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POST MERGER POLITICAL STATUS OF MANIPUR

To know the political condition of Manipur or its position during the period 1947-49 is related with to see the political status during this crucial phase in the political history of Manipur. So two political equations are to be addressed. The first equation is India's policy towards other states with general principle for integrating all states by providing guidelines before and after Independence. Another is the political status enjoyed by Manipur during that time. In this regard two schools of thoughts are coming up. The former is in favour of India's integration and the latter is subscribing dissent views. So, either of their arguments are highly needed to study in order to find out the real facts.

*Indian Political trend and its framework of Integration:*

Before independence the political trend in India and abroad seems that all the Indian states should have the option of joining either of the two Domination or of remaining Independent and their obligation under paramountcy were laps with the withdrawal of the
British. Clement Attlee was speaking on the Indian Independence build in the House of commons on 10 July 1947 that “With the ending of the treaties and agreements, the states regained their Independence”.¹ The secretary of state for India, Lord Listowel also declared in the house of Lords on 16 July, 1947 that “From the date when the New Dominations are set up, the treaties and agreements which gave us suzerainty over the states will become void .... They will then be entirely free to choose whether to associate with one or other, of the Domination government or to stand alone”.²

The Indian delegate in the security council of the U.N.O. during the debate on the Kashmir dispute on 15 January, 1948 recognized the right of any princely state to remain Independent with the right to claim membership in the United Nations.

Thus theoretically and legally every Indian princely state had full freedom to claim independence after the transfer of power to India i.e. after 15 August, 1947. The memorandum prepared by the cabinet Mission on ‘states’ Treaties and paramountcy and endorsed by the Mountbatten Plan left any prince or a combination of princes free to declare his or their independence and even to enter into

---
¹ Choudhury G N - The Times. 20 June, 1947.
² Ibid
negotiations with any foreign power and thus become islands of independence territory within the country. In fact some states like Hyderabad and Junagarh had began to flirt with foreign states.

But practically this theory of Indians states becoming independence after the transfer of power was meaningless. On this issue, the stand of Indian National Congress was very clear. On 15 July, 1947 the claim of some of the states and the theory of the lapse of paramountcy, speaking at this meeting Nehru said that the States have only two alternatives; they could join the Union of India either individually or in groups. "There is no third way out of the situation third way meaning independence or special relation to a foreign power".\(^3\)

Immediately after the plan to partition and grand of Independence on 15 August 1947 was announced, the Interim Government set up a state Ministry to deal with the problem of Indian States. This Ministry was placed under the charge of Sardar Valabhai Patel.

On June, 1947, the All India Congress Committee invited the princes who had not joined the Indian Constituent Assembly to do

---

the same of free India in which the states will be equal and autonomous shares with other units of the federalism. The congress claimed for the people of the states the dominant voice in decisions concerning the one of its resolutions declared that the All Indian Congress Committee did not admit the right of any state in India to declare its independence and to live in isolation from the rest of India. The lapse of paramountcy of the British crown did not make the Indian states Independent. To quote Jawahalal Nehru, "I should like to say and other countries to know that we shall not recognized the independence of any state in India and any recognition of any such independence by any foreign power will be considered an unfriendly act".

The Indian Independence Act 1947 was passed by the British Parliament. It provided that the suzerainty of His Majesty over the Indian states lapsed with all its treaties and agreements in force on the date. The result was that the Indian states become completely independent and the Government of India and Pakistan did not inherit the right and authority of British Government in Indian over the Indian States. In the meantime the Ministry of state established by the Government of India was that the Indian states become completely independent and the Government of India and Pakistan did not inherit the right and authority of British Government in India was able to
conclude by the Government of India was able to conclude standstill Agreement and Instruments of Accession with most of the Indian states before Independence. Appendix ix of the Standstill Agreement provided for the continuance for the time being of all substituting agreements and administrative arrangements in matters of common concern between the states and the Dominion of Indian or any part thereof.  

The Instrument of Accession further elaborated the relationship between the Dominion of India and the Indian States that “unit new agreement on this behalf are made all agreements and administrative arrangements as to matters of common concern now existing between the crown and any Indian state shall, in so fare as may be appropriate, continue as between the Dominion of India or as the case may be, the part thereof, and state”. The matters of common concern included Defense, Foreign Affairs, and Communications etc. Any dispute arising out of these Agreements was to be settled by Arbitration Act, 1899. Nothing in this Agreement included the exercise of any paramountcy function. This means the conclusion of the Agreement was not the British crown. At the same time same relationship (under

5. Instrument of Accession Section 1 (i).
6. Ibid. Section 3.
paramountcy), the Agreement was valid until the signing of a new Agreement.

Thus the standstill Agreement and the Instrument of Accession kept the Indian States within the broader framework of the Indian Dominion. Theoretically they were independent. But practically they are not so.

From this above political trend of India and its frame work to integrate all the States of India. Not a single state of India could remain as sovereign state even though they fought through both supreme court and U.N.O. during that time. The best example is the case of Jammu and Kashmir. There is vagueness in the judgment concerning the state of Jammu and Kashmir. In the first, after the Indian Independence Act 1947, the state attained the states of a sovereign independence state. It is very clear and right. Second, the Instrument of Accession signed on 25 November, 1947 did not affect the sovereignty. Here if one interprets this judgment logically, he may conclude that the Indian Independence Act 1947 and the signing of the Instrument of Accession did not, in any way, affect the sovereignty of the Maharaja of Kashmir.
Thus the contention of the judgments of the Supreme Court is that the rulers had full sovereign power in the administration of the state except Foreign affairs, Defense and communications. This does not mean the state enjoyed full sovereign independent status in the eye of International Law. To be sovereign independent state, the state should have supreme power in all fields including Foreign Affairs, Defense and Communications. This was not so in the case of the Indian states who have entered into the Instrument of Accession with the Government of India.

