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CONCLUSION

Manipur being a state inhabited by different ethnic group has been with many problems that are mainly of political, economic, social and ethnicity in nature. So assertion of interest and reaction of it among the ethnic group and in between hill and valley are in an on going and continuing process. It now has assumed a completely spiral character. Such conflict situation threatens peaceful, jovial and prosperous lives of all groups. In such situation of conflicts, it is possible to study the genesis and measures of it, which restore the glorious past and revive the traditions of peaceful co-existence and accommodation of reasonable interests. If one trace back to find out the genesis of it, he comes to realize that it is the identity crisis and its political implication because of Manipur being composed of different ethnic groups, ethnicity becomes an important instrument in demanding economic and political upliftment, which consequently leads to the consolidation of each
ethnic group. These ethnic loyalties and ethnic problems were at the centre of scale of Manipuri's politics, because it openly threatened the territorial boundary of Manipur. As consequence, the communal politics, that never appeared in Manipur in the past, rooted deeply and began to spread in the mindsets of each of the groups.

In the olden days, people are associated with geographical territorial unity, common historical background and common interest by conceiving them in the womb of parochial political culture though they are geographically classified as hill and valley people. The hill areas covering ninety percent of the states area is inhabited by two tribal groups i.e. the Naga group of tribes and the Kuki group of tribes, while the valley is dominated by the Meiteis. Today a good numbers of tribal population are occupying many precious areas of valley. Yet the Manipur has not officially hill tribes and plain tribes like its counterpart northeastern states of Assam. These ethnic groups with passage of time are at stake to preserve their separate identity because of not
having common political culture and common political socialization with the Meiteis. It leads to harboring of different political aspiration and interest. These are the outcome of colonial British administration in the past. Before the British colonial rule, the king of Manipur with his sixty-four phamdous (Nobility appointed by the kings including Chieftains of hill areas) ruled the State without any interference. The State functioned internally supreme and externally independent. But it was vanished after British conquered Manipur in Anglo-Manipuri War in 1891. Naturally the British always administered their occupied territories by divide and rule policy in order to control them. So during the British colonial rule, the tribals of the hill areas were administered under a common administration system separated from the valley. And the valley was ruled by the native King. Such type of bifurcation and having different administration in one State was completely ended when Manipur had its own constitution, the Manipur Constitution Act 1947 and the Manipur Hill People Regulation Act 1947. It was drafted by
both hill and valley people for the interest of Manipuri Meitei, Manipuri Naga, Manipuri Kuki and Manipuri Muslim. According to this Act, under Article 17 the seat allocation in the Assembly was in the ratio of 30:18:3 between General, Hills and Mohamadans with an additional two seats to represent educational and commercial interests. The member was elected by adult – franchise. Towards the end of 1948, Manipur became a constitutional monarchy with a legislative Assembly consisting of 53 members including 18 hill men. It was dissolved after the annexation of Manipur to India and Chief Commissioner took over its administration. In it, there was no Manipur Assembly because of its part C State status. It was the same administration of the British by sending their political agent to Manipur.

Such step-motherly treatment of the centre was sincerely criticized by some attentive peoples of Manipur. Still they are lamenting about such civilized venture towards democracy. It means that they are compelled to launch armed resistance in order to regain the lost sovereignty of
Manipur. So it is true to say that the armed struggle started by Irawat from the later part of 1948 and formation of Meitei State committee in 1960, United National Liberation Front (UNLF) in 1964 and People Liberation Army (PLA) in 1978 have been articulating the same argument and aspiration. They justified their struggles on its importance of being a historically evolved state. It is a unique character of Manipur from their counterpart of the rest of NE States with the exception of Tripura and Assam. For Tripura, everything is on grave as their reaction came very late after the scenario went out of their control. They now have been completely marginalized and reduced to the status of microscopic minority both in terms of numerical preponderance as well as financial affluence in their own native land.

