naga problem, which has been going on for the last five decades.

Though there are differences in opinion, many Nagas believe the elite’s and the politicians have betrayed the hopes and aspirations of the people. Although these leaders are in a position to steer the destiny of the Nagas, they have failed to take advantage of the Government of India’s offer. Moreover, people also feel that the elite’s and the politicians have rather exploited them by misusing the persisting tribalism for their own personal gains.

Apart from this, the International communities has also not been able to put enough pressure on the government of India, notwithstanding the fact that many Naga lobbies have been able to create an impact in the International forums. Thus, unlike in the erstwhile Soviet Union, the regional power equation in South Asia is disposed of in favour of the Government of India. As a result many Nagas feel that there should be a free and fresh dialogue between the
Government of India and all the Naga groups. At the same time, Nagas are also of the opinion that, they should have a right to self-determination, through a path of non-violence.

However there is a clear perception that to solve the Naga problem, the main hindrance is a lack of adequate awareness and agreement with regard, to what it takes to build a nation. The very fact that the state of Nagaland was created manifest, the deep-rooted weakness, distrust, tribalism and division within the Naga movement. The signing of the Shillong Accord in 1975 reflect this inherent weakness.

Some Nagas felt that they should not settle for less than, a protectorate status like Bhutan in South Asia. On the other hand the majority of the Nagas did not want to settle without a Sovereign Independent Nagaland, which include all the Naga inhabited areas of India and Myanmar (Burma). Since, the creation of statehood of Nagaland in 1963, it has excluded the Naga inhabited areas within the Indian dominions as well as Naga who are in Myanmar. This is one, of the factor why the problem has not been solved.

In the present context, to settle the Naga problems it is necessary that all the Naga underground factions should participate in any talks or negotiation. Talks, with one factions of the Nagas underground may not, settle the issues as this might again be rejected as the Shillong Accord of 1975, where majority of the Nagas
denounced the accord as 'sell out'. Therefore the Nagas in general felt that unification of all the factions are important, to arrive at a consensus on the objective of negotiation to resolve the problem. If all factions unite and agree on the fundamental demands there are strong possibility of final settlement of Naga problem. To bring all the underground factions NNC, NSCN(IM), and NSCN(K) a Regional Conference is necessary. The organization like Naga Hoho, Church, NGO’s NSF (student organization) and also Important Opinion makers and Elders must play an important role in bringing the underground factions. This are part of two diplomacy.

Theoretical foundation of the process of negotiations and its methods of analysis span a wide spectrum. Negotiation can be treated as part of a larger system or as an object and process in itself to achieve specific political, economic or other aim. There is no single approach to negotiation. Its reality is apprehended only when approached from any directions, depending upon the types and complexity of issue involved.

Dean Pruitt defines negotiations as process by which a joint discussion is made by two or more parties. The parties first verbalize contradictory demands and then move towards agreement by a process of concession making and a search for new alternatives. Similarly, Zarkman and Berman define it as a “process in which

---

divergent values are combined into an agreed decision, and it is based on the idea that there are appropriate stages, sequences and tactics that can be identified and used to improve the conduct of negotiation and better the chances of success".  

Zartman and Berman identifies three stages in the process:
1. Diagnose the situation and decide to try negotiations.
2. Negotiate a formula or common definition of the conflict in terms amenable to a solution.
3. Negotiate the details to implement the formula on precise points of dispute.

Based on the theory it indicates that the Naga issue where it could not be able to diagnose the situation for negotiation, to resolve the issues like the creation of statehood in 1963, and the Shillong Accord of 1975. The first stage has been initiated but not properly done. For the second stage there has been an agreement to proceed for negotiation. However, the parties are not able to bring a consensus on the definition of the conflicts in terms of amenable to solution. Moreover all the concern groups are not involve in the negotiation.