**Manipur in the Pre and Post Merger Agreement**

It is undisputed fact that before India’s independence, Manipur was under the Paramountcy of British Crown. The state was under the general Principles applied to the other Indian states though the state enjoyed limited monarchy. That was only after the passing of the Indians Indipendence Act 1947, Manipur was a sovereign independent state. The first Manipur Legislative Assembly was inaugurated on 18th Oct 1948. While inaugurating, His Highness the Maharaja of Manipur pointed out the bright political future of Manipur. Before Indians independence the British tried their best effort to integrate the India states. But it was in vain though they took up
active measures to integrate the Indian state into the Union. So after Indian’s Independence, Sadar Valabhai Patel as iron man of India, the then Deputy Prime Minister utilized all his abilities and skill to unite the state by force. He organized several meetings with the Princes of different states. The Government of India sent Dewans in the states with the full powers over the whole range of administration. Lastly, the rulers signed conventions ceding to the Dominion Government, exclusive authority, jurisdiction and powers for and in relation to the government of the states.  

In Manipur Major General Nawab Amar Singh was the Dewan. The dewan had the direct charge of law and forces and relation with the Government of India. And the administration of Manipur was greatly influenced by the Governor of Assam, who was the Agent of the Indian Union.

As far as a step for the integration of the North Eastern States is concerned, there was two important proposals. One was the creation of “A frontier Hill State”. Of the two, the former became more popular. Another was the propose of ‘Purbachal’ State including

---

8. Letter, dated 14-4-1949 from Shri Prakasa, Governor of Assam, to the Maharaja Bodha Chandra; also the Maharaja’s Order No. 13F of 1949 dated 16-4-49.
Manipur, Tripura, Cachar, Lushai Hill etc. 9 The main objective of
the Purbachal plan was the Unification of Cachar, Manipur and Lushai
Hill into a singal political unit in order to cede as a group to the
Indians Union. But the plan was objected by the Manipur except a
small section of the Manipur State Congress. They supported the
plan.10

The Manipur Praja Sangha and the Krishak sabha were against
the proposed Prubanchal plan. The two organizations convened
meeting on 21st September 1948 at the M.D.U Hall, Imphal to condemn
the plan.11 People from different directions came to attend the meeting.
But unfortunately mass procession from pungdongbam clashed with
the police forces, and one police officer was killed. From the incident,
the Government of Manipur, consequently, Irawat and his followers
went underground. But his activities became stronger and proposed
integration of Manipur with Burma had become a burning issue.12

The second plan, the creation of a “Frontier Hill States” was
objected by Manipur State Congress. It was a plan of for forming a
new State consisting of Manipur, Naga Hill and Lushai Hills.

9. Supplementary Memorandum to the State Re-organisation Commission, submitted
by the Manipur State Congress on the 5th May, 1955, p.8.
In the hill areas of Manipur also there were political tensions during that time. In the north, specially in Mao, "the Naga People Leagues" was formed under the Leadership of A. Daiho and had started a movement to integrate the Naga inhabited areas of Manipur with the Hills.\textsuperscript{13} The newspaper of Shillong noted that "Lawlessness has been encouraged among the law abiding hill people and administration in the Mao area for some time past has been a statement. As things were turning from bad to worse the state authorities sent a strong military contingent to arrest Dioho"\textsuperscript{14}

There was a similar movements in the South-West of Manipur by the Mizo Union, from 1947 onwards, started movement to merge the Mizo- inhabited areas in Manipur into Lushai Hills and as a part of the movement, they boycotted the election of 1948.\textsuperscript{15}

The Manipur State Congress worked actively for the integration of Manipur into the Indian Union. They organized mass demonstrations and Satyagraha to end the monarchial rule and for the merger of Manipur into the Indian Union. Congress and Socialist party took up all possible issues such as abolition of passport system. In its General Session held at Imphal on 29\textsuperscript{th} and 30\textsuperscript{th} April, 1949,

\textsuperscript{13} Op.cit Satradhari
\textsuperscript{14} Shillong Times, 3.9.1948.
the Manipur State Congress passed resolution for merging Manipur into the Indian Dominion. It is stated that:

"The state congress views with deep concern the present international situation specially the communist rising in the neighbouring states of Burma and fells that the consolidation of the Governments of India." All over India by completing the unification of India through integration and the merging of the native states, especially Manipur state which is an eastern gate way to India and which is now administered by a pro-communist and in-efficient government is urgently required."\(^{16}\)

But the integration was strongly opposed by the people in the hill areas of Manipur and the ruling party of that time. The hill peolpe were rather concerned to preserve their traditions and the customs than the issue of integrating Manipur into Indian Union. Thus, special meeting of the hill MLAs only was held on the 27\(^{th}\) July, 1949 at Imphal with S. Lune in the chair. \(^{17}\) The meeting strongly resolved that the plain people should not take responsibility for the integration of the hill areas of Manipur into the Indian Union.