Here, my finding is that the root cause of this entire social, political and economic crisis in India's Government policy which has been pursuing experimentation of integrating the region to the mainstream by playing politics of Divide and Rule Policy copied from their erstwhile British
colonial master. Still India's attitude towards the North-Eastern states is in favour of 'accident and force' and strongly against the 'reflection and choice' of the people. From our short span of historical experience of British colonialism and democratic deficits like internal colonialism of India, we come to understand that such democratic constitution neither guarantee democracy nor however carefully crafted, does it necessarily reduce conflict. The main issue is that there is no democratic politics in the democratic constitution. So the problem is the politics of institutional choice not redesigning the existing democratic polity. The victims are the people of NE in general and Manipur in particular because people are sandwiched under the frozen layer of so called neo-colonialism, even the identity crisis in Manipur, the manifestation of the struggle for reinvention of constitution and redesigning of it. Truly speaking, in such situation as a natural corollary the subsequent policy of the Government of India has been to turn 'the principal antagonistic contradiction' to 'non
principal antagonistic contradiction' by making voluminous of internal contradiction. So people are crying for unity of their brethren communities and even for the protection of territorial boundary.

Unfortunately majority of the ethnic groups of the region are unable to realize such intention of the Government. Nevertheless a few attentive public and social activists from both hill and valley are at stake for bringing unity, through discussion and criticism and people to people dialogue. It means starting from the desire for Unity, resolving contradictions through criticism or collective struggle and arriving at a new unity on a new basis. From the successful historical experience of many conflicts – torn countries of the World like South Africa, Ghana, Uganda, Bosnia – Herzegovina, we learn that the correct method of resolving contradictions among the people is to start from the desire of unity in order to bring permanent unity, meaningful development and peace. In short we have to make two vivid road maps, one to overcome Government's Divide and
Rule Policy and another to resolve internal contradiction among us.

Therefore many scholars and social activist from hill and valley of Manipur are engaging themselves in the process of criticism. The manifestation of ethnic nationalism and identity crisis are natural outcomes of such criticisms. Many books may have been written with accumulated discontentment’s, as well as a good numbers of seminars, meetings and discussion were being organized with the conceived ideas that without this unity brought by criticism, any struggle is certain to go of hand.

Further a part from identity crisis is associated with Nation Liberation question, the genesis is the democratic constitution without democratic politics. The past decades have witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of ruling elites to their country describing themselves as democracies. Nearly everywhere, it has been argued, liberal representatives democracy has been accepted as the best method of managing political affairs. Yet the spread of
democracy has been far from smooth. Authoritarianism, poverty, identity crisis manifested in the form of irreconcilable conflicts and human rights violation have still been the dominant characteristics of politics in large parts of the country more so to North East in general and Manipur in particular. As politics of exclusion, some of the challenges identified in the present study faced by the people have to be understood.

In this discourse, a humble effort has been made to draw a distinction between institution and politics. The central argument put forward in the present study is that the spread of democratic institution does not necessarily mean the spread of democratic politics. Significant factors for arriving at the stated arguments are given below by confining to theoretical perspective of it in order to identify the reality as amicable solution of all forms of conflicts in the region:
a) The meaning of democracy including the distinction between democratic institutions and democratic politics;

b) The extent or 'depth' of democracy it is considered how far the actual practice of democracy is consistent with aspirations for democracy, especially in terms of the way disadvantaged groups experience citizenship;

c) The web of relationship between democracy and social equity: It is analysed whether democracy as a system can reconcile conflicting expectations regarding redistributive policies and economic growth;

d) The conflict management effectiveness of democracy; its capacity to promote the resolution of conflicts through democratic institutions and debate, rather than violence.

Meaning and Models in relevance with Democratic Institution and Democratic Politics

From the very beginning of polity, basically it has been a contested concept, arising historically from struggles against despotic rule and social injustice. That is, it was democratic politics which produced democratic institutions.
Yet at the same time the institution most associated with modern democracy—free elections, political and civil rights protected under the rule of law, and so on—were shaped through the efforts of dominant groups to regulate popular participation. They wished to ensure that democracy did not interfere with emerging capitalist markets, and did this by making a sharp distinction between the public sphere of politics and administration and the private sphere of the economy and family lineage. Such western liberal democratic views are deeply rooted in the Indian polity also. But we are out of the democratic goals, which are created by our democratic institutions. The goals are as follows:

1. To enable participation either directly or through elections;

2. To avoid tyranny by autocratic rulers and (in some democratic systems) by the majority;

3. To promote open and fair competition for power on the basis of the popular vote;

4. To ensure the accountability of governments;
5. To provide a forum for rational discussion of political problems and settlement of conflicting social interests.