---


The most outstanding characteristic of the disequilibrium in the INDO-NAGA PROBLEMATICQUE is the failure to find a place for Naga values in any of the interrelated projects. The present study is based on our earlier investigation into the history of Naga Peace Ideas and the system of peace values which were reflected in Phizo’s personality. It is our contention that although Phizo became the father of Naga Unrest and Revolution, the characteristics of his personality pointed to a balance of attitudes, values and beliefs which could have laid the foundations of a Naga Peace Movement. If India’s psyche and political structure had comprehended during his lifetime. Autonomy as a mechanism of mediating relations between the Nagas and New Delhi would have help in finding a solution. Phizo’s ideas have a relevance to our contemporary situation, which would include:

- Human Rights
- Elimination of inter-tribal rivalry
- Cultural and educational advancement of Nagas
- Naga self determination/self administration
- India’s security concerns
- Global socio-economic policy
- Global and regional disarmament
- Nonviolence verses syndrome of force and the Nagas
The Church as the centre of social and political power and preservation of peace and freedom

Mechanism of international coordination

It is distressing to observe how a sophisticated democracy like India continued to define in controversial terms. Phizo's peace-related thinking, judgement and expectations. At a time when major shift took place in European peace research in favour of Gandhian and Indian peace-related ideas, New Delhi in its interactions with Phizo subordinated peace values to values to values of stabilization which engendered collective aggressiveness on both sides. The result it was decades of social injustice and political instability among the Naga people. Phizo, on the contrary understood that Naga social reality was formed by a tribes, which in turn were formed by persons in a "conscious process of free action". Both at home and from exile in Britain, he exhorted his followers to respect the rights of the human person to act on behalf of peace both on account of Naga tribal peace values and on account of Christian personalism. It is a continuing fallacy of the Indian bureaucracy to see the Naga problem through the prism of insurgency and violence like in other parts of the country and the world and not to build upon the ideals of Naga tribal humanism and Christian personalism which were always espoused by Phizo when he defended social peace and condemned repression.

If India is to pursue a vision appropriate to the 21 century, the
Naga problem should not remain locked in misguided bureaucratic policies, but should be approached on the basis of moral confidence in the Naga people. The imperatives of a new approach should include:

1. A mandate for making arrangement acceptable to all Naga groups to discuss possibilities that would allow them to sign an interim agreement for autonomy of self-government.

2. A series of unilateral acts by the Government of India to show that they recognised the “historical land inalienable” rights of the Naga people and are willing to create a situation of trust which would move the peace process forward.

3. A series of Confidence Building Measures under the auspicious of an autonomous Naga people’s Development Organisation (NPDO).

4. The NPDO would have full powers over allocation of financial, fiscal, investment and human resources, and also have an international technical support network.

5. A wide range of positive proposals would be developed during the interim period which would be “functional” and would be in four baskets:

   1. Political
   2. Strategic
   3. Commercial and industrial
4. Free movement of the Naga people in the traditional Naga territories across territorial borders

6. To separate the issue of "sovereignty" from the issues of "self-administration" till the time when final talks are held. During the period of interim talks a non-confrontational relationship will be created by creating a balance between the Naga interests and the interests of the Government of India.

7. The International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights will be reiterated by both sides.

8. Naga political activism will not be inhibited by the bureaucratic machine, although the question of sovereignty in relation to other states will not be an issue in the interim period. The focus will be on (a) Naga local security (2) Naga regional stability (c) Naga environmental security and (d) Naga regional political, economic and social networks.

9. To formulate a Naga Charter incorporating the political legacy of Phizo and the new thinking among the Naga intelligentsia and to provide effective tools in the hands of Naga civil society with the following basic assumption:
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i. Resurrection of Naga self-respect

ii. Maintenance of Naga strategic strength against potential risks

iii. Transition to mutual arms reduction talks and ability to secure political agreements without resort to weapons

iv. Rehabilitation of the Naga economy

v. Expansion of cooperation with cross border Naga communities

vi. Transition to partnership relations between political, bureaucratic and military and paramilitary formations

vii. General expansion of cooperation in ensuring mutual security through creation and projection of images of peace and friendship based on Naga peace values.

10. Final talks to realise new structures and processes outside the present constitutional context.