---

16. Resolution No. 2 of the Congress General Session, dated 29.4.1949 held at Imphal.
17. Lamyanba; No. 50- November, 1973; p.27
Merger of Manipur:

The period from 1947 to 1949 was a turning point in the political history of Manipur. Because, during the period, the people of Manipur had the great responsibility of determining their political future. People of Manipur witnessed that before the integration of Manipur into the Indian Domination, Manipur was under the rule of a monarch. With the lapse of British paramountcy over India on 15\textsuperscript{th} August, 1947, Manipur became Independent having its own constitution and National House, its representatives were elected by the people based on adult franchise. According to the provision of the India Independence Act, 1947, Manipur had the right to join either the Indian or the Pakistan Domination or to remain Independent. The relationship between Manipur and the Indian Union was conducted through a “Dominion Agent” and later on a “Dewan”. Besides, the governor of Assam was another important intermediary the two entities India and Manipur.

The political situation became more critical day by day because of two different opinions among the people, both the two groups organised the meetings and submitted memorandums for and against the merger policy to the Deputy Prime Minister and other authorities. Simultaneously, the work of integration into the Indian Union was actively taken up by the Agents of the Indian Dominion. The Dewan
concentrated all major powers and positions of the Government of Manipur into his hand. He even had judicial powers. The Maharaja was very much unhappy with the developing situation and he wanted to discuss the mater with the Governor of Assam. Some months ago, the Governor had invited the maharaja to visit Shillong. In fact, the plan for making a final agreement for the merger of Manipur into the Indian Domination was made in advance.

Accepting the invitation of Shri Prakash, the Governor of Assam, the Maharaja had visited Shillong on 17th September, 1949 with his few Officials. The Maharaja was almost disappointed when he realised the plans of Shri Prakash. Shri Prakash advised the Maharaja to sign the “Merger Agreement” for the welfare of Manipur. The Maharaja refused to sign the Agreement without the consent of his council and that of the people of Manipur.

In fact, to sign such an important Agreement without the knowledge of his people by a constitutional ruler is against the principles of the democracy.

18. Letter, dated 17-8-1949; from Shri Prakasa, Governor of Assam, to the Maharaja of Manipur.
However, in the afternoon of September 21st, 1949 at the Government House in Shillong, the Maharaja signed the "Merger Agreement". To quote Nari Rustomji:

At last, at a private meeting with the Governor, the Maharaja placed himself, without any reserve, in the governor's hand to do as he considered best in the interest of India, Manipur and the ruler”.

With this Agreement the Maharaja of Manipur ceded to the Dominion Government with full and exclusive authority, jurisdiction and powers for and in relation to the Government of the state.

Thus the merger was signed by a Maharaja under duress, which was not ratified by the Maharaja in council or by the legislature. This was recommended by National Convention which was held at Imphal. According to this convention "The Merger of Manipur is null and void". The National convention on the Manipur merger issue was convened by tri-ethnic plateform of Manipur from the 28th to 29th October, 1993 in the capital city Imphal; the convention has unanimously resolved in plenum that the impugned merger agreement with India in 1949 is illegal and unconstitutional considering the entire process and circumstances that led to the Merger Agreement.

---

The general feeling is that a constitutional head, which had political obligation to a constitution, lacked the political capacity to sign all instrument of merger in the absence of ratification by the constitutionally elected assembly and a plebiscite. The Maharaja was concerned to sign the Instrument of Accession on August 11, 1947 under which Defense, Communication, External relations passed within the exclusive jurisdiction of New Delhi. Prior to the Merger on October 15, 1949 as a response to the pressure from the officials of New Delhi, the Maharaja clarify that he was governed by the Manipur Constitution, unlike other rulers of the native Kingdoms. He wrote to the concerned official of Government of India on September 20, 1949, just one day before he was coerced to put his signature to Merger Agreement. The letter states:

“Direct dealing with me was feasible when sovereignty was vested in me but, after the introduction of the State Constitution Act, the sovereignty and the administration of the state has been shifted to the people”.

Earlier, the Maharaja wrote to the official of Government of India “if I am compelled to work independently of my people my action will be quite unjustifiable”. He also wrote three days before to the official of Government of India, “Now that the sovereignty of

23. Ibid
the state has been vested in the people. It would be in the fitness of things to hear the people's voice and learnt their sentiment so the line of action may not in any case be unconstitutional." In the fitness of things, a referendum on merger could have been held, but the government of India din't understand what constitutional procedure should have to be followed short of confiscating the state by war, even at the peak of power, the mighty British crown had foregone even their right to annexation of Manipur after a state of belligerency in 1891 and through debate in the parliament.  

Provisions of the Merger Agreement:

On 15th October, 1949. N. K. Vellodi, Secretary to the Ministry of State, New Delhi, passed an order effecting the full integration of Manipur into the Indian Union. The central Government has full and exclusive authority. Rawal Amar Singh, former Dewan of Manipur was designated as Chief Commissioner, Manipur. He was asked to conduct the administration under the Manipur Administration Order, 1949, issued by the Government of India on 15th October, 1949. Consequently, the Manipur State Legislative Assembly and the Council of Ministers were dissolved. The administration of Manipur was placed under direct administration of the Indian Union.

