CHAPTER II

NAGA NATIONALISM AND INSURGENCY
Nationalism has been the most powerful political idea of the past several hundred years. The fact remains that nationalism is an idea powerful enough to have induced millions to willingly die in its name. It represents the union of a political phenomenon with the identity of the human being and hence it is a frame of reference for individuals and their societies.¹

NATION

In order to understand what nationalism is, one has to examine the concept of nation. We find that it is the nation or the idea of a nation that usually generates nationalism. Indeed, the concept of a nation is more social than political. Therefore, a nation can even exist even though it is not contained within a particular or served by a given government. It has been generally acknowledged that the most common feature around which a nation is united is ethnic in nature. No wonder, one's nationality can also be expressed in terms of ethnic background rather than citizenship. The reason behind this is that nationalism gives the individual an identity and 'extends that identity into something greater than the self.'

Against this background, any definition of a nation must also take into account the claim of a people living together within a territory, that they are a separate unit and 'seeking a control over their own way of life under the banner of a common organisation.'²

The word 'nation' is derived from the Latin word 'natio' meaning birth or descent. In its etymological sense, the word 'nation' therefore refers to a group of people descended from the same stock. In later usage the term came to embrace such other variables as territory, culture, language, history and so on. It is possible, however that no nation has ever possessed all of these criteria. ³ Convincingly, Isaacs discussed the question of the 'nation' and quoting Carlton Hayes wrote:

In one form or another, the strong identification and feeling of loyalty attached to the idea of the 'nation' has always been present in human affairs. "It has been a mark of nature if not nurture," wrote Carlton Hayes, "for human beings since the dawn of history to possess some consciousness of nationality, some feeling that the linguistic, historical, and cultural peculiarities of a group make its members akin among themselves and alien from all other groups." ⁴

The term 'nation' has been used to denote a human group with the following characteristics:

(1) The idea of a common government whether as a reality in the present or past, or as an aspiration of the future.

(2) A certain size and closeness of contact between all its individual members.

(3) A more or less defined territory.

(4) A certain characteristic (of which the most frequent is language or dialects of a common language) clearly

---

distinguishing the nation from other nations and non-national groups.

(5) Certain interests common to the individual members.

(6) A certain degree of common feeling or will, associated with a picture of the nation in the minds of the individual members. 5

This description is only intended to convey the essentials of the many images of the nation held by the nationalists everywhere. "Any group which does not possess one or more of these features is not a complete nation." 6 The Unrepresented Nations and People's Organisation (UNPO) covenant defines a nation or people as:

A group of human beings which possesses the will to be identified as a nation or people and determine its common destiny as a nation or people, and is bound by a common heritage which can be historical, racial, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, religious, or territorial. 7

This definition stresses the element of self identification i.e. the need for a nation or people to regard itself a people or nation and be regarded as such by others.

Thus, every writer has his own list of parts that go into the making of a nation. On closer examination, it seems, no single part could be shown to be unique or indispensable to nationhood, except perhaps for some version of the idea of a

shared past and a shared common will. Rupert Emerson concludes that "the simplest statement that can be made about a nation is that it is a body of people who feel that they are a nation; and it may be that when all the fine-spun analysis is concluded, this will be the ultimate state as well."8

C.J. Hayes identifies a nation with "a sovereign political state'. In this view every state forms a nation and every citizen is a member of the nation. This definition, of course, is an exclusively legal one, and like many other declarations of legal equality disregards factual inequalities. Many states were or are composed of different nations or nationalities. The Scots and Welsh regard themselves as nation, though they live in a common state with the English.9 However, it must be noted that the concept of a nation is more social than political. As Anthony Smith puts it this way that "the idea of the nation by contrast is fundamentally cultural and social"10 However, nationalism is also a means by which consciousness is construed and cultural is made congruent with the political.

Another scholar, Motyl described nation as a self-conscious cultural community.11 Subscribing to the same view, Akzin holds that 'nations' are simply large, delocalised and politicised ethnic groups.12 This is rightly intended to suggest that

political consciousness is a necessity for evolving of a nation. However, though, on the score of size it is generally plausible assumption that the nation involves societies of substantial magnitude, but since nations range from a million or so people to hundreds of millions nothing approaching precision is possible. Thus this element should not be over-emphasised because for the simple reason that it is meaningless and will lead to further complication.

A number of scholars give a conventional or etymological definition of a nation. One such writer defined nation "as a relatively large group of people who feel that they belong together by virtue of sharing one or more of such traits as a common race, a common language, a common culture, a common history, a common set of customs or traditions."13 A renowned writer on this subject, Rupert Emerson gives a simple yet widely accepted definition of a nation and writes thus-

The nation is a community of people who feel that they belong together in the double sense that they share deeply significant elements of a common heritage and that they have a common destiny for the future.14

Thus almost all writers and scholars do agree on certain essential elements of a nation, usually meaning shared culture, history, tradition, language, etc. Admittedly, Smith writes, "there is a remarkable similarity in the concept of the nation in

its general features in most nationalist thinking."\(^15\) This leads us to reflect on the ideal model of the nation, even though no such nation ever existed in total purity, as a single people, traditionally fixed on a well defined territory, speaking the same language and preferably a language all its own, possessing a distinctive culture, and shaped to a common mold by many generations of shared historical experience.\(^16\) This is in line with the etymological meaning of a nation. Durgess, adhering to the etymological meaning, defines a nation as "a population of an ethnic unity, inhabiting a territory of a geographic unity."\(^17\) A French publicist Pradier-Fodere likewise conceived nation to be primarily an ethnic rather than a politically united aggregation. "Affinity of race, community of language, of habits, of customs and religion, are," he said, "the elements which constitute the nation."\(^18\) Calvo, in his work on "International Law" held substantially the same opinion, emphasizing the fact that the idea of the nation is associated with the origin or birth, community of race, community of language, etc.\(^19\)

A nation, Anderson argues, is an imagined political community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nations will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even


\(^{16}\) Emerson, of. cit., p. 103.


\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 103.

hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives an image of their community. Anderson's definition emphasises the central role played by the image of a nation in creating a national reality. In constructing the image of a nation there are other attributes such as culture, language, history and national consciousness. An imagined community is however not to be confused with imaginary one.

The Nagas living in geographical contiguity, broadly speaking belong to the Mongoloid stock. They also share a common faith and their dialects spring from the Tibeto-Burman group. Udayon Misra admittedly wrote, "if a deep attachment to one's native soil, to local traditions and to established territorial authority can be accepted as marks of nationalism, then the Nagas qualify on all counts." Another person who understood the Nagas and their political struggle was Jayaprakash Narayan (a member of the Peace Mission in Nagaland) who stated that "The Naga people are unquestionably a nation." Anthony Smith, an outstanding theoretician on 'nationalism' classified Nagas as a nation while listing the 'current' movements of other ethnic groups like that of the Kurds, Pan-Arabists, Austrian Tyrolese, Quebecois and Palestinians.

There is no Naga nation in the sense that there is, say a Chinese, or a French nation. Their homeland is divided between

two sovereign countries - India and Burma (Myanmar). The state of
Nagaland, as part of India, has a merely political connotation as
it only consists of those living west of Saramati range. The real
Nagaland-a homeland of all the Nagas exists in the mind of the
people. In fact, it is also essential to the notion of a nation
that it be imagined. "Members of even the smallest nation will
never know most of their fellow members...yet in the mind of each
lives the image of their community." Acknowledging this fact,
A.R. Desai also mentions in reference to the notion of nation
that "a certain degree of common feeling or will associated with
a picture of the nation in the minds of the individual members" is always there.

