

## **Kuki Chiefs Role in the Transitional Period of Manipur Politics, 1946-1952**

Dr. Priyadarshni M. Gangte<sup>1</sup>

### **Introduction**

Monarchy was the form of governance before 1947 in Manipur. Moreover, ancient kingdom of the same had her own written Constitution “Loyumba Shilyen” or “Loyamba Shinyen” since Meidingu Loyamba (Loiyamba) who reigned in the 11<sup>th</sup> Century A.D. in 1074 – 1112 A.D.<sup>1</sup>. Administration of this small monarchy, had been carried out by a system of representatives form of government, of course, not exactly Legislative Assembly or Council of contemporary times, under a constitutional monarch till 1891 when Manipur was kept under the British Paramountcy<sup>2</sup>. It was the “phumthou” resembling modern parliament<sup>3</sup> – a 64 (sixty-four) parliamentary body incepted during Nongda Lairen Pakhangba’s Regime, historically well known as the “Phumdou Humphumari”. Ningthou Pongba Tara – the Council of Ministers (Ibid) comprising of 10 (ten) were selected by the King from Phumdou Humphumari. They assisted the King by guiding and advising in different fields, which affectedly regulated in carrying out the monarchy in the right perspective. Legacy of Manipuri Monarchy was, in fact, horizontal or well as vertical according to time and situation, however, and the pre-colonial Manipur, monarchy – a semi constitutional nature played a great role in maintaining stability and upholding, inter alia. The socio-culture ties among the inhabitants who were different ethnic communities.

In this regard, Roy<sup>4</sup> emphatically contended that the institution of monarchy contended that the institution of monarchy in Manipur successfully played its historical role in two ways : viz one in maintaining the stability of the society by effectively working its influence due to its descent from legendary Pakhangba and Babrubahan through religious sentiment, of the people of the valley and other by the direct personal allegiance of all subjects towards the monarch (Roy’s claiming of decency from Babrubahan is, in fact, needs to further research). However, with

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gangte is Assistant Professor at Damdei College, Kangpokpi, Manipur

consolidation of British administration in Manipur drove a wedge in the unity by dividing the political authority separately for the hills and valley, and, as a matter of the fact, i.e. divide and rule policy, the Manipuris have been facing the ethnic crisis even today.<sup>5</sup>

Democratic terms like Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council was not incepted at all. The Manipuris influenced by the Civil Disobedience Movement started by Mahatma Gandhi in British India, started agitation for the establishment Government in Manipur since 1939<sup>6</sup>. The Manipur State Congress, a branch of the INC supported the proposal and the Maharaja accepted it, and constituted a constitution – making committee<sup>7</sup> named as the Manipur State Constitution Making Committee of whose Chairman was Mr. F.F. Pearson, POS (Indian Political Service) the then President of the Darbar<sup>8</sup>. The Committee framed the Constitution known as the Manipur Constitution Act which was brought into force in 1948. Meanwhile a Council of Ministers also known as His Highness Maharaja in Council with a Chief Minister was constituted by the Maharaja Bodhchandra Singh before the conduction of elections to the Legislative Assembly after dissolving the Manipur State Darbar on 30 June, 1947<sup>9</sup> before the Indian independence. Thus, as for Manipur after 1891, she ceased to be a sovereign power and a era of colonialism continued till 1947<sup>10</sup>.

The Council of Ministers were composed of (1) Mr. F.F. Pearson, I.P.S.(Chief Minister); (2) Maharajkumar Priyobrata Singh (MK. P.B. Singh); (3) Shri Sougajam Somorendra Singh, (4) Shri Sanjenbam Nodiachand Singh (5) Waikhom Chaoba Singh and (6) Moulavi Qazi Md. Walimullah. (No.2-6 were all Ministers). However, it did not last long, the Maharaja dissolved the Council on 13 August, 1947 and an Interim Council was brought into existence at 7.15 a.m. of 14<sup>th</sup> August, 1947. The period of “His Highness Maharaja in Council” lasted for a period only one and half month, i.e. 1<sup>st</sup> July, 1947 – 13<sup>th</sup> August, 1947.