---

The “Merger Agreement” which was signed between Bodhachandra Singh, the Maharaja of Manipur and V. P. Menon, Advisor to the Government of India, Ministry of States, consists of nine articles. Maximum articles are more or less dealt with the private interests of the Maharaja, his relatives and the integration of Manipur into the Indian Dominion. This article indicates the political status of Manipur as Indian Government had full sovereignty over the administration of Manipur.

If one analyses the last sentence of that Agreement, he comes to understand that the Government of India did not take into cognizance the existence of the popular Legislative Assembly. Moreover they considered the Maharaja was the real sovereign of the state. These are completely negation to the Manipur Constitution Act, 1947.

Thus Manipur become Part “C” state which was not having its own assembly. All the administrative works of Manipur are in the hands of Chief Commissioner just like Political Agent of British.

TOWARDS STATEHOOD (1947-52):

People of Manipur were ashamed of the political status of Manipur. Because before merger with India Manipur was sovereign. A memorandum of women’s Assembly Demand Committee to the Chief Commissioner states “we had an Assembly in 1948-49 and
along with integration of state of Manipur with the Centre the Assembly was dissolved... we know that the Centre gives us a good sum of money. We cannot barter away our democratic and civic rights for central grants and subsidies. Give us our Assembly back and please inform the central government immediately that we are really to join the agitation along with our men for the restoration of responsible government in Manipur".26

Statehood movement was a great occasion in which participation of all Manipuris including Naga and Muslim took place. Statehood movement being a great tug of war between Centre and Manipur could manifest the skill of Manipuris as political actors. Prolonged struggles have been made by all political parties separately as well as jointly to convince the government of India about the urgency and legitimacy of their claim for full-fledged statehood.

WHY PEOPLE DEMANDED STATEHOOD:

The British departed on 14 August and Manipuris hoisted ‘Pafan Flag’ (It is a national flag of Manipur having picture of Pakhangba in a snake form) at 10 o’clock and 15 minutes a.m. at the same day at

26. Memorandum submitted by the Women’s Assembly Demand Committee to the Chief Commissioner of Manipur, 1960.
Kangla. Fourteenth August is the independence day of Manipur.27 After independence, the durbar ceased to exist and the Maharaja convened an Interim Council consisting of four official representative of the Maharaja and five non-official representatives of the hills and the valley. The council drafted the Manipur state (constitution) Act, 1947; and the Manipur state Hill people’s (Administration) Regulation, 1947. Towards the end of 1948, Manipur became a constitutional monarchy with a Legislative Assembly consisting of 53 members including 18 hillmen. On 21 September, 1949, the Maharaja signed the instrument of Merger. On Saturday, 15 October a Chief Commissioner took over its administration. The council of ministers and the legislature were dissolved. On 26 January, 1950, with the enforcement of the constitution of India, Manipur became a Part ‘C’ State.28 When the first general elections of the Indian Union was held in January, 1952, there was no election for legislative assembly in Manipur. But some Part ‘C’ states, like Himachal Pradesh, Bhopal, Ajmeer, Coorge, Delhi and Vindhya Pradesh were granted Legislative Assemblies. Tripura, Bilaspur and Kutch also got the same fate of Manipur. Manipur had a legislature and a council of ministers which was not technically responsible to

27. Press note released by Ad-hoc committee Royal Labour Reserve ask Front-Maning Tambasingbu Singnaba, 6-6-1985, p.3.
the legislature. There were 30 members of the Electoral College, constituted for electing a member for the Rajya Sabha, the upper house. Their duties were to select a member of Rajya Sabha. All the administrative work of Manipur were vested only in the Chief Commissioner, who did not represent anybody other than himself. He possessed immense administrative power. Unlike the Governors of part ‘A’ and part ‘B’ states, he could interfere in the administration of Manipur. The Advisory Council of 1953 was also powerless. In case of difference of opinion between the Chief Commissioner and his advisors the matter was referred to the President of India. The decision of the president was final. That meant the advice given by the Advisors in the Part ‘C’ State might be rejected by the Chief Commissioner. He was not bound by their advice. He acted as an agent of the Central Government.

**ADVISORY COUNCIL:**

*Advisory Council Invites the Movement:*

The Advisory Council was short of the political aspiration of the people. The Manipur Democratic Front, which was formed by Praja Shanti, National Union, Gandhi Sevak Sabha and Communist party articulated their ideas ‘that without the popular representatives in administration, people could not get democratic government. So they submitted a memorandum. Consequently there was movement
for responsible government. All political parties unanimously demanded Legislative Assembly and all parties except the Congress' stood against the Advisory Council.

STATE RE-ORGANISATION ON COMMISSION OF 1954 OILED THE MOVEMENT:

The Manipur state Congress convened, a political conference on 2nd and 3rd of July, 1953 at Gandhi Median. They demanded setting up of a fully elected legislature with a council of ministers responsible to it.29 People's demand for full fledged statehood was influenced by the attitude of State Re-organisation Commission of 1954. The Commission dreamt of an integrated north-east India in the form of an enlarged Assam. The commission anticipated the merger of Manipur with Assam in the long run and prescribed a kind of interim administration. Thirteen memoranda were submitted to Ph. H. Kunjru and Sardar Panikar, when they visited Imphal on 5th May, 1955. Ten out of the 13 memoranda demanded status-quo of the state's boundary. The memorandum of the Congress party was also one of these. The memoranda of the Congress pointed to the state Re-organisation Commission the historical background of Manipur, its strategic importance, future economic viabilities, administration and

reasons for dislike for a larger field. At that time, Lalit Madhav Sharma, the then president of Manipur state Congress and other congressmen were opposed to the formation of Purbachal and frontier hill State. They had mentioned the words given by Pandit Nehru in their memorandum submitted to the S.R.C. (State Re-organisation Commission) that . . . The dominant people in these states are of course Manipuris and Tripuris, both quite advanced. There are other tribes also and in Manipur there are many Nagas. Both states are rather small with a population of a few hundred thousands. And yet I think that it would be very unwise to merge them in some other state would create dissatisfaction and new problems.