In spite of having such goals of democracy, the trend in the Indian political system is not commendable at all. We have been witnessing violence, castiesm, feudalism and communalism in the electoral process. Even in this 21st century, the Government always suppresses the reactions of the masses against the Government (both centre and state) if they deviates from the willingness of the masses. Here one should be aware of not confusing the achievements of any modern country with the achievements of democracy itself. It is true that in the setting-up of steel mills, in the establishment of hydro-electric power project for the production of electric power, in the manufacture of railway locomotives, in the field of increase of road mileage and in certain other fields the country has registered important advances (like knowledge economic sector - Information technology, communication and telecom services, Media
and entertainment etc). But these achievements which the country has registered need not necessarily be interpreted as achievements of the democratic system. Any efficient political system has to show such advances if it is to subsist. The totalitarian system or even a monarchical system in the twentieth century has to show such advances. But economic achievements in different sectors should not be confused with or interpreted as advancements brought about by democratic machines or due to the democratic practice. Without in any way minimizing the great achievements that have been brought about in the country economic life, we have to analyse the democratic process and to find out its trends. So far as this aspect is concerned, one should be perturbed by the rising divisive and separatist tendencies in the country. Democracy believes in the growth of community which aims to achieve consensus on the important issues and which tries to solve political problems by reference to debates, discussions, argumentation and referendum in place of the arbitrary pressure techniques of
organised coercion and violence. Separatism which seeks to subvert the sense of the community is a dangerous trend (Political aspirations of north east and its armed struggle). But most of the scholars of the region are not pessimistic because they are on the positive side of the democratic experiment. Basically above the democratic institutions why not our political leaders should play democratic politics. Until and unless if that is so, such undesired elements should come up in the democratic polity. For making the political actor an important citizen or attentive public who can participate in the political process and contribute the quota of his wisdom and experiences to the making of decisions in the country, we have to do a formidable job. That requires tremendous spirit or sacrifice and dedication. Only then democracy can succeed. Otherwise divisive, separatist, oligarchic, plutocratic, feudal, mercenary and other perverse forces will retard the process of the triumph of the common man which is the ideal of democracy. That means we need to see democratic politics in democratic institutions.
Politics can be defined as the struggle or competition for power or for access to rulers and collective goods. Yet not all forms of politics are democratic, even inside the formal structures of democratic institutions. According to Beetham, democratic political practices require not only political contestation, but also that contestation be tempered by certain basic moral and political principles, including popular control (over government and political elites) and political equality (among all citizens). That is to say, they aim to hold democratic institutions to their democratic promise by:

- Ensuring open and effective challenges to governments and their policies through free and fair elections, the party system and other forms of political contestation;

- increasing citizen participation, so that the exercise of power at all levels of political authority is based so far as possible with citizens;
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• Maximizing the accountability and transparency of the holders of political power and bureaucratic office, at all levels of government;

• Guaranteeing equal political and civil rights for all citizens, together with the basic social and economic entitlements that enable to fully exercise these rights;

• ensuring fully inclusive citizenship, based on respect for gender, cultural and other differences;

• Providing accessible procedures through which these rights and entitlements can be guaranteed, not just through the courts, but also in day-to-day relationships with agents of the state;

• assuring effective citizen redress against infringements of rights by private (especially corporate) interests as well as by the states;

• increasing the accountability of such corporate interests, above all where they impinge upon the public domain and citizens rights.
Democratic politics as thus defined include, are broader than, the processes of political contestation which inculcate vibrancy for enlivening liberal democracies. They depend upon a culture of participation, including a range of mechanisms-pluralistic media, an active civil society, competing political parties, etc. – through which all citizens can, if they want, acquire a political voice. It is through democratic politics that government and more broadly, democratic institutions acquire legitimacy, are made accountable to their citizens, and can in turn regulate powerful private interests.