The Interim Manipur Council initially consisted<sup>11</sup> of 6(six) Ministers - (1) Shri Konjengbam Gouro Singh (Education and Press), (2) Moulavi Basiruddin Ahmed (Jail, Medical and Public Works); (3) Shri Sinam Krishnamohon Singh (Finance, Commerce, Forest, Agriculture & Veterinary); (4) Rajkumar Bhubonsana Singh (Revenue); (5) Maharajkumar Priyobrata Singh (Chief Minister). Soon after two

hillmen – (i) Mr. T.C. Tiankham (Forest) and (ii) Major Bob K. Khating (Hill affairs) were inducted<sup>12</sup>.

The Legislative Assembly was unicameral. The members were elected for a term of three years. Adult franchise was the basis in the valley whereas in the hill, it was only the Chief who had the right to vote. It will be pertinent to know that how the election was held. Elections were held for 53 seats of which six were filled up without contest, five from the Hills and one from the Valley, i.e. Jiri Constituency. There were 192 (one hundred and ninety-two) candidates filed for candidature for the remaining 47 (forty-seven) seats.<sup>13</sup>

Regarding politics in Manipur Hills 1946-52, Irawat was, in fact the first person who wanted to keep the integrity of Manipur, therefore, under his leadership, the Praja Sangha organised a joint meeting of the representatives of the political parties of the Hills and Valley of Manipur<sup>14</sup>. The following organizations were represented in the meeting : (i) Tangkhul Long, (ii) Kuki National Assembly, (iii) Kabui Association, (iv) Khulmi Union, (v) Mizo Union, (vi) Manipur Praja Sabha, (vii) Manipuri Krishak Sabha, (viii) Meitei Marup and (ix) Nongpok Apunba Marup<sup>15</sup>. This Conference demanded a full responsible government and decided to keep the territorial integrity of Manipur and formed a United Front of Manipur<sup>16</sup>. It was, of course, a rare historical event of its kind where nine organizations belonging to different ethnic communities from hills and plain, held at Manipur Dramatic Union, on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 1947 presided by M.K. Shimray of Tangkhullong<sup>17</sup>. Irawat, rendering his speech, focused on the politics of the Naga National Council and its impacts on Manipur<sup>18</sup>. Thus we notice the affirmative policy in Irawat's political aspiration, i.e. to bring unity among the hill and plain peoples<sup>19</sup>. Lamphel Singh of Meitei Marup, Ibomcha Singh and Kanhai Singh of Krishak Sabha, Lunneh of Kuki National Assembly and Kakhangai Kabui of Kabui Association gave speeches on the various socio-economic problem that the people of both the plain and the hill areas had been facing<sup>20</sup>. The meeting realized genuine necessities for forming a United Front of all the parties in the hills and plain and therefore, resolved to constitute an organizing committee with Irabot Singh as the President and M.K. Shimray as the Secretary<sup>21</sup>. Since then, none of the political parties whether national or regional parties of Manipur, such as the Congress, the Socialist, the Praja Santi Sabha and the Krisak

Sabha had interested to open their account in the hill areas, perhaps, due to orthodox Hinduism, an impact of cultural colonialisation, which was firmly entrenched in the valley. Thus different attitude shown towards the hill as well as valley people by their socio-political leaders also could easily seen, perhaps, out of cultural arrogance<sup>22</sup>. When the Meiteis became the followers of Vaishnavism this historically given cultural arrogance, according the value system of the new faith, has been express in the framework of pollution parity relationship and has alienated the non-Hindu tribes<sup>23</sup>. The tribes who have embraced Christianity, also have alienated themselves from the Meiteis<sup>24</sup>. This social gap resulted from the mutual alienation became wider and wider with the metamorphosis of the colonial subjects into free citizens of independent India because political democratization has stimulated primordial sentiments<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, specifically in the areas of Kuki dominance the Kuki National Assembly and the Mizo got political momentum for the time being. And, as a matter of fact, the national parties had no place in the tribal areas at all during this political phase of historical importance and significance.