The Manipur State Congress Committee also had the same political stand. It said that such a stand was supported by Manipur’s history, culture, customs, traditions, language and geographical location. The United Assembly Demand Committee expressed the same view in their memorandum. Besides, members of Manipur Electoral College, K. N. A. (Kuki National Assembly), Historical Research Committee, Praja Santi and Journalist Association also demanded for the same. But the Praja Socialist Party (P. S. P.) was

30. Memorandum submitted to the S.R.C. in April, 1954 by the M.P.C.C.
charged for pleading merger of Manipur with Assam in collusion with the leaders of Assam. It was confirmed at a public meeting of P.S.P. held at pologround on 12th April, 1956.\footnote{Press note issued by Th. Meghachandra, Secretary, United Assembly Demand Committee, 6-5-1953.} Along with the demand for the separate state, the demand for Legislative Assembly became stronger. On 28th August, 1953, 9 (nine) M.Ps. from different Parties submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister to modify the part 'C' states Act in Manipur and Tripura. The memorandum also mention that such a demand of theirs was supported by all parties, M.Ps, Advisors, Electoral College members and the people of the states. Even though the stand of S. R. C. was to merge Manipur with Assam or creation of a Purbanchal state since Manipur maintain its separate would not existence for a long time. So the ultimate solution would be its merger in the adjoining state of Assam.\footnote{The Hindusthan Standard, 1-9-1954.} So the Manipur state Congress Committee submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister of India in consideration of intrinsic merits of Manipur on one hand and of ought to be logical consummation of ethnical, cultural and linguistic distinctiveness of Manipur admitted by the S. R. C. on the other.
DISAPPOINTING TERRITORIAL COUNCIL:

The part 'C' states (Laws) Act was modified as the Union Territories (Laws) Act in 1956. Under this Act, on 1, August 1957 Manipur Territorial Council consisting of 32 members was inaugurated.\textsuperscript{35} Dwijamani Dev Sharma was elected chairman. The Council got power over education, public health, roads, transport, panchayats, revenue, works, animal husbandry, relief works and the power to levy taxes, subject to central government approval, on processions, trade, employment, tolls on bridges and school fees. The Administrator could attend the meetings of the council on which he could exercise substantive powers. So the power given by the central government was only in name. The central government could interfere in administration of Manipur. As such the Territorial Council was advisory in nature and could only influence the working of the government. But influence is not power.

From the later part of 1959, the Manipur Socialist Party started preparations for launching agitation. In a meeting held on 20\textsuperscript{th} July, 1958, the party passed a resolution asking the territorial Council members to resign in the interest of the people. The Manipur Socialist

\textsuperscript{35} S.R.C. Report Para 782.
Party also passed a resolution for establishing a responsible government in Manipur.\textsuperscript{36}

In a conference held on 26 March, 1960 at Aryan Theatre an Assembly Demand Co-ordinating Committee consisting of Congress, Communist Party of India (C.P.I.), Samyuka Socialist Party (S.S.P.), Communist party of Marxist (C.P.M.), and Praja Socialist Party (P.S.P.) was formed. The aim and object was to co-ordinate the activities of different political parties in demanding full fledged legislative assembly for Manipur. Thus a common platform was also made for the common cause. The movement started on 11 April, 1960.

Before the agitation, several memoranda were submitted to the Union Government and a deputation was sent to meet the President and the Home Minister of the Indian Union during the first week of April, 1960 and appraised them of the situation in Manipur.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{36} The Territorial council consisted of three elected and two nominated members. It was a corporate body having perpetual succession and a common seal, with powers to acquire, hold and dispose of property and to contract. The term of each councillor was five years from the date of notification of his election or nomination or from the date on which he was elected or nominated, whichever date was later. But the Government had the power to extend the term by one year. Both the chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Council were chosen from among the members of T.C. Central Government may nominate the first chairman who would hold office for a period not exceeding one year. The elected chairman could not be removed within one year from the date of election.

\textsuperscript{37} Resolution passed in the 12th Annual Conference of the Manipur State Socialist Party, 1959 at Terakeithel.
1960’s MOVEMENT:

The movement started on 11th April, 1960. Hartal in the markets and picketing of government offices and law courts were the order of the day. Slogans demanding legislative assembly were shouted in the Chief Commissioner IS Court, Secretariat, District Magistrate’s court and D.C.’s office during office hours by the volunteers of the A.D.C.C. (Assembly Demand Co-ordinating Committee). A big rally was also organised at Imphal on 16 April, 1960. A Youth Assembly Demand Committee was formed to mobilise youths and students of Manipur.\(^{38}\) Reminding the government or its step-motherly treatment to the people of Manipur and its adverse consequences to the integrity and solidarity of India, the Youth Assembly Demand Committee demanded to the government of India to end responsive government and establish a full-fledged responsible government.\(^{39}\) A women’s Assembly Demand Committee was also formed and Women’s Assembly Demand Day was observed on 21 April, 1960. Consequently they had a big rally to impress the gravity of the demand to the people of Manipur.\(^{40}\)

\(^{38}\) A.D.C.C., Why Responsible Government for Manipur, Imphal, 1960, p.1. Memorandum submitted by the A.D.C.C. to the president dated 3rd of April, 1960, containing charges against the Manipur Administration was also sent to the President. It complained the domination by outsider in the administration of state, the non-implementation of plan schemes, bribery, corruption and mismanagement in government departments.