This definition of democratic politics includes the capacity of citizens (acting independently or through government) to hold powerful private interests as well as agents of the state to account, for three main reasons,

First, in a globalized world the traditional distinctions between state and market, public and private, around which liberal democratic institutions have been constructed, have become blurred as corporate interests have rolled
back the frontiers of the public domain. Second, democratic polities cannot be confined to the terrain of national government, when the real levers of political power may lie elsewhere – for instance in the corporate economy, mass media and international financial institutions. Third, recent years have seen the emergence of new forms of democratic politics linking grassroots campaigns across national boundaries and developing norms of global governance in order to influence the behavior not only of national governments, but also of transnational corporations and international institutions.  

But here some notes of caution need to be added. First, neither democratic politics nor democratic institutions can be replacements for each other. The pitfalls of engineering democratic institutions are amply illustrated in the case studies presented in this work. But equally, attempts to construct popular or participatory ‘alternatives’ to liberal

democracy based on grassroots empowerment of ordinary citizens, as in Tanzania, Nicaragua and Uganda, have not proved sustainable when they have neglected democratic institutions. Hence, although we stress the role of democratic politics, the crucial issue is how it can enliven democratic institutions; and how the latter can in turn hasten democratic politics.⁴

A further caveat is that different stands of democratic thought emphasize different aspects of democratic politics, and these may clash or contradict each other. Some regard political contestation as the essence of democratic politics; others emphasize inclusion and participation. Some again, would confines democratic rights and freedom to the political or public sphere—in contrast to those who argue for an expanded conception of rights under which freedom from poverty and gross social equality are seen as basic entitlements of democratic citizenship.

From foregoing some details about democratic institutions and democratic politics, one could safely conclude by saying that in a politically and culturally diverse country like India, in which both the Government and super imposition of globalization recreates social differences as fast as it breaks them down, there is not, and probably cannot be, universal agreement on the goals of democratic politics, nor on the institutions which can best express them. Western liberal democracy, to be sure, is currently the paradigmatic form of democratic governance. But there are immense dangers in imposing it uncritically on non-western societies with scant regard to the later own historical experience of struggles against tyrannical rule and efforts to develop their own forms of democratic politics. So the question of democratising democracy and politics of inclusion are coming up. The answer should be integrative consensual power sharing. That means most of the attentive public are heeding or third species of majoritarianism. The same view is reflected in the mind sets of North East people because they
are fighting against structural injustice. So we prefer to take the politics of inclusion as our starting point, rather than starting with institutions and asking what residual spaces are left in which citizens may exercise their entitlements. Hence it is better to focus on four main questions:

- How can the basis of citizenship be expanded to give citizens (especially the oppressed people of North East) a more effective political voice and stake in government;
- How can the accountability of governments and their responsiveness to citizens' interests and needs be increased;
- How can democratic institutions be designed so as to create expanded spaces for political contestation and debate;
- How, at the same time, can democratisation from below be harmonised with stable, effective governance, without which it is difficult to translate
the entitlements of citizenship into policies that actually benefit the mass of citizens.

These questions are raised about the meaning and quality of democracy, not just in fragile, contested democracies in India - where democratic institutions may co-exist with political violence, human rights abuses, discrimination against minorities, excessive influence of military and security services and non-accountability of public officials.  

An important tradition of 'democracy realism' in democratic theory holds that such deficits are normal features of representative democracy. Being above all a system of political competition, the later does not encourage, nor is it intended to encourage high popular participation in the affairs of government, so it is argued. To be sure, governments are legitimized by themselves exercising continued suffrage at times of elections. Elections,

---

together with a constitutional state and the rule of law prevent tyranny. Yet democratic institutions do not stand or fall by their success or failure in empowering citizens, enabling participation or assuring economic and social justice. On the contrary, disputes generated by the unequal distribution of wealth and power have always been the stuff of democratic politics. What distinguished the latter from other forms of politics is that these disputes are settled through coercion or violent conflict. It indicates that we are in the democratic polity having full of deficits. The idea of democracy in parts may be used to provide a differentiated account of the quality of real-world democracy, based on an inventory of ‘democracy deficits’.