It was during this period in the hills of Manipur socio-political organizations: such as the Kuki National Assembly (KNA) which later on converted into political party and finally to secessionist group and the Khulmi National Union (KNU) were also established<sup>26</sup>; on 24<sup>th</sup> October, 1946 and 6<sup>th</sup> July, 1947 under the leaderships of Zavum Misao and Thangkhopau Kipgen and Teba Kilong and T.C. Tiankham<sup>27</sup>. In fact, these two organizations became very active in shaping the political scenario in the Kuki dominated areas in Manipur. The Constituent member tribes of KNA were (i) Anal, (ii) Chiru; (iii) Gangte; (iv) Guite; (v) Hmar; (vi) Koireng; (vii) Kom; (viii) Monsang; (ix) Paite, (x) Simte; (xi) Thadou; (xii) Vaiphei and (xiii) Zou. Not pleased with the Thadou dominancy and arrogance, the non Thadou ethnic grupos, searched for a more democratic pan tribal organisation as an alternative to KNA<sup>28</sup>, as an outcome of the subject matter, a parallel body – the KNU, came into existence with its constituent tribes, namely : (i) Aimol; (ii) Anal, (iii) Baite; (iv) Chiru; (v) Dounghel; (vi) Gangte; (vii) Hanghal; (viii) Khongsai (Lunkim, Changsan, Hlangum, Lengthang); (ix) Kom; (x) Manchong; (xi) Manlhun, (xii) Maring; (xiii) Mate; (xiv) Moyon; (xv) Paite; (xvi) Purum, (xvii) Saum; (xviii) Simte; (xix) Tarao; (xx) Vaiphei and (xxi) Zou. As a pan non-Naga tribal political organization KNU contested in 1948

election of Manipur State Assembly and seven of its member become victorious in the said election<sup>29</sup>. The year 1947 also witnessed the birth of another association of non-Naga tribes, called the Kom Rem Association of which Kom, Aimol, Chiru, Koireng, Purum and Kharam were the member tribes<sup>30</sup>. However, the idea of adopting this generic term did not last long as the Government of India did not recognized, creating an environment to the formation of splinter groups like the Hmar National Organization, the Tiddim Chin Union, the Baite National Government Council and the Mate Tribal Union<sup>31</sup> due to the lack of mutual trust and a common ideology and also partly of arrogant, dominant attitude of the Thadous<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, the southern part of Churachandpur District bordering Miroram was affected by the Mizo Union, formed on 11<sup>th</sup> April, 1946 at Aizawl, Mizoram<sup>33</sup> movement. The Mizo Union was the first ever Regional Political Party established in the erstwhile Lushai Hills (now Mizoram) <sup>34</sup> born on 9<sup>th</sup> April, 1946 at Lungleh in its adhoc basis uner the style of Mizo Common People's Union<sup>35</sup>. A branch of the same had opened in Manipur under the leaderships of L. Tawna and G.L. Daka as its President and Secretary<sup>36</sup>. In 1948 this party was divided on the issue of merger of Hmar inhabited areas of Manipur with Lushai Hills (Mizoram) and the lone candidate of Mizo Union contested in the election was defeated.

The other regional political parties in the Hill areas of Manipur were also the Naga National League (NNL) formed in September, 1946 with its manifesto to bring all the Nagas under one Flag<sup>37</sup> and the Naga Peoples League under the leadership of Athiko Daiho Mao. The party, in its public meeting held in 1948, at Song-Song, Mao in Manipur, decided to boycott the preparation of the electoral rolls for the ensuing elections to the Manipur State Legislative Assembly. The Kabui Samiti/Association as well as the Tangkhul Association, inter alia, had strong hands in formulating policies and programme of the Naga National League and the Naga Peoples League.

Thus, in 1948 election was conducted, in such a way, that each candidate was given one ballot box on which the symbol of the candidate and his photograph were displayed. As the masses were illiterate, the simplest, an easy method to indicate and signify was adopted. P.C. Deb (Revenue Officer) was the Returning Officer, 11 and 30 June in the valley and 26 and 27 July were periods of commencement and carried out successfully.

Declaration of result took some days, announcement of result were on 14 July (Valley) and 6 August (Hills) <sup>38</sup>. Out of the total number of 53 seats, there was only 52 elected members of the first Manipur Legislative Assembly, one seat of a hill constituency was not filled up<sup>39</sup>. But, no party was able to obtain an absolute majority in this historic event. Relating to this, it will more clear to have the party-wise position as given by Gangmumei<sup>40</sup> (i) State Congress 14(fourteen), (ii) Manipur Krishak Sabha-5(five), (iii) Socialist Party-3(three); (iv) Hill (Independents) – 18(eighteen), and (v) Praja Santi-12(twelve). Thus on 18 October, 1948, the elected members were sworn at the Palace Darbar Hall. The Maharaja administered the oath<sup>41</sup>, henceforth, coalition government of Praja Santi, <sup>42</sup> and the 18 Independent M.L.A's from the Hills and Krishak Sabha was formed. The Raja made every effort to stabilize the Praja Shanti led Government<sup>43</sup>.