\(^{39}\) A.D.C.C., op.cit., p.3.

\(^{40}\) Memorandum submitted by the Manipur Youth Assembly Demand Committee to the President of India for the restoration of responsible government in Manipur.
By the end of July, the leaders of the movement decided to change their line of action to elicit public sympathy and support.

NAGALAND’S 41 STATEHOOD STRENGTHENED THE MOVEMENT:

Manipur was divided statehood on grounds of small population and absence of economic viability. But Indian Government was trying to grant statehood to Nagaland, inferior to Manipur both in population and economic viability. Manipuris got a chance to pursue union government in logical argumentative way. Some Nagas of Manipur wanted to merge their portion of land with Nagaland. In a meeting, on 20 October, 1960, the Congress resolved that if Naga Hills and Tuensang area becomes a full-fledged state, the grant of statehood

41. Memorandum submitted by Women’s Assembly Demand Committee to the Chief Commissioner of Manipur. There was a big rally of more than 50,000 Women at Imphal Pologround and they gave a memorandum to the Chief Commissioner to restore the former status of Manipur. They were ready to join agitation along with their menfolk. In order to suppress the activities of the people, the District Magistrate of Imphal promulgated on 25th April, 1960, an order under section 144 prohibiting meeting, processions and demonstrations. Severe lathi charges, tear gasing and firing were resorted to by the police. About 300 persons were arrested on the same day. The 16th May of 1960 was observed as Civil Resistance Day by a mass of people in defiance of section 144. More than 50,000 people assembled on the pologround and paraded at Imphal. Several leaders of the movement including 3 members of the Manipur Territorial Council, 4 members of the Assembly Demand Co-ordinating Committee sought court arrest on that day.
to Manipur must not be delayed.\textsuperscript{42} Union Government granted statehood to Nagaland in 1963. When Nagaland got statehood in 1963, the demand for Manipur statehood was strengthened, because Nagaland has lesser economic resources, population and area. In other words Manipur is not inferior to Nagaland in many respects. But Manipur has been deprived of statehood by the Government of India.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT (1963 - 1972) :

\textit{Small Dose of Responsible Government} :

In place of full responsible government, Manipur got the status of a Union Territory under Government of Union Territories Act, 1963. Under this Act, there were Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers. Provision was made for reservation of seats in the legislature for scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. All bills passed by the Assembly were subjected to reservation by the Chief Commissioner for the president's assent, but the Administrator could himself recommend demands for grants. The legislative competence of the Territorial Assembly was also extended to Union List and

---

\textsuperscript{42} The Nagaland state comprises the former Naga Hills District of Assam and the former Tuensang Frontier division of North East Frontier Agency. These had been made a centrally Administered Area in 1957, administered by the president through the Governor of Assam. In January 1961 the Government of India conferred the status of a state on Nagaland. The state of Nagaland was, officially inaugurated on 1st December, 1963.
Concurrent List of the Sixth Schedule. The Union Government interacted separate contingency and consolidated funds. The Administrator had a “Special responsibility” in respect of “border defence” to be discharged in his discretion. In other matters, any difference between the Administrator and the Council of Ministers would be referred to the president of India. The president could suspend any provision of the Act in case of a constitutional breakdown. The scope for central intervention was great. It was some sort of diarchy in which elected representatives were reduced to the position of junior partners. As a consequence, people were not satisfied. Their representatives had no right to cast their votes in the presidential election. They considered themselves as second class citizens. Therefore people’s aspiration for statehood movement became more and more.

43. Telegram, Manipur State Congress, Dated, 30.7.1960, President, S. Tombi Singh. A delegation named All Manipur Community Delegation reached Delhi on 3 December, 1960. They protested against the move of some M.Ps. in Parliament for merging Manipur and Tripura to Assam and submitted a memorandum to Home Minister demanding legislative assembly for Manipur before the next general election. The Congress Party had already sent a telegram each to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister, Shri Gobind Ballabh Pantji, Home Minister, Shri Jha Home Secretary, Government of India and Shri C. Dutta Foreign Secretary Government of India on 30 July, 1960, to oppose a section of Manipuri Nagas to join Nagaland.

ALL PARTIES’ STATEHOOD DEMAND CO-ORDINATING BODY:

On 28 February, 1970 all parties viz. S. S. P. (Samyukta Socialist Party), P.S.P. (Praja Socialist Party), C. P. I.(M) (Communist Party of India (Marxist), Congress (R) and M.P. P. (Manipur People’s party), had a meeting to discuss about their separate line of action. They mentioned about the need for taking joint actions. On 26 April, 1970 the six parties formed all parties Statehood Demand Co-ordinating Body. After some months two more parties, Congress (0) and Manipur National Organisation, joined the Co-ordinating Body. They strongly recommended to the Central Government to grant Statehood to Manipur.