From this foregoing analysis on democratic institution without democratic politics, one may focus on the phenomenon of identity crisis associated with insurgency in north east in general and particularly in Manipur. Needles to say, there has been a plethora of theoretical perspectives that have been utilized from time to time to explain the
phenomenon of identity crisis with insurgency. That is why the stress has been given to the democratic institution and democratic politics; because the two sets of questions are deals with these issues. The centre of all these arguments is related with democratic deficits. It is the correct logic behind the discourse of identity crisis and political implications of it. During the last decades, Manipur has experienced crucial transformation in various domains of its political existence. Many movements were launch to eliminate king’s rights. The formation of state as a part of Indian union, active participation of people for changing monarchy to people representative government, have brought significant changes in the attitudes of the masses as political actors with participant political culture. But the government response of spoon feeding like giving part ‘C’ state, union territory and finally statehood creates accumulated discontentment’s to the masses. The best example may be cited that the granting of statehood to Nagaland was in 1963 while Manipur was in 1972. As consequence, Naga people of
Manipur (Manipur Naga) conceived the ideas to merge with Nagaland. Both the political status was demanded by the people of each state with struggle. Only different thing is that Nagas were on the path of violence and Manipuri's were on non violence. Such type of transformation is not democratic at all. For Manipur as sovereign state became part 'C' means third class status, it had not its own assembly. After passing 3rd Five Year Plan economy of India, Manipur got statehood. Then there were not social justice, political and economic also. These are all democratic deficits. So it is better to see some elements based on an inventory of democracy deficits.

First, democracy means little to ordinary citizens if they do not enjoy equal rights and entitlements as citizens; either because constitutional and legal arrangements fail to guarantee these rights; or because they are excluded from the public sphere due to societal inequality, lack of organisation, cultures of intolerance or violence.
The second crucial form of democracy deficit is the inability of citizens to hold governments and political elites accountable for their use of power. This may stem from procedural defeats as may occur in voting systems or decentralisation provisions or it may reflect weak societal support for democracy—citizens may have little effective choice between alternative political programmes; civil society may be weak and divided; or the power of dominant economic interests may be disproportionate.

A third type of democracy deficits are on the terrain of high politics and manifests itself in the weak horizontal accountability of over powerful and potentially tyrannical executive’s vis-à-vis the legislature or judiciary. This may be due to weak constitutional and legal checks and balances—but it may also be because they are circumvented by government patronage, corruption, judicial inertia, weak opposition parties or co-opted media.\(^6\) In short such stain of

---

democratic deficits and unaccountability of government are not easy to increase in contemporary polity.

The fourth one is the international accountability dilemmas associated with globalization. Both national governments and indeed international institutions often lack the formal mandate to deal with pressing global issues. Moreover, the policy space within which they can take decisions has shrunk due to global economic forces or the power of multinational enterprises, making it even more difficult for citizens to hold them to account.

If these democracy deficits tend to be less glaring than those of authoritarian systems, democracies nevertheless vary between those where deficits are so deep that democratic institutions are little more than a formality, and those whose governments remain (despite their shortcomings) in some real sense accountable to their people.

Where, then can democratic politics start; How can it begin to close these deficits; Liberal democracy's own
institutions and procedures provide an entry point, in that they create spaces for political debate and decisions. But they are not the only spaces that are open. How they are used depends on whether citizens themselves can be mobilized for collective political action.

Truly speaking, democracy deficits could be analysed by depicting sharing of citizens in the spaces for democratic politics associated with vertical or horizontal accountability of rulers to citizen and international accountability. If one did so, who could find democratic institutions without democratic politics. That is also the genesis of all forms of conflict situation in North East including armed conflict. That is why the four contemporary debates about democracy, namely: what does democracy mean; how far do democratic values and institutions penetrate society; how far do democracy provide conditions for effective anti- poverty policies; and how far do they help resolve or provoke new forms of conflict. Cutting across each of these discussions has been a distinction between democratic institutions and
democratic politics. This distinction is a reminder that democratization is not just a process of implanting formal institutions of liberal democracy, but a project of norm creation and cultural change.