It will be worth mentioning that these 18 M.L.As. from the hills joined the coalition government on the condition that the Deputy Speaker of the Assembly should be a tribal, secondly no part of Manipur should never be merged with any other State, thirdly the individuality of the State should be maintained at any cost<sup>44</sup>. Subsequently the M.L.As from the hill areas also insisted that if any neighbouring areas desire to join Manipur, it should welcome and be permitted to do so<sup>45</sup>. Thus the political environment was in fact, smooth and healthy with all assurances and promises to, including responsible form of government with the Maharaja as its constitutional head made by the Council of Minister, was, however, did not last long.

A totally different political scenario developed in Manipur with the Maharaja signing the Merger Agreement with India on 21<sup>st</sup> September, 1949 and enforced in 15<sup>th</sup> October, 1949 along with Benaras and Tripura, Manipur became a part of the Indian Union rather under “Part-C” status by the enacted “Part-C”, Act to which everyone in Manipur felt extremely regretted and insulted. Resist and protest of all kinds erupted in the state, Joykumar<sup>46</sup> emphatically maintained:

*“The most significant epoch making development in the political history of Manipur was the movement for the merger of Manipur into the Indian Union.”*

As a consequence, during the last part of 1949, the D.O.C. and the Red Guard undertook major organizational changes of which the latter in Red Guard became very active in the beginning of 1950<sup>47</sup>. Obviously, these are the root causes of insurgency in Manipur.

In this regard, it is imperative to note the contention of Pillai (G.K. Pillai, former Union Home Secretary) on September 26, at a lecture titled “Manipur – the way forward” at Delhi,<sup>48</sup>:

*“the ancient kingdom, which a constitution even before India wrote her own, had its own proud history and was overnight turned into a C-category state in 1948”.*

Instead of paying attention the Government of India constituted an Advisory Council consisting of the Chief Commissioner and fourteen others nominated by the Central Government in consultation with the Chief Commissioner. The Council was inaugurated on 9th October, 1950 consisting with (i) Sinam Krishnamohon Singh; (ii) H. Dwijamani Dev Sharma, (iii) Salam Tombi Singh, (iv) Dr. L. Kampu Gangte and (v) A. Daiho Mao. It was, however, “compelled to do so as the term “Part C” state meant that it had no popularly elected body and was ruled by a Chief Commissioner responsible directly to Delhi” contended by Guha<sup>49</sup>.

Thus, political developments in the pre and post-merger period produced a serious psychological effect on every sensitive educated youth of the State<sup>50</sup>.

It will be interesting to know the politics developed during this transitional phase from monarchy to democracy in the domains of Kuki Chiefs also.

Before administration of the entire hill territories was entrusted to a single officer (the Vice President who was already overburdened with his usual duties in the durbar<sup>51</sup>. The British employed well known policy of ‘divide et impera’ – a policy that played a crucial part in ensuring the stability indeed, the viability of nearly every colonial system, <sup>52</sup>. Moreover Kamei<sup>53</sup> has contended their Indirect Rule both in the valley and hills was fraught with troubles – Manipur became a part of the Dominion of India from 15<sup>th</sup> August, 1947, as a result of signing the Instrument of accession and stand-still Agreement by the Maharaja on 11 August, 1947 <sup>54</sup>

Concerning the hill people, chapter VII of the Manipur State Constitution Act, 1947, <sup>55</sup> clearly says :

*“The Council shall be responsible for the welfare and good administration of the hill people of the state and shall provide such funds for the purpose as may, subject to the provision of 32 above, be deemed necessary, provided the local Authorities in the Hill shall exercise such powers of Local Self Government as may be laid down in the Manipur state Hill (Administration) Regulation Act, 1947.”*

Moreover, in the past the numerous tribal groups living in Manipur had been placed under the administration of their respective chiefs. These were gradually replaced partially by ordinances for better effective administration. At the threshold of Indian Independence, the Manipur State Hill People (Administrations) Regulation was enacted in 1947.

However, we understand that the rights of chiefs were not totally abandoned, but the same were retained to deal with various tribal social and political problems the lowest law enforcing agencies at the village level<sup>56</sup>. This was subsequently improved by another Act called the Manipur (Village Authorities in the Hill Areas) Act, 1956 <sup>57</sup>.

The Act created strongly a sense of opposition, generated a great amount of discontentment apprehensions of Government's intention to do away with the chiefs' right<sup>58</sup> over the land and vehemently resented application or extension of the Act in the hill areas. Protests of all kinds were launched by the public and within the then Territorial Council of the State, by the Kuki members of the Manipur Territorial Council that resulted at times in the stability of government due to change of sides (defecting) to topple the political party that held the reign of Government.

Thus, with insecurity looming large over their heads like 'Damocles' Sword', the Kuki National Assembly, the new pan-Kuki social organisation at the point of Kuki National Assembly (KNA) formed by the Kuki elite group in 1946 which had initially raised the usual threat secession like the Nagas<sup>59</sup> decided to take a political decision to demand a Kuki State<sup>60</sup>.



Though these are the immediate resultant consequences of the Act enacted relating to the administration of the Hill areas, the main provision relating to the administration of the said Act are highlighted below that gradually eroded the authority of the chiefs among the hill tribes of Manipur the Kuki's in particular.

### **Manipur State Hill Peoples (Administration) Regulation Act, 1947 :**

In Manipur, the Manipur State Hill People (Administration) Regulation was enacted in 1947, containing provisions for administration of justice in the hill areas. It provided that criminal and civil justices should be administered by the court of a village authority, the court of the circle authority the Hill Bench at Imphal and the Chief of Manipur State.

The Court of a Village Authority was empowered to try any criminal case, involving the offence of theft, mischief, cattle lifting, simple hurt, assault, using criminal force or illegal slaughter of cattle.

In civil matter the Village Authority could try and suit of values below Rs.501/-

The Court Circle could exercise the powers of a magistrate of the first class.

The Hill Bench at Imphal exercised the powers of the Session Court. It was composed of a judge of the Chief Court as Chairman with two hillmen as judges Mr. Thangkhopao Kipgen and Mr. Kathipri Mao were the Judges who were subsequently nominated to the Indian Administrative Service and ultimately retired as Chief Secretaries of Goa and Nagaland respectively. <sup>61</sup>.

Except the Village Authority the other court had appellate powers, procedures etc under 1947 Regulation were more or less the same as those in 1937 and the series of Rules for the Hill-Districts of Assam. <sup>62</sup>.

### **The Manipur (Village Authorities in Hill Areas) Act, 1955 :**

In 1955, the Manipur (Village Authorities in Hill Areas) Act, 1956 was passed, modifying the provisions of 1947 Regulation, so far as the Village Authority was concerned. It was represented to the sub-group that the Village Authorities set up

under this 1956 Act had failed to command the same respect as the earlier traditional village authorities so it was further amended and the same was called, “The Manipur Hill Areas (Acquisition of Chiefs Rights) Act 1967”. This gave rest to increasing speculation that the Government of Manipur was bent on evicting the Kukis from their land.

Under this situation, i.e. with worse political environment, Kukis sentiments were terribly shocked when the information such as the Merger of Manipur to the Dominion of India was learnt, they immediately protested the same. <sup>63</sup> Kuki chiefs who vehemently stood against such a dare political step of whose a few names worth mentioning : (1) Thanggoumang Sitalhou, Chief of Sangnoa; (2) Mangkhokai, Younger brother of Kilkhong Khotinthang, Chief of Jampi, (3) S. L. Lunneh, Chief of Matbung, (4) Sumkhohen Haokip, Chief of Nabil; (5) Lhukhomang Haokip, Chief of Chahsad; (6) Sumkhohao Haokip, Chief of Ukha Tampak; (7) Paokhohang Haokip of Saitol; (8) Thangkhosie Chongloi, Chief of Khengjang; (9) Otngam Sitalhou, Chief of Khaochongbung; (10) Lhunkhopao Singson, Chief of Lungthulien; (11) Pakang Haokip, Chief of Maokot; (12) Paolen Haokip, Chief of Saitu; (13) Demjalam Kipgen, Buning; (14) Thangkhopao Kipgen, Buning, (15) Lunkhopao Singson, Chief of Songsang and some also who were not chiefs<sup>64</sup>. Despite their strong opposition to abolish monarchy from Manipur, Manipur was reduced to a fiefdom of the Chief Commissioner<sup>65</sup>. Bhubon<sup>66</sup> also supplemented by maintaining that tribals and their followers came in huge numbers to defend their Maharaja the thinking that along with the abolition of Maharajship, Tribal Chiefship would also disappear. In this connection, it is relevant to mention that Irawat was against