A ‘Manipur Bandh’ was observed by the Co-ordinating Body on 18 May, 1970. It was also observed at Jiribam, Moreh, Pallel, Sekmai, Lamlai, Yairipok, Sugnu, Churachandpur, etc. The following programmes were drawn up for their line of action.

1. Resignation of both elected and nominated members of Imphal Municipal Board from August, 1970;
2. To boycott all government functions from 1 August, 1970;
3. Resignation of all elected and nominated Town Committee members and other government nominees in advisory boards from 15 August, 1970;

4. Resignation of M.Ps. in August, 1970;

5. To boycott all elections including that of Imphal Municipality;

6. To start Civil-Disobedience Movement from 26 August, 1970.⁴⁵

The co-ordinating body gave a memorandum to the team of 10 M.Ps., who were coming to study the political situation in Manipur on 9 May, 1970. Each party made its own gates and welcomed all the M. Ps. from Delhi.⁴⁶

The Co-ordinating Body warmly welcomed the resignation of Municipal Commissioners. Another ‘Manipur Bandh’ was observed on 3 August, 1970. Their movement was so organised that even the Independence Day Celebration function of the government was boycotted by the people.

Civil disobedience movement was started from 17 August, 1970. On that day, volunteers of the Co-ordinating Body observed satyagraha near secretariat gates. Slogans like ‘we demand statehood, Co-ordinating Body Zindabad etc. were shouted. All of them were

---


arrested and put into jail. On the same day, a delegation of nine members of the Co-ordinating Body met the central leaders and reiterated their demand for statehood. This civil disobedience movement was ended on 28 August, 1970. The movement got active and strong support from all over Manipur. There were more than 2,000 active volunteers. On 3\textsuperscript{rd} September, 1970 Mrs. Gandhi’s government announced that the centre had agreed to grant statehood to Manipur and Tripura in principle. But the bill for granting statehood could not be introduced because of the dissolution of the lower house by the president on 28\textsuperscript{th} December, 1970 after the split of the congress into two groups. After the 1971 elections, the congress party was led again by Mrs. Gandhi and got power. She introduced the North East Areas (Reorganisation) Bill, 1971, on 9\textsuperscript{th} December 1971 with the state Minister of Home affairs, Shri K. C. Pant. The Bill was passed by Lok Sabha on 15\textsuperscript{th} December, 1971. The Upper House passed the Bill on 22\textsuperscript{nd} December, 1971.\textsuperscript{47} Manipur Statehood was inaugurated by Mrs. Indira Gandhi on 21\textsuperscript{st} January, 1972.

Thus, prolonged struggles had been made by all political parties and unions separately to convince the government about the urgency and legitimacy of their claim for full fledged statehood. People of Manipur made utmost patience and kept firm confidence in the leaderships of all parties. They knew the method of political

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 1980, p.59.
participation such as rally with shouting slogans, demonstration, sit-ins, bandh, cease work and fasting. In short statehood movement of Manipur was working like training institution to produce active political actors for sharing in political participation of Manipur.

Hence, the transformation of political status of Manipur from sovereign state to unit state of India was taken place. The following table shows the political status and its transformation:

**Transformation of Manipur State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Status of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.D. 33 – early 20 century</td>
<td>Sovereign State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1891 – 1946</td>
<td>International Protectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26 July, 1947</td>
<td>Autonomous State (Constitution Adopted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 August, 1947</td>
<td>Associate State (Sovereign within Indian Confederation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14 August, 1947</td>
<td>Sovereign State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 October, 1948</td>
<td>Sovereign State (Assembly Functions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15 October, 1949</td>
<td>Annexed State (Continuous State with Suspended Sovereignty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21 January, 1972</td>
<td>Constituent State of India (Suspended Sovereignty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political status of state during the inter-war period (1919 - 1945) had varied in the comity of nation (Sanajaoba Naoriya, *Arms Forces Special Power Act, 1958 - a Law for extra Judicial Execution in Prepetuity*. Paper at AASU - Apunba Lup, one day convention, Gauhati, 2006)
INPUT - OUTPUT ANALYSIS:

The object of this chapter is not to present a general historical narrative of all movements of Manipur for reforming the society in general and political system in particular during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. An attempt has been made to trace how the people of Manipur had launched these movements in connection with their ideas in the form of input and responses from the authorities as output in the trends of people’s ideas of liberalism, utilitarianism and positivism. It indicates political behaviour of the masses concerned with the political status of the state. Before analysing input-output of Manipuris' movement, something about the input-output analysis in theoretical concepts is necessary.

Political system is a set of interactions having structures and functions. It is a set of processes converting input into outputs. It is a complex cyclical operation that has a dynamic of its own and that is capable of being purposive and goal directed. If outputs are not accepted by the people or environment, they can turn and operate as feedback. Oran R. Young says, “Above all, the political system is seen as a conversion process performing work, producing outputs, and altering its environment, with a continuous exchange between apolitical system and its environment based on the steady operation

of the dynamic processes. At the same time, the approach provides numerous concepts for dealing both with political dynamics in the form of systemic adaptation processes and even with purposive redirection in the form of goal-changing feedback.\textsuperscript{49}

He further mentions about the importance of modification in the system itself that with the perspective of goal-changing it is possible to deal with changes in the system itself, although the approach focusses mainly on changes whose principal results are only to modify or streamline the system. It is, therefore, important to observe that the input-output approach does not dwell extensively on a third level of change and dynamics focussing on broader-scale and more far-reaching alterations. Revolutionary change is hardly mentioned and even the possibilities of evolution to new systemic forms are not covered in detail. Though the adaptive consequences of phenomena like growth could certainly be treated under this approach, their broader aspects of qualitative change do not find much place therein.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{50} Oran, R. Young, 1968. Systems of Political Science, p.44.
In case of input-output analysis of Easton we have got three main variables in the forms of demands, supports and feedback. Demands are interest of the people. People as actors make these demands upon their political system that subserve their specific interest. Thus, the political system undergoes 'demand stress'.