Democracy and Identity – based Conflicts (Problem or Solution)

In any conflict situation, one should not assume that it should be social conflict only. Besides, one should take care of political conflict i.e. National Identity conflict. In support of this argument, everybody branded cultural minorities as permanent “national minorities” alongside the cultural majority as the nation. Moreover the former is heeding in the process of state formation through the nation state paradigm: a nation is a cultural community living on a common territory. And its self-determination requires that it should create its own state. That is the main issue of North East also. But today’s democracy having more decentralised forms in name becomes oppression and the factors for escalation of political violence. States, it is argued, are especially at risk from political violence whose ‘structural root
causes’ are to be found in power struggles between ‘different identity groups’. The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) in one of its publication cited that some 80 per cent of major conflicts in the 1990s had a clear identity component. In this ‘clear identity component’, secession is only the means for that. So their alternative frame is independent.  

The term “Secession” is most often used to refer to a declaration of intent by a minority community to pursue independence. This is a distinct and specific kind of ethnically-based political mobilization. Secessionist activities can broadly be classified into two distinct categories. One of these categories has to do with peaceful conduct of secessionism while the other refers to incremental secessionism that involves a gradual transformation of an ongoing peaceful secessionism into increasing violent political activity aimed at independence. Given this
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difference, however, both kinds of secessionist movements must be based in a well-defined territorial location for a collectivity and a sizeable minority to act concertedly. A secessionist movement cannot survive for long if it lacks three essential characteristics. It must have a degree of in-group legitimization that endorses the aims and means of the conflict. Along with it, it must be capable of posing a viable military threat. Additionally, it should receive tangible political support from external states.

In so far as the question of the factors that are supposed to be causing a collectivity to rise in insurgency is analysed, one could broadly identified four distinct theoretical perspectives on the reasons. They are primordial, instrumental, structural and politico-economic.\(^8\)

**(a) Primordial:** The primordial is considered to be the prime factor in the rise of insurgency. It is argued that people’s ethnic and religious identities have deep social, historical
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and genetic foundations. Further more, motivation for ethnic and kinship affiliation comes from these subjective, psychological forces, internal to the individual and related to basic human needs for security and more importantly survival, so armed conflicts in the North East has its root in desire for independence. But their aspirations, goals, values and needs are systematically denied by the modern nation. Focusing his attention on international law, Ryan argues that self-determination is a key legitimizing principle for political management and organisation.  

(b) **Instrumental**: Instrumental perspective refers to those ethnic groups who are led to take recourse to collective action for a particular objective. The basis of collective action is ethnic identification that is reinforced and brought into active political play as well as maintained through collective action for realizing a well defined set of objective. Conflict arises because certain demands made by ethnic groups then to be ignored for long. It is quite likely that

---

certain advantages are denied to these grounds simply because their identity is quite different from groups based on class or occupational grouping. And when their perceived grievances arising from a sense of deprivation remain unattended for long, they are compelled to act politically. When such groups act politically the ground of ethnic conflicts shift from the cultural, linguistic or religious interests to the political, material and territorial appeals for self-determination. It leads the politicisation of these groups for safeguarding or obtaining entitlements. As a result of this shift, the groups engage in such political actions as protest, rebellion and non-violent action for either protesting entitlement previously enjoyed or as a way of gaining new entitlement.

(c) Structural: Generally the third approach to the understanding of conflict is mainly concerned with the social aspect only like race, class and merit or any other. Besides structural inequalities or social order, one could not ignore the structural injustice of democratic institutions like
executive, legislative and judiciary because the basis of economic periphery and accumulated political discontentment's arises from these organs. Since any particular pattern of the distribution of all values has ingrained in it in a varying degree of inequality, this gives rise to the perception on the part of those who feel disadvantaged by the pattern of distribution of being discriminated against. When this perception is widely shared by a large number of the members of the disadvantaged group, political action becomes inevitable. In case peaceful political action proves ineffective, the struggle may graduate into violent struggle.

(d) Politico-economic: The last important approach is related with certain factors of political economy. If economic benefits are not equally available to all, it raises the cry of injustice. The main reason is neglect to see production relationship. The government should not ignore the people who involve in production, their status and economic standard. Moreover unequal distribution of values should be
checked as far a possible. Otherwise the role of government in the distribution should be deemed at all. That means they are compelled to react on large scale against the system.

From above theoretical perspective of emergence of conflict situation, we come to understand that the people of North East are fighting against the structural injustice with relative deprivation based on rational choice theory. But the government of India did not address the issue of redesigning democracy by providing democratic politics. As a fall-out of counter insurgency measures adopted in the region, the maximum number of youth becomes drug addicts and internal contradiction among the ethnic groups becomes increasingly voluminous day by day. Even the peace initiative done by the government turns to negative without delivering and addressing social, economic and political justice.

So the thrust of study of North East is democratic institutions without democratic politics. All are confined to the study of its implication and failures. In short the matter is
concerned with the absence of democratic politics. Democracy deficits are more in majoritarianism. In addition to it, it needs to ponder why disaffected minorities have taken up arms against the state in so many new dimensions. The case against it is that it consistently excludes minorities from power and offers them insufficient protection from hegemonic majorities. Under qualified majoritarianism or democratic counter-majoritarianism a range of devices may be wheeled in to remedy the defects of majoritarianism. The less radical accept the basic principle of majority rule, but modify it to assure better political representation of minorities and more plural, decentralised centers of power. There is, however, no single recipe for constitutional engineering, which should take account of a country’s history, socio-economic structure and depth of inter-group polarization. The following is a menu of the constitutional, legal and political options that might be considered by a democratic mechanism aiming to curb the political excesses of majoritarian governance.
• Strong, constitutionally guaranteed human rights protections; These are both desirable in their own right and can reduce minority fear of discrimination and state persecution.

• Affirmative action measures to reverse legacies of discrimination, or to assure inter-communal balance as under the 'federal character' principle supposed to govern the allocation of political and administrative appointments.

• Horizontal accountability of the executive to the legislature and (via an independent judiciary) to the constitution can help restrain government tendencies to resort to populist electoral appeals in disregard of minority rights.

• The embedded autonomy of state bureaucracies is another important protection against the arbitrary use of power by majoritarian governments, providing an inbuilt capacity to resist attempts by governments to impose discriminatory policies and practices,
construct patronage systems and engage in corruption.

- Democratic control over the armed forces and police is often crucial in ensuring that they are not used as human rights abuses and ban the conflict.

- Plebiscite for right to self determination of independence, though still it is debatable, should be supported by the Government in order to bring the ultimate conclusion in the conflict situation where the proposal of historical right is so strong. Otherwise the conflict should be spiral and hang up so long time. Instead, dominant approach will lead tendency of anti- establishment to the masses. It will strengthen the organised class termed as oppressor.

- Peace- building and democratisation is also important device to resolve or transform the conflict situation. Peace does not mean only stopping the war alongside with that people should get structural justice otherwise no one does maintain peace with
the expenses of his fundamental freedom. The shortcomings of existing democratic institutions, including their inability to manage political violence, are another less often considered source of conflict. Sometimes the problem may not be with democracy as such, so much as with the lack of democratic politics within facade polity. The main problem is often with particular forms of democratic contestation, notably under majoritarian 'winner takes-all' institutions. It hurts the participatory democracy, which demands alert, empowered and conscious citizens. In an era of 'Right to Information', it is important for citizens to be aware about the system's outcomes that have deeper implications for them. A sound political culture demands a feedback from the masses for adaptation and integration for the system's input-output functioning. Members of a political community provide important inputs that connect them with political system. This is the
successful history of democratic politics. But for the people who are living in the North East India, all are in vain. People's voice is remaining confined only in this region which boundary is surrounded by good numbers of foreign countries.

Moreover all forms of conflicts with high tone of identity crisis also seems to be the counter insurgency measures to make voluminous internal contradiction in order to degenerate the Principle antagonistic contradiction to non principle antagonistic contradiction. It also leads to micro level of exclusive politics verses inclusive politics, in between hill valley relationship. The Manipuri Meitei are claiming periphery to the Indian union. In the same vein, the Manipuri Nagas and Manipuri Kukis claimed themselves as periphery within periphery. So our political aspiration is to fight against the structural injustice and all these are manifestation of having democratic institution without corresponding democratic politics.