The Study Group of the Royal Institute of International
Affairs in its report spells out the ingredients of the nation as
follows:

(a) The idea of common government whether as a reality in
the present or past or an aspiration of the future.
(b) A certain size and closeness of contact between all
individual members.
(c) A more or less defined character.
(d) A certain degree of common feelings or will associated
with a picture of a nation in the minds of the
individual members.

24. Horam, M., Naga Insurgency, (Cosmo Publication, New Delhi,
Review by Rod Benson, Journal of International Affairs,
27. Sarhadi, Ajit Singh., Nationalisms in India, The problem
(Heritage Publishers Delhi, n.d.), pp. 74-75.
The Nagas have more or less fulfilled all these criteria and it is in this context that the Naga National Council (NNC), the political wing of the Federal Government of Nagaland (FGN) and now the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) consistently maintained that the Nagas constituted a separate and independent nation. At the UNPO General Conference, Isak Chishi Swu reasserted this fact and stated:

Nagas have their history and it does not admit of any attempts at distortion. Nagas as a distinct nation remains unconquered, unadministered and independent from time immemorial, though this reality is hardly known to the outside world.

In the final analysis, the scholar agrees with Harold R. Isaacs that the "formula whereby a "tribe" or a "people" do or do not become or remain a "nation"* depends mainly on the conditions of power or the lack of it, and the given political circumstances of the time.29 Hence,

No formula, only particular conditions and relations of power and interest, could explain why in the decades following 1945 little Gambia and the tiny islands of Fiji, Nauru, and Grenada could become "nation" while big Biafra could not; why Pakistan, a patchwork of Punjabis, Sindis, Pathans, Buluchis, etc. could become a nation while 'Nagaland',* with its patchwork of separate tribes, could not; Why the Pathans of Pakistan could not have their own Pushtoonistan, at least not yet, while the Bengalis could, after a bloody amputation finally create their own Bangladesh. Tiny Abu Dhabi could become a


* Here Isaacs uses the term 'nation' meaning 'nation-state' and not nation in a social sense.

* Emphasis given by the scholar.
"nation" but the Kurds must still fight on to establish their own Kurdistan. The Filipinos, Indonesians, Burmese, all acquired sovereignty of their own, but not the Muslims of Mindanao and Jolo, the Achinese of Sumatra, or the Kachins, Shans, or other peoples living on lands they held long before there was a "Burma."30

Thus by some unkind fate, all claimants to nationhood or nation-state who are unsuccessful in winning sovereignty for themselves have to remain a mere "nation" in a social sense or an ethnic group. This fate, it should be clear, has nothing to do with whether they are indeed "nation-state" by this or that definition. It has to do only with the fact that at the given time they lack the power or other fortuitous conditions.

NATIONALISM

Before taking up the course of events leading to the assertion of Naga nationalism, it is necessary to survey briefly the concept of Nationalism in general.

Like all social phenomena, nationalism is a historical category. It emerged in the social world at a certain stage of evolution of the life of the community when certain socio-historical conditions both objective and subjective, matured.31 Modern nationalism originated in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the nineteenth century, it became a general European movement,32 and in the twentieth, it has become

one of the most explosive political philosophies that rules the world today.

Nationalism emerged in the West as a result of the decline of the Papacy and the rise of sovereign secular states in the early modern period. The old myth of Christiandom lost its relevance and a new consciousness dawned that informed a person to feel first an Englishman, or an a French and a member of the universal Christian community afterwards.\(^3\) England was the first country in which the feeling of nationalism strongly developed and it was the first to attain the full stature of organized and conscious nationhood.\(^4\) Likewise in Spain and Portugal the national spirit was kindled by various causes and at the opening of the modern age these two countries emerged as fully consolidated nation-states. Garner locates the influence of education and general enlightenment, together with the development of political consciousness and the love of liberty.\(^5\) Thus, he rightly remarked, "the Poles were divided among the aggressors, but they remained a nation, if not a state and the flame which the partition kindled was destined never to be extinguished."\(^6\)

However, nationalism received great impetus after the French Revolution of 1789 that unleashed the forces of unification. Thus, G.P. Gooch could well take nationalism as "a child of the French Revolution."\(^7\) The idea that patriotism is identifiable

---

35. Idem.
36. Idem.
37. Idem.
with devotion to the nation spread widely and became popular in Western Europe only towards the end of the eighteenth century during the era of the French Revolution. It is with reference to this era that the term 'nationalism' can accurately be used for the first time. It is in this context that Rupert Emerson admittedly writes, thus, "for the first time the idea that nation has a natural right of its own and that it is the nation which legitimizes the state began to put forward in the nineteenth century as a proposition of universal validity." In short, the French Revolution spread the idea that the nation has a right and identity of its own.

Soon after the French Revolution, the phenomenon of nationalism flourished throughout the continent. In Italy, Germany, Spain, Russia, and elsewhere, nationalism became a consuming force. Inspired by the French example, the people of Europe began to look upon nationalism as a blessing to be enjoyed by all men.

Nationalism now took the form of a political principle or doctrine, that is, it became the basis of a theory that every people who constitute a nation have a right to be independent and to organise themselves as a separate state of their own creation.

But defining nationalism obviously permits no definitive solution as it is an essentially contested concept. Meanings will vary from person to person and from context to context. No scientific definition of nationalism can thus be devised.

38. Emerson, _cit._, p. 190.
As we would expect, the meanings assigned to nationalism is much scholarship and most political discourse revealed more about the users of the term than about the phenomenon. Of late the emphasis is being shifted from the universal design theories of nationalism to the situationally designed theories of nationalism. The focus is now on the unique elements of particular nationalism in specific periods and territories.⁴⁰

Generally, nationalism is seen as a political doctrine which holds that humanity is naturally divided into culturally distinct nations, and that only legitimate form of government is national self government within the nation state.⁴¹

The power of nationalism, argues Smith, should be attributed to the fact that membership in a nation provides "a powerful means of defining and locating individual selves in the world through the prism of the collective personality and its distinctive culture."⁴² The power of nationalism, according to him can be attributed to the following four features:

1. Membership in a nation promises individuals redemption from personal oblivion.
2. Identification with a nation gives individuals hope of personal renewal through national regeneration.
3. Membership in a nation offers rescue from alienation, solitude and anonymity.

---

⁴¹ Idem.
4. National membership assures individuals that as members they enjoy equal status.

NAGA NATIONALISM

Nationalism is a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a certain stage of history. Nationalism is first and foremost 'a state of mind', an 'act of consciousness'. It stands for all cases where a group of people affirms their rights as separate group.

In the light of the above discussion, the Naga search for political recognition may be an inseparable part of Naga nationalism. "Even if we accept nationality as basically a cultural phenomenon we must concede that in the modern world all nationalities perceive some national rights and view themselves as political group". Nagas have in course of their political struggle extraordinarily displayed this sentiment. A number of scholars like Udayon Misra, M. Horam, Alemchiba etc., a host of foreign writers and scholars and the Peace Mission (a neutral body recognised by the Government of India) explicitly maintained the stand that 'the Naga people are unquestionably a nation' even in modern sense of the term, essentially because of its distinctiveness in all spheres which marked it off from other groups. In fact, 'in most European languages the Nation refers very specifically to the ethnic group'. Thus, it is not wrong to

use the term 'Naga nationalism' in the context of the Naga struggle for recognition of their right.

There is no doubt that Naga struggle is true nationalism with deep popular roots. Admittedly, Horald Lasswell stated "genuinely nationalist movement are not to be confused with separatist demands." Even Lt. Col. Anand (whose writing is known for his biased military view concerning the Naga movement) concluded that the Naga movement developed into a people's movement. Thus he wrote, "for the first time, the Nagas...joined hands to attain independence. The development of such a unanimous voice in one of the most inhospitable areas of the world was not a mean achievement." Colin Johnson went further reaffirming it and wrote, "the Naga people have developed a strong sense of nationalism which is shared even by those seeking some accommodation with India. The movement is ardently supported by the Nagas in India as well as in Myanmar.

Now the follow-up query is whether in the changed situation the term 'Naga nationalism' is still valid or not. No doubt, there has been several changes in terms of organisational set up, leadership, strategy or modus operandi etc. but one thing stands clear is that the Naga movement which commenced in the pre-independence era still continues. As M. Horam rightly remarked

46. Emerson, op. cit., p. 216.
"thirty years is a long time for a small people to hold out against a far stronger opponent." Naga leaders like Th. Muivah succinctly stated

Is the presence of more than two hundred thousand troops of India for so long time a sign of peoples' acceptance of Indian Constitution? Is it a manifestation of peoples' commitment to India? Is it not a sign of peoples' support to the cause? What organisation can stand against such heavy odds for 47 years without the support of the people?

In other words, Naga nationalism is still alive if not strengthened. However, one has to admit that in any movement there are ups and down. It is also true that the situation has completely changed but not the fundamental political stand of the Naga nationalists. Since 1975, the main group which denounced the Shillong Accord represents the 'hardcore section of Naga nationalists. The resurgence of Naga nationalism today is essentially the work of the NSCN under the leadership of Isak Swu and Th. Muivah. Yet there is no fundamental change in the political stand earlier upheld by the NNC.

For understanding the contents and direction of Naga nationalism, one may categorise it under the variety called ethnic nationalism. The ethnic sources of Naga nationalism are unquestionable. It derives the force from the inner and dormant resources of the Nagas being an ethnic community and the perceptions and sentiments they aspire. In ethnic nationalism the

50. Muivah, Th., _A rejoinder to the Indian propaganda stunt : 'Does violence get a mandate' submitted to the Secretary General, UNPO, Oking 6th June, 1994, p. 5.
focus primarily is on the collective level of identity and community. Here lies the key to the explosive power of nationalism. This particular identity is the ethnie or ethnic community which refers to a "named human population with a myth of common ancestry, shared memories and cultural elements, a link with an historic territory or homeland and a measure of solidarity." 51

The belief of common identity has provided the Nagas a plank for self and other identification. Ethnicity is not about blood or genes as such but about myths and beliefs in common origin. 52 The importance of historical memories is always highlighted in ethnic nationalism and in the case of the Nagas, selective reference of the historical fact of some areas never forming an effective part of the British administration has no doubt fostered a sense of collectivity. A nationalist movement selectively draws from history to legitimize its own hegemonistic interpretation of the nation. 53 A shared culture is equally important. The cultural components which have promoted nationalism among the Nagas include dress, food, music and craft as well as customs and mode of village administration. The absence of a Naga language has not however impeded the growth of a common consciousness. Language, often important, is not the key criterion of ethnicity. Max Muller came to realize it a century ago when he pointed out that it was dangerous and misleading to

52. Ibid., p. 50.

54
equate language with ethnic origins. 54 Religion undoubtedly acted as the most common shared cultural element for the Nagas as embodied in the generally accepted ideal 'Nagaland for Christ'. The overwhelming majority of the Nagas in the Nagaland state, hill districts of Manipur, and Assam-Nagaland border areas are Christians by faith and in Myanmar the NSCN initiative has resulted in large scale conversion of the Naga tribes from traditional animistic belief to Christianity. No wonder, the NSCN ideology of 'Christian socialisms is directed towards strengthening the ethnic unity of the Naga tribes.

What is vital for ethnicity is the sense of attachment to a particular land, otherwise known as 'homeland', which carries with it a sense of sanctification and embodies a sense of fulfilment. The homeland is seen as a cradle of the people. 55 In the case of the Nagas attachment to the territory is real and not imaginary. The contiguity of land held by them in India and Myanmar has contributed towards the sense of mutual belonging. Nationalist ideologies have sought to interpret the importance of the occupation and control of space, both in the past and as a plan for the future. 56 The demand for greater Nagaland, as advocated by the Nagas is clearly a plan for the future. Territory is the means by which consciousness is structured. Nationalists desirous of matching their distinctive group identity with the claimed or held territory would accept the contention that "territory...is space to which identity is

54. Smith, loc. cit.
attached by a distinctive group who held or covet that territory and who desire to have full control over it for the group's benefit.\textsuperscript{57}

The compactness of the held and projected territory in the case of the Nagas has only crystallised Naga nationalism. Similar occupation of a compact territory by one ethnic group is not always found. Thus it has been estimated that only in about a quarter of the states in the world (out of almost 190 states) does over 95 per cent of the population comprise of one ethnic group.\textsuperscript{58} Territory is bounded space, that is, 'a very substantial, material, measurable and concretive entity' although 'it is also the product and indeed the expression of the psychological features of human groups'.\textsuperscript{59} Nationalism is also a means of imposing cultural homogeneity within the bounds of a given territory. Ethnic nationalism is clearly a form of social and political movement firmly rooted in territory, in place and space. Nationalism generally defines people as belonging/not belonging to a territory and culture, rather than in terms of class or status divisions and it seeks to play down internal divisions and conflicts by externalising the supposed source of problems.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{59} Gottman, J., \textit{The Significance of Territory} (Virginia 1973), p. 15.
The element of solidarity also constitutes another dimension of ethnic nationalism. However, "not all the members of a given ethnie feel an equal sense of belonging to the community." To foster it is however one of the self-appointed tasks of nationalists. This can be done through a well defined ideology by the movement leaders. "The ideology propagated by them should be clearly understandable, highly motivating and should have a universal appeal which can be internalised by the masses." In fact, ethnic nationalism has an advantage over territorial and civic nationalism—that of building the nation, as it were, out of pre-existing ethnic ties. The Naga nationalism under the NSCN has been able to arouse and ignite collective ties and sentiments among the Nagas.

No doubt Naga nationalism has displayed signs of ethnocentrism which amounts to

the view of things in which one's own group is the centre of everything, and all others are scaled with reference to it....Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities and looks with contempt on outsiders."

The FGN has persistently maintained that 'the Nagas are not Indians and have nothing to do with India'. The NSCN view 'anything Indian or Burmese' as 'detestable'.

63. Swartz, Marc J., Negative ethnocentrism (In) Crisis and Continuity in World Politics, p. 97.
64. FGN Document A Brief Political background of Naga Independence (Oking 21 May, 1968), p. 36.
nationalists' attitude of hostility towards India and Indians is
guided by two apparent considerations. On the one hand, this
attitude legitimizes their political struggle and unites the
people against a common enemy. On the other hand, it structures a
defensive mechanism against the might of the Indian state,
flagrant and systematic violation of human rights and the
sweeping powers of the army permissible under special laws in
operation. An account of the violation of human rights in the
sixties is vividly given in the Rev. Michael Scott's report to
the Prime Minister of India (1966), Luingam Luithui and Nandita
Haksar Nagaland File, Mar Atsongchanger's - Unforgettable
memories from Nagaland etc. Again, the communication sent by the
NSCN office to the UN Secretary General * on 10 August 1995
reveals that in the past three years, more than 1,000 innocent
Nagas have been killed. Over 100 villages were incinerated,
thousands uprooted and rendered homeless.66

The Naga nationalist sentiment is based on the fact that the
Nagas are 'different from Indians and Burmese (Myanmarese)! The
Naga leaders of all camps have always projected these
differences.67 The FGN has stated that Nagaland has always been
an independent territory adjoining territories of India and Burma
(Myanmar).68 Purely from historical perspective, the scholar will

* - The UN Secretary General accepted the case submitted by the
Naga leaders (NSCN) through the Society for Threatened
People on 10 August, 1995.
66. UN Document on Economic and Social Council, Agenda item 6, 10
68. Baboo, Balgobind, The Naga National Movement - An Analysis
Third World Unity (Journal) (See Jaya Prakash Narayan's
Nation Building in India, p. 357), Jan.-April, 1970, p. 42.
agree with Balgovind Baboo that "historical and legal documents show that before British rule, 'Nagaland' was in no way a part of India." He further elucidated: "ethnically, culturally and linguistically the Nagas are not Indians as the Rajanthanis, Assamese or Keralites are." 69

It is on this account that the Naga leaders of all camps consider India as an 'occupation force'. The Peace Mission's proposal No.5 amply unveiled the political stand of the Naga nationalists:

The Nagaland Federal Delegation have claimed that the Nagas had been never conquered by the Indian Army or ruled by an Indian Government, although their territory had been forcibly annexed by the British Army and British Government about a century ago. Nevertheless, their right of self-determination, they claim, belongs to them separately as a people from the sovereign Independent state of India, and they are now demanding recognition of their independence, which as they say, India herself demanded and heroically struggled for under the historic slogan of Swaraj. 70

On the other hand, the Government of India's position is that Nagaland formed an integral part of India before 1947 and that with the transfer of power to India by the British Parliament, Nagaland became part of India in the same way as all other states in India. 71 But the Peace Mission questioned India's first claim and stated that India's claim had no historical basis. 72

69. Baboo, loc.cit.
71. Horam, loc.cit.
The FGN in an attempt to espouse the cause of the Naga political struggle underlined the emerging unity and stated:

Today, the Nagas wherever they may be, have developed a spiritual longing to be together. The longing to draw close together by themselves also at the same time develop a longing to live as a distinct nation. In other words, Naga nationalism has fired the minds of men and women everywhere to constitute the Naga people into a free and independent nation. The sooner India recognises this Naga nationalism the better it will be. If India does not respect the right of the Nagas to the same liberty and independence for which they themselves had fought who can be respected to do so?

It is one of the characteristic features of modern nationalism that most people who constitute a nationality aspire either to be independent and to live under a political organisation of their own choice and creation, or at least to be accorded a larger political autonomy. In other words, it treats as a natural right of the people of a particular nationality to determine their political destiny. Put differently, it implies "in every case was the insistence that the dominion on one nation was politically inexpedient and morally wrong." It also implies that the disintegration of a multi-national state should be regarded as a natural and logical consequence. In this sense 'nationalism' is a vision of the future which restores to man his

---

73. FGN Document, *op.cit.*, p. 68.
   See Smith, *op.cit.*, p. 221 'is interpreted by nationalists as contrary to nature'.
   See contemporary Nationalism and World Order by C.P. Romulo, p. 22.
'essence', his basic pattern of living and being, which was once his undisputed birthright.\textsuperscript{76}

**INSURGENCY**

The Naga political movement can hardly be regarded as insurgent movement. Firstly, the Naga movement had commenced even before the independence of India. To be precise, on January 10, 1929, a memorandum was submitted to the Simon Commission (by the Naga Club body) stating that "Nagas should be left alone should the British leave India."\textsuperscript{77} Hence the question of 'uprising against constituted Government' does not arise as free Indian State had not there been established.

Secondly, one cannot overlook the contention of the Nagas that the Nagas are a 'distinct nation' and the Naga nationalists stated: "We are not asking India to grant us independence. We are simply asking India to recognise our independence which is our birthright."\textsuperscript{78} In seeking to justify the stand, A.Z. Phizo emphatically asserted the stand of the NNC and said, "historically, Nagaland has no connection with India, and even the part of Nagaland which was for a time came under British administration was kept separate from British India."\textsuperscript{79}

Thirdly, another circumstantial factor acting as a counterpoise in applying the term 'insurgency' in Naga case is that the movement is not just confined to India alone but extends

\textsuperscript{76} Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{77} Horam, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{78} FCN Document, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 70.
to Myanmar as well where a sizeable Naga population inhabit. Thus, be it NNC or the NSCN, the Nagas of the North-West of Myanmar (Eastern Nagaland), unquestionably are a decisive factor as they contribute bulk of the fighting force. The Naga leaders of all camps, therefore, are persistent on the issue of merger all the Naga areas in India as well as in Myanmar. The ardent desire to unify the people was obvious when the NNC appealed to Sir Akbar Hydari "to bring all the Naga tribes together, for they all naturally desire to be together."\(^8^0\) In this sense, Naga nationalism has certain elements of 'irredentism'. No wonder, Anthony Smith admittedly writes that "many movement have, in addition to their separatist aims, the opposite drive to unification of all co-nationals in one state."\(^8^1\)

Lastly, several Indian political leaders directly or indirectly maintained the unique character of the Nagas. Mahatma Gandhi, when met by a Naga delegation in the third week of July, 1947 at Bhangi colony in Delhi told:

Nagas have every right to be independent. We do not want to live under the dominion of the British and they are now leaving us. I want you to feel that India is yours. I feel that the Naga Hills are mine just as much as they are yours, but if you say, it is mine then the matter must stop there. I believe in the brotherhood of men, but I do not believe in force or forced Union. If you do not wish to join the Union of India nobody will force you to do that. The Congress Government will not do that.\(^8^2\)

\(^8^0\) FGN Document, \textit{cit.}, p. 11.
\(^8^1\) Smith, \textit{cit.}, p. 222.
\textit{Vide} The World of Nagas by M. Rumunny, pp. 41-42.
Jawaharlal Nehru (seems to be spelling out the status of Naga Hills) when reacting to the proposed British constitutional proposals is said to have stated on August 19, 1946 that "The tribal Areas are defined as being those long frontier of India which are neither part of India nor Burma (Myanmar), nor of Indian states nor of any foreign power." This stand was well expressed when the former Prime Minister, in a letter to the NNC leader wrote:

The Naga areas when India is independent, as it is bound to be soon, it will not be possible for the British Government to hold on the Naga territory or any part of it. This strip of land will be left isolated between India and China. Inevitably, therefore, this Naga territory must form part of India and of Assam.

Later Nehru stated:

It is obvious that the Naga territory in Eastern Assam is much too small to stand by itself politically or economically. It lies between two huge countries, India and China, and part of it consists of rather backward people who who require considerable help. When India is independent, it will not be possible for the British Government to hold on to the Naga territory or any part of it. The world be isolated there between India and China. Inevitably, therefore, this Naga territory must form part of India and of Assam with which it has developed such close association.

Some years later, in November 28, 1949 in Shillong, C. Rajagopalachari, the then Government General of free India reportedly told a Naga delegation that:
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India wanted to be friendly with you. India does not want to deprive the Nagas of their land. Nagas are at full liberty to do as they like, either to become part of India or be separated if it would be best for their interest to be isolated. 86

When the Naga political movement was at the peak, the Peace Mission was formed to find an 'honourable solution' to the political problem. The Peace Mission from its inception maintained the stand that 'the Naga struggle' could not be regarded as a 'problem of law and order'. It was certainly a struggle for national freedom. In its opinion, it may not aim at over throwing a government, but it certainly aims at throwing out a government—the Government of India which according to them, is established in Nagaland by force. 87

Here, the Peace Mission has indicated a significant point which, obviously does not fit into the definition of insurgency' precisely meaning 'uprising against rightfully constituted government'. Therefore, the Peace Mission did not regard the Naga movement as 'rebellion or secession'. 88 Even the Naga nationalists have always been quite vocal enough in stating that Naga case is neither a question of 'separation' nor 'secession' from India. Separation or Secession in their view comes only when there is a union. Nagaland was and is never part of India and as such, Naga independence to them is neither a question of separation nor secession from India. 89

86. FGN Document, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
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Against this background, it is somewhat difficult to view Naga nationalism as 'insurgency'. Taking into account, the historical reality and facts, Naga struggle for recognition of their rights cannot be term as an 'insurgency movement'. Unfortunately, there is a strong tendency among academicians, politicians, civil and military administrators, journalists etc. to use the term 'insurgency' and apply it to all types of contemporary political movements. In other words, they explicitly deny the existence of genuine national movement as if the era of nationalism has already had its closing ceremony. Further, social science literature reveals the absence of uniform understanding of the term insurgency, let alone any conceptualization of the term. A review of literature shows that the term 'insurgency' has been 'scarcely used in the typology of social movements'. 90 The casual treatment the term received led an eminent scholar to remark that even the 'accommodation of insurgency under the broad category of social movement serves little purpose as long as the differentiating attributes are not well settled. 91 Insurgency in such literature has been viewed 'more as a means rather than ends'.

Naga National Movement: Main Events

It is generally agreed among the historians and writers that the groundwork of Naga nationalism was laid down during the last days of the British reign. In 1918, a 'Naga Club' was set up at

91. Idem.
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Kohima with government officials, educated men and a few village headmen. This became a discussion forum on various Naga affairs. This club was the first Naga organisation to submit a memorandum to the Simon Commission on 10th January, 1929. The memorandum inter alia stated: "We Nagas should not be thrust to the mercy of the people (Indian) who could never have conquered us themselves, and to whom we were never subjected, but to leave us alone to determine for ourselves as in ancient times". This was the first sign of Naga expression of their political aspiration. The Government of the People's Republic of Nagaland estimated that 'this is the first written document in which the Nagas had expressed their national longing and political aspirations to regain their independence'.

The Emergence of Naga National Council

However, the Naga struggle took a direction with the formation of Naga National Council in 1946. It is this 'organisation which expressed and modulated' the Naga sense of nationhood. This could be considered to be the beginning of the modern phase of Naga movement.

In April, 1946, the British Government sent a Cabinet Mission to India to study the political situation in the country. The NNC informed the Cabinet Mission that the Naga future will not be bound by any arbitrary decision of the British Government,
and that no recommendation will be accepted without consultation'.

On February 20, 1947, the Naga National Council requested His Majesty's Government to appoint India to act as guardian power over Nagaland for a period of 10 years, at the end of which it was proposed that the question of the political future would be left to the Naga people themselves to decide. This request was embodied in a Memorandum submitted to the last Viceroy of India, Lord Louis Mountbatten. The Memorandum's subject was self-explanatory. It reads: Memorandum of the case of the Naga people for self-determination and an APPEAL to H.M.G. and the Government of India.

On May 19, 1947, the Naga National Council submitted a second Memorandum to His Majesty's Government. Here the NNC was explicit enough in spelling out the proposed 10 year 'Interim Government' for the Naga people with full legislative, judicial and executive powers except defence after which they would choose their own Government.

On 20th May, 1947, when a sub-committee of the Advisory Committee on aboriginal tribes visited Kohima, the Naga leaders reiterated the same view. In fact, events were moving fast in the subcontinent that the Naga leaders realised that if it did not spell out its demands in unequivocal terms, the Naga political aspiration would suffer a setback.
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For the Nagas, the British Government did not act favourably and though it was discussed at the highest level, no concrete decision was taken; perhaps, the British Government did not want to delay the transfer of power to free India just because of the 'Naga case'. Secondly, in their perception the Naga National Council was not a fully representative body of the Nagas. This is evident from Lord Pethich Lawrence, the Secretary of State correspondence with Admiral Viscount Mountbatten.101

With the approach of India's independence, the question of the Naga's future got sharpened. The British and especially those who had spent much of their lives among the Nagas-hoped to find means to perpetuate the protective insulation especially from the domination of the plans, and mooted various plans for the purpose. One such idea was that the tribal areas in the north-east should be cut out from India and set up as a British Crown colony. Another approach suggested a tripartite guarantee of the integrity and autonomy of the Naga areas by Britain, India and Burma (Myanmar).102 The NNC leadership unmindfully* opposed this proposal and the Indian National Congress was too happy to follow suit and declared that the 'British must quit Naga hills when they quit India'.103 Verrier Elwin (a friend of India) stated
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that 'there is not doubt that if the Nagas had lent the slightest support or encouragement to the scheme, the colony might well have been a reality'.

The 9 Point Agreement

In June, 1947, the Governor of Assam, Akbar Hydari negotiated an agreement with the Naga National Council and this came to be known as 'the 9 point agreement'. This understanding was significant on the one hand for it acknowledged the NNC's right of control over all spheres of Naga life ranging from prevalent tribal laws to the ownership of land and taxation. On the other, it gave hope to the them government to break the prevailing deadlock. But the ninth point was the most controversial and gave rise to another deadlock. It reads as follows:

9. Period of Agreement The Governor of Assam as the Agent of the Government of Indian Union will have a special responsibility for a period of ten years to ensure the due observation of this Agreement; at the end of this period, the Naga National Council will be asked whether they require the above Agreement to be extended for a further period or a new agreement regarding the future of the Naga people arrived at.

The NNC claimed that it ensured the Nagas the right to complete independence on the expiry of the 10 year period. The NNC leaders believe that it guaranteed their right to self-determination because the Governor himself had proposed (in...)
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course of their negotiation) on the last point that "at the end of 10 years the Nagas will be free to oppose any form of government provided they do not join Pakistan or Burma (Myanmar)". Unfortunately, this proposal on the 9 point was rejected by the NNC members and instead they agreed on the modified version (as it is in the agreement).

Secondly, the stand taken by Jawaharlal Nehru in support of self-determination in 1944, coincide with the 9th provision. He stated:

...it may be desirable to fix a period of say ten years later after the establishment of free Indian state, at the end of which the right to secede may be exercised through proper constitutional process and in accordance with the clearly expressed will of the inhabitants of the area concerned.

No wonder, Naga National Council leaders persistently stuck to their interpretation of the 9 clause, meaning a "clear promise of self-determination" and to that end "they had been given this assurance.'

Some years later, on November 9, 1949 a "three man delegation of the Naga National Council met the representative of the Government of India. The delegation was bluntly told that there was no Agreement made with the Nagas. According to the NNC sources Gopinath Bordoloi (Prime Minister of Assam) himself

106. Imti, T. Aliba., Reminiscence Impur to Naga National Council (Published by the writer, Mokokchung, 1988), p. 67. Mr. T. Aliba was a Joint Secretary of the NNC, the time when 9 Point Agreement was negotiated and signed.
sorrowfully admitted to the Nagas... that the Agreement was no longer considered to exist by the Indian Government.\textsuperscript{109} Imti remarked that 'it was the misfortune of the Nagas that the Governor belonged to a minority community a Muslim.'\textsuperscript{110} In fact, the Government of India unilaterally withdrew from the Agreement.

Meeting with Mahatma Gandhi

On July 17th, 1947, a Naga delegation under the leadership of A.Z. Phizo 'met Jinnah and told him that they intended to make a unilateral declaration of independence on 14 August which was also to be Pakistan's independence day'.\textsuperscript{111} Two days later (19th July) they met Gandhi who reportedly stated: (recorded by Pyarelal, his associate)-

Nagas have every right to be independent. We do not want to live under the domination of the British and they are now leaving us.... if you do not wish to join the Union of India nobody will force you to do that.\textsuperscript{112}

Unfortunately for the Nagas, Gandhi did not live to carry out his promise and the new leadership in the Congress did not share his perception on the issue. As no understanding or agreement was reached between the Naga nationalists and the Government of India, the former declared themselves independent on 14th August 1947\textsuperscript{113} According to the NNC document, 'the Government of India and the United Nations was informed by cable
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to which the UNO was kind enough to send an acknowledgment.'

Thus a unique situation arose where in India which just became independent found itself confronted with the Nagas who wanted their rights to be recognised. Henceforth, the situation turned for the worse. Besides, the Government of India did not follow a consistent policy and at times there were discrepancy in the statements of the leaders in India. For instance, Neville Maxwell writes, following newspaper reports, that the Governor General, C. Rajagopalacharia told a Naga delegation in November 1949 that they were at full liberty to do as they liked.' On the other hand, Jawaharlal Nehru was willing to give complete autonomy but never independence. Nehru was then speaking under the shadow of uncertainty about the intention of the Nizam of Hyderabad and other rulers of princely states.

On January 24, 1950, the Naga nationalists under the banner of the NNC informed the Government of India, the United Nations and all the foreign ambassadors in New Delhi that Nagas did not accept the Indian Constitution.

Plebiscite

The Naga National Council organised a General Naga Conference for three days in 1950 at Kohima. This conference was unique for two reasons. Firstly, the Nagas of different tribes were well represented in a big way. Secondly, this conference

115. Maxwell, op. cit., p. 5.
116. loc. cit.
passed an important resolution. The Intelligence Bureau's Deputy Director, S.M. Dutt reported having seen a 'remarkable' thing:

Various Naga tribes had come together, were staying together, messing together and talking together - a thing which had never happened before in Naga history. Amongst the tribals who had gathered were some who were bitter enemies of each other. A miracle did happen for the first time in the history of the Nagas; there were remarkable unanimity amongst all the tribals. 118

The conference resolves to hold a plebiscite on the issue of the Naga independence as early as possible. It was decided to inform New Delhi about the holding of the plebiscite three months in advance. 119 Later on, the Government of India was requested to send its representatives and observes to Nagaland to witness the holding of plebiscite vide NNC letters dated March 30, and April 11, 1951. 120

Therefore, to legitimize the Naga position, and to demonstrate that it spoke for all the Nagas, the NNC conducted a plebiscite. Voting by thumb print (because of widespread illiteracy and it was thought this would prevent fraud) the Nagas gave a massive, indeed nearly unanimous vote (99.9 per cent) in favour of independence from India. 121 Nevertheless this result was ignored by the Government of India.

The success of the Naga nationalists is quite evident because of the 'wrong assessment' and 'conflicting views' from the government side. The Assam Government, for instance, did not
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take this matter seriously because they were of the view that Phizo had no influence and that the divisive forces among the tribals would prevent them from coming together and Phizo was in no position to create any trouble. On the other hand, the Intelligence Bureau took this development quite seriously. As confessed by Mullik "we informed the Prime Minister about this development" and S.M. Dutt himself had spoken to Pandit Nehru at Shillong and suggested that measures should be taken to prevent the holding of this conference. He also mentioned that there was a strong feeling amongst the Nagas that they had been betrayed, as the agreement signed by them with Hydari and Bordoloi (the 9 point agreement) had not been respected by the framers of the Indian Constitution, and so they were no longer bound by the Indian Constitution.

Unfortunately, Dutt failed to carry conviction with the Prime Minister who naturally at that time had more regard for the views of the Assam Government. Mullik further enlightened on the issue and thus writes, "up to this time it must be said to the credit of the Nagas that they were not thinking of any violent movement. They were hoping that the result of the plebiscite would sufficiently influence the authorities to give a dispensation in their favour".

Boycott of Election

The Government of India went ahead with the preparation for the first general election to the Indian Parliament (1952). The
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NNC organised a total boycott of the general election.125 (for the second general election in 1957, the Government of India did not even prepare for election nominations in most parts of Naga areas).126 According to the Naga Nationalist sources, Bimala Prasad Chaliha, the then President of the Assam Pradesh Congress, who toured the interior of the Naga country in September, 1953, observed that

apart from the plebiscite, the boycott of the general elections were sufficient proof of the unanimity of the Naga Hills people for independence and their singleness of purpose.127

This obviously nullifies the allegations that the movement was led by a few "misguided elements' and only 'a harmful of supporters'. The boycott of elections was simultaneously followed by a civil disobedience movement resulting in the mass resignation of school teachers, boycott of all Government of India functions, and refusal to pay taxes. Through these moves, each more successful than the other, the NNC proved beyond any shadow of doubt that it was the spokesman of all the Naga tribes and that the verdict of the Naga people was in favour of independence.128

To thwart the emergence of a powerful Naga nationalism, there was joint programme by the Prime Minister of the India and Myanmar on March 30, 1953, to visit both the Naga territories in
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India and in Myanmar.\textsuperscript{129} When they reached Kohima, "a most unfortunate incident occurred during the public meeting'. The Nagas, demanded to read out the statement asking for the acceptance of their desire for political self-determination.\textsuperscript{130} When denied the right to speak their mind to the Prime Minister, the Nagas decided that they would not hear the Prime Minister. Every Naga present walked off the stage and from the meeting some smacked their buttocks, a gesture unmistakably conveying insult and total rejection.\textsuperscript{131}

"Nehru never forgot this insult,'\textsuperscript{132} which most unfortunately took place in the presence of the Burmese (Myanmarese) Prime Minister, U Nu.

The Start of the Fighting (Undeclared War)

Unable to check the trend of events in the Naga Hills, the Government of India decided to crack down on the NNC. Almost the entire NNC set-up went underground.\textsuperscript{133} The Government of India, sent a joint force of armed Police and Assam Rifles to began operations to restore (what they called) Indian authority.\textsuperscript{134} Shortly, there were raids, seizure of arms, strengthening of Police force and more Police outposts were set up in the Naga Hills.\textsuperscript{135} Meanwhile, in September, 1953, Bimala Prasad Chaliha, the President of the Assam Congress Committee, toured Naga Hills
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Chaliha in his report to the Congress Committee informed that the NNC workers were very loyal to the organisation. His impression was that the demand for independence was sincere and popular ... He found the Naga mind was so surcharged with the sentiment for independence that it was not in a receptive mood to hear anything else. 137

In 1954, the formation of the Hongkin Government was announcement. It was called Khunak Kautang Ngeukhuma - that is the 'People's Sovereign Republic of Free Nagaland'. 138 This was the political wing of the NNC to direct and monitor its activities mainly in Eastern Nagaland. In the following year, on 22nd March, 1956, the NNC formed the Naga Federal Government (NFG) (later changed it to Federal Government of Nagaland (FGN)). It presented a Federal Nagaland Constitution which was later amended in 1968. 139 Along with it, its armed wing was also formed known as 'Naga Home Guard'; later on it changed into 'Naga Army'. 140

In the same year, the Indian troops were sent into the Naga Hills, and nearly a division of Indian troops were battling the Naga guerrillas. 141 The Government of India officially announced the dispatch of Army into the Naga Hills. By that time, Nehru decided that it would have to be dealt with military rather than
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writes that the then "Chief of Army Staff, General K.S: Thimayya, had a rather long meeting with the Prime Minister. He told Nehru candidly that it required political wisdom rather than military might to solve the Naga problem. However, General Thimayya did what he was expected to do. Jawaharlal Nehru was not alone on politically. Concerning this shift of policy, Nirmal Nibenon this line of thinking, even Rajendra Prasad, the then President of India recommended such step. Thus he observed:

The Naga problem is formidable even now, but then it will become more or less beyond our capacity to control unless we are prepared to be ruthless, and it is doubtful if even then we could suppress them.

Since then terrible conflict and fighting spread fast in the Naga hills. More units of Army were deployed. According to the Government sources, nearly two divisions of the Army and thirty-five battalions of Assam Rifles or Armed police were in operation in the Naga areas, and as stated by B.N. Mullik, 'there was nearly one security troop for every adult male Naga in the Naga Hills Tuensang area, but there never was a time when it could be claimed that the Naga guerrillas had been broken into submission. They (Naga) had few odd varieties of arms, muzzle-loaders, for instance, they suffered privation and casualties but did not give in.

Thus, it is particularly true that in Nagaland "war
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theatre' the Government had sufficient troops 'but was baffled by
the nature of the terrain. Frustrated by elusive guerrillas, the
Army more than once clamped down hard on innocent villagers'.

In the process of large-scale operations, the Naga civilian
suffered immensely. India Today (Magazine) articulated the bitter
truth thus

Nowhere has the experience of insurgency been
longer and greater than in Nagaland, and
nowhere else in the North-East human suffering
been more painful and protracted. Nagaland was
the laboratory in which the Indian Army, new
to counter-insurgency, committed its biggest
errors.\textsuperscript{148}

The NSCN leaders described intensely the situation of that
period in these lines:

The behaviour of the Indian troops was beastly
and horrible. There was no human compunction
in them. Whatever they did, they did with
sadism. The gloated over acts of cruelty
wherever and whenever they performed. Mass
arrests of men, women and children were done
all over the country. They were mercilessly
beaten, herded into concentration camps, where
thousands died of starvation, tortures and
diseases. All able-bodies were used as labour
force to construct camps, carry supplies ...
torturing to death through ruthless beating,
thrusting stick into the rectum of private
parts of men and women, hanging upside down
were daily phenomenon .... Some villages were
burnt down twenty times even. Besides, a large
number of villages were uprooted from one
place to another causing sufferings beyond
words. Granaries were burnt to ashes without
exception. Standing crops were destroyed.
Schools and Churches were raged to the ground.
Scorch-earth policies were applied in every
part of the land.\textsuperscript{149}
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In facing the natinalist movement, insurgencies or secessionist movements, there are three options for solutions. The first is the use of force. The second is the use of political process. And the third is the willingness to concede the basic demand. Phadnis writes "the Nagas who never felt a part of India asked for independence, and got the Indian Army instead."\textsuperscript{150} She also added that "the army used methods that were brutal and even uncivilised. But because Kohima was so far cut off from the rest of the world, New Delhi got away with it."\textsuperscript{151}

Indeed, India was facing problem of such magnitude for the first time and the serious allegations against the security forces were true in most cases. In Delhi, the Lok Sabha heard a member accusing the Indian army and other security forces of having indulged in "an orgy of murder."\textsuperscript{152} Dessan Tagore, a strong critic of the Government of India's policy on the Naga issue wrote condemntiously:

Nagaland has seen the worst horrible form of the state terrorism - women are raped, men and children tortured, and people moved into concentration camps. The Nagas have no recourse to civic justice. All this persecution is to force the Naga people to surrender to India and to accept the Indian rulers as their masters. The Nagas never will.\textsuperscript{153}

Nehru undoubtedly was quite disturbed as is evident from his letter to Assam Chief Minister B.R. Medhi:
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we know that the Nagas are tough people and are very disciplined. It is therefore, conceivable that even when we have succeeded completely in a military sense, small scale guerrilla tactics may continue giving us continuous headaches, apart from affecting our reputation both in India and abroad. How then are we to face this situation? 154

This note certainly reflects the psyche of the leadership. By then the Government of India had already adopted the infamous 'village grouping' technique pioneered by the Japanese in Manchuria. 155 According to B.N. Mullik, the plan was to break the supply and intelligence system of the rebels, who, being a guerrilla force, depended for their supplies and information on the villagers. 156 However, he admitted that this grouping of villages had also a telling effect on the Naga civilian population. 157 Thus writing on the period of the mid 1950s some ten years later, Charles Pawsey after a visit to Nagaland said that 'the India Army's behaviour will never be forgotten or forgiven by the Nagas and the hatred engendered in that first Indian attempt to crush Naga resistance has been revived and intensified by every new attempt since then'. 158 Even Jayaprakash Narayan, a member of the Peace Commission could not seal the factual account of Indian Army atrocities and he confessed: "many atrocities were perpetrated by the Indian security forces, of which every descent Indian I am sure is ashamed." 159

---
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It is true that the Indian security forces' high handedness filled many peace loving Nagas with a burning resentment against India and the Indians. Several Naga leaders went underground as did their followers and other Naga youths whose families or relatives or who themselves have been victims of repression by army operations. Thus, M. Horam remarked, "It is ironic but true that the very same army which was in the Naga Hills to prevent insurgency drove so many Nagas to insurgency and rebellion.... Naga nationalism, hitherto an embryonic concept, now became the obsession of almost every Naga.\textsuperscript{160}

\textbf{Naga People's Convention and Statehood}

In the late 1950s the idea surfaced in Nagaland that statehood within the Indian Union might provide an answer to the demand for independence. This became a proposal, especially associated with a new organisation called the Naga People's Convention (NPC),\textsuperscript{161} formed as an 'overground'\textsuperscript{*} organisation to act as intermediary between the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland.

There were altogether three conventions held. The first was in 1957 at Kohima from August 22 to 26th under the chairmanship of Imkongliba Ao. The convention recommended that "the Naga Hills
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District and the Tuensang Area should be amalgamated and a new unit called "Naga Hills and Tuensang Area (NIITA) should be formed. This arrangement came into effect in December, 1957 and was placed under the Ministry of External Affairs. The second convention was held on May 21, 1958, in the Ao village of Ungma. This convention set up a liaison committee to contact the Federal Government of Nagaland with a view to bringing about a political settlement. However, the FGN instead termed them as "renegades" and "traitors". Hence, the NPC decided to strike yet other bargain with the Government of India which seemed eager enough to comply.

In October, 1959, the Third Naga People's Convention was held and it was decided to propose that "Nagaland might be made into a separate State within the Indian Union". It was here that the 16 point memorandum was endorsed by NPC and later approved by the Government of India.

From the very outset NPC was suspected by the FGN and its sympathisers that the idea of statehood had been conceived by the Government to divide and delude the Nagas and explicit confirmation that the Indian Intelligence Bureau (IB) was behind the organising of NPC as well as its various demands including the statehood movement is to be found in the memoirs of that Bureau's then Director, B.N. Mullik. Thus the GPRN estimated Dutt (Deputy Director, IB) "didn't lose time to hatch a process

162. Das, loc. cit.
163. Horam, loc. cit.
164. Das, op. cit., p. 46.
165. Horam, Naga Insurgency, p. 84.
166. Idem.
for the formation of a puppet state of Nagaland by collecting a few Naga officials who were in the pay of the Indian Government. The participation of Intelligence Bureau in setting up and working behind NPC was conclusive. As S.M. Dutt explained:

> While the separation of Naga Hills from Assam should be accepted in principle, no unilateral decision should be announced and that the request for the separation should formally come from a representative Naga convention and the Government of India should generously accept it as a token of their good faith towards the Nagas.

Thus precisely, it was meant to be used as a 'bargaining chip' vis-a-vis the demand of the Nagas. Significantly B.N. Mullik confessed: "we in the IB were also quite clear that in our minds that the Naga partisan guerrillas could not be defeated by purely military action." Hence, 'to divide and delude' the Nagas seemed to have been a workable strategy and no wonder the IB carried out the plan with such precision that it worked absolutely splendid.

As per the agreement reached on 16 point in 1962, the Parliament of India passed the 13th Amendment Act and thereby created Nagaland State within the Union of India. Ironically, the formation of the Nagaland state did not cause any major abatement in the nationalist movement. So all those wishfully expecting the collapse of the movement found themselves to be wrong for this did not happen. On the contrary, there was an even greater
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explosion on Naga nationalist sentiment which predictably resulted in more determined and organised military action.\textsuperscript{170} As a matter of fact, "a large number of Nagas viewed statehood as only an 'interim solution'."\textsuperscript{171} Of course, the majority of the Nagas were outside this arrangement of 'Nagaland State', who obviously more determined to fight on.

Meanwhile Colonel V.K. Anand estimated that the strength of the Federal Army had gone up to 9,000 approximately and 500,000 Nagas were actively involved as helpers.\textsuperscript{172} However, Naga nationalist sources greatly differed as, for instance, Th. Muivah stated that "Naga Army went up to 40,000 and the arms which they captured and brought from Pakistan came up to nearly 15,000 to 18,000.\textsuperscript{173}

A.Z. Phizo in London and International Press

According to the NNC sources, A.Z. Phizo, President of the NNC arrived in London on June 12, 1960 to place the Naga case before the bar of world opinion.\textsuperscript{174} Significantly, in the same year (in December) for the first time, the Government of India permitted international press into the Naga areas which included the New York Times, Neue Zurcher Zeitung and The Times. The journalists' perception of the situation as reported to The Times at the end of the brief tour in Nagaland revealed:

\textsuperscript{170} Horam, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{171} Nibedon, \textit{The Ethnic Explosion}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{172} Anand, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{173} Interview of Thuingaleng Muivah by Deepak Dewan Chief of Bureau NE SUN, magazine December 18-24, 1993, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{174} FGN Document, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
The Naga people desire the greatest possible degree of independence from India - or from any one else. Some have now been convinced that sovereignty for this little land is simply not feasible... Others and many more than are actually under arms have still not been convinced and remained determined to obtain sovereignty. The difference between the two groups is essentially one of degree and of means, but it has been widened by the savageries of a guerrilla campaign....

Neville Maxwell further supplemented and writes:

None of the foreign correspondents doubted that, given a choice, the great mass of the Nagas would opt for total independence from India: those who had accepted statehood had done so as the lesser of two evils, the other being indefinite continuation of guerrilla war and all the miseries consequent upon it.

In 1961, Gavin Young, a journalist of The Observer, London secretly visited the fighting areas and brought out his report in a booklet form. 'The Nagas: An Unknown War'. Reporting on the intensity of the fighting he writes, thus:

> Indian Air Force aircraft, including Jets, regularly petrol the area. I saw relics of Indian Air attacks - fragments of bombs and 20mm cannon shells and heard the sound of heavy firing farther north, probably from mortars.

In fact, in 1963 the Government admitted aerial bombing and strafing of suspected guerrilla areas. Thus, the Government of India applied 'scorch-earth method' to crush the Naga nationalists as a last resort. That is how the Nagaland state

---
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came into being essentially a bye product of the Naga resistance. Nevertheless, in spite of the settlement, the fighting between the Indian security forces and the Naga nationalists went on unabated.

The Three-Man Peace Commission

Unmistakably, the establishment of a three man Peace Commission : two of the members of this commission were Indians - B.P. Chaliha, the then Chief Minister of Assam, J.P. Narayan, an active Gandhian, widely respected in India and abroad and the third was Rev. Michael Scott 180 who had worked for the Indians in South Africa.

It is important to note the stand of the Peace Commission in understanding the nature of the conflict between the two parties i.e. the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland. The Peace Commission appreciated "the desire of the Nagas for self-determination" and their struggle for the preservation of their way of life. It also admitted that the Nagas never formed a part of the Indian mainstream and that "the Federal Government of Nagaland could on their own volition decide to be a participant in the union of India." 181 The first achievement of the Peace Commission was to successfully negotiate for a "cease-fire" between the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland.

For the Naga nationalists and its government, 'Ceasefire' was a tremendous moral booster for two reasons. Firstly, inclusion of Rev. Michael Scott was considered as having an 'international observer'. Secondly, (as they demanded), the Government of India and Federal Government of Nagaland were treated on equal footing.* Further as Horam remarked: "the use of the term 'ceasefire' was either a misnomer or the Government of India's recognition of the sovereignty of the Nagas was implicit in it as according to international law, the term 'ceasefire' could only be used between two nations in the true sense of the word".182 For the Indian Government, on the other hand, the ceasefire was no more than an opportunity for those who favoured peace in Nagaland to persuade the Federal Nagas183 to arrive to a solution within the 'Indian Union'.184 Though the 'ceasefire' was a shortlived one, it marked the end of one era and the beginning of another.

The main objective of signing the 'Ceasefire Agreement' is to create a congenial atmosphere whereby final solution to the problem could process. The 'peace talks' had two phases: the first was at the governmental level and as many as seven round of talks were held; the second was at prime ministerial level spreading over six rounds of talks.

* equal footing - Throughout their work, the Peace Commission treated the matter as conflict between two parties. Thus in all their dealings, they were treated on equal footing.
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Meanwhile the Peace Commission (Mission) evolved its own proposal to consideration by both the parties—the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland. The main thrust of the Peace Commission which is contained in the 13th Para, thus suggested that

On the one hand, the Naga Federal Government on their own volition, decide to be a participant in the Union of India and mutually settle the terms and conditions for that purpose. On the other hand, the Government of India could consider to what extent the pattern and structure of the relationship between Nagaland and the Government of India should be adapted and recast. 185

However, both the representatives of the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland could not come into any meaningful settlement. Instead both the parties brought out their own perception and reservation against some of the paras of the proposal. Phizo declined to come to India saying that the time was not yet 'ripe' for him at that stage to join the political dialogue. 186

The first round of Ministerial talks was held on February 18, 1966, between the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Naga leaders led by Kukhato Ato Kiloner. 187 But the series of peace talks unfortunately failed to arrive at any tangible solution of the problem. Hence, the Naga issue was destined to drag on and seek 'unknown destiny'.

Inspite of this complete breakdown in the search for a political settlement, the ceasefire at first continued, though
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89
breaches were reported with increasing frequency, each side, of course, accusing the other of causing them. 188 By 1966, the Peace Commission was winding up its mission and when the External Affairs Minister, Dinesh Singh announced in the Rajya Sabha on 3rd May that Rev. Michael Scott had been served orders to leave the country immediately, 189 it finally sealed the fate of the Peace Commission as well. Cyril Dunn (The observer, London) writing from New Delhi, gave an account of how Rev. Scott was once hailed by the Indians as a hero and noted: "Rev. Scott now (has been) transformed by the course of Indian history into a meddlesome intruder". 190

The Naga nationalists now started making several trips to East Pakistan (Bangladesh) for training and to procure arms. They were preparing, obviously for another war.

Significantly, the Alee Command* under Th. Muivah, plenipotentiary and 'Brigadier' Thinoselie M. Keyho had successfully made contacts with the Chinese Government in 1967. 191 This was a great achievement indeed for China link was sure to play a crucial role in aiding and abetting the Naga resistance force.

The following year, drastic changes took in the Federal Government of Nagaland set up. These changes were sudden, far reaching and definitely for the worse as far as the Nagas were
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concerned. The first serious crack developed in the solidarity of the Nagas with the formation of the Council of Naga People (CNP) and its government christened as Revolutionary Government and joining hands with the Indian security force and sleuthing for the capture of Federal Army.\textsuperscript{192} As noted by M. Horam, "the Nagas were succumbing to their most potent enemy-tribalism and never before had they presented such a vulnerable front to the Indian authorities.\textsuperscript{193}

More worse to come to the movement was the conversion of East Pakistan into Bangladesh. The Naga nationalists suffered a severe setback with the loss of the sanctuaries it had enjoyed in the East Pakistan and the Indian Army heavily reinforced the Naga areas to make that advantage decisive. Along with it, the Government of India on 1st October, 1972 unilaterally terminated the ceasefire agreement and banned the Naga National Council, the Federal Government of Nagaland and the Naga Federal Army.\textsuperscript{194} That was indicative enough of the fact that the Naga nationalists remained determined to continue their struggle for recognition of this rights.
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