For Almond there are four variables in input and three variables in output. Political Socialisation and recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation, and political communication are in the form of inputs, and rule making, rule-application and rule-adjudication in the output. He is trying to include all interactions effected by the variables of inputs and interactions that effect the use of physical coercion in all the structures, including undifferentiated structures, like kinship and lineage, and anomie phenomena like riots and street demonstrations, and not merely the interactions which take place within the structures associated with the state, like parliament, executive and bureaucracies, and formally organised units like parties, interest groups and media of communications. 

51. Ibid., p.45.
Judged by the above theory of input-output analysis we find that movement in Manipur does not always, obey the rules. In the then prevailing absolute monarchical form of government, demand stress was there. But naturally there is no question of overload.\textsuperscript{53} Because, input in the form of demands from the people was very few. As such there was no question of content stress\textsuperscript{54} and volume stress.\textsuperscript{55} Demands come from the people if there is strain of sub-system. For in stance all movements, like Thoubal Lal, Kuki rebellion, Jadonang movement, Irawat movement and Nupilal were against the forced labour and autocratic rule of the king and the colonial power. From the beginning of these movements, the demand stresses were few and qualitative elements would not manifest unlike in developed political systems. Some demands might be fulfilled and some, rejected. People had willingness of reacting against cultural mechanism in the shape of firm beliefs and attitudes. In brief demands could not be articulated as all interests could not be focussed. This was not due to lack of content stress. It led to failure of the regulatory mechanism. So, there was no necessity to maintain gatekeepers and no need of cultural, communication and reduction mechanism. But the demands or input of Irawat’s movement had enough content

\textsuperscript{54} Overload means to fill overmuch of demands to the polity.
\textsuperscript{55} Content stress means demands of qualitative elements.
stress, because it threatened against the existing political system. Quality of demand was demand for participation in the political system e.g., right to vote, hold office, petition government bodies and officials and to organise political associations. Thus he made overload of demands at the end of his movement. But it could not run proper operation of Input-Output systems. Because demand stresses of environment were too fluctuating.

THE OUTPUT:

The first movement undoubtedly belongs to anti-British movement, that is, Women’s War against the order issued by the political agent to rebuild the Assistant political agents bungalow by forced labour. People got their actual output (desired decision) from the authority i.e., to cancel the order. Thoubal Agitation had also the same result. Some movements repressed the aspiration of the people and even killed the leader and arrested and tortured them. This happened in the case of Kuki rebellion, Jadonang and Irawat movement. These movements really affected in both economy and political systems of colonial power and the king. In these movements the input was considered as the voice of the people. The demand for full responsible government of Manipur launched by the members of Nikhil Manipuri Mahasabha headed by Hijam Irawat was achieved in 1948.

56. Burden of quantitative elements.
Before independence output dominated input. But in post-independence period also most demands were not turned into output. People had some output for their minor grievances. After attaining statehood, people could not get their demands fulfilled. Any method of protest against the government could not be fruitful because government got more and more power and there was no pro rata allocation of values to the people. In Manipur power and value do not vary directly. It made great discontent to the people of Manipur, particularly to the youth. If both input and output i.e., making of demands and making of decision, were proceeding in the actual process of political system, there might be fighting within the system. This was not so in the political process of Manipur. So the revolutionary movement might result from such defects of relationship between people and government.

Being subjects\(^{57}\) of the king in the pre-independence period, the people had no real sense of political activities such as governmental organisation, pressure group, voting, political parties and other social elements related to them, such as classes, regional groupings, etc. But after independence, we have got all these political activities. So the people being to see how and why they vote, what roles political leaders play, how propaganda functions, the way in

---

57. Prafulla Kumar Mahanta: The Tussle between the citizens and foreigners in assam,1986, pp.4 & 5. Subjects: The word subject has been used in history to describe the relation between the absolute king and those whom be ruled over. So a subject is one who is not entitled to any political rights.
which the chief minister and the other cabinet ministers performed their legislative, executive and other functions. But people could not react against the government in time due to lack of good political communication between the people and the government. Moreover, political culture of Manipur renders the people not to act against the government as far as possible. So long there is no personal hurt, a Manipuri would not easily rise as social consciousness is low. Foreign rulers were not responsible to the people, so people had tendency of unpositivism. This unpositivism led indifference to the political system. That is why from the social grouping to formal organisation, our people cannot react. Because modern citizenship implies interaction among themselves and reaction with the government.

Thus the political status of Manipur is in the long way of top-down process, i.e. from sovereign country to Part ‘C’ State, from Part ‘C’ State to Territorial Council, Territorial Council to Union Territory, Union Territory to full fledged state. But this state as unit states of India, is also nominal because of more intervantion by the centre and not having equal representation. It will be discussed in the next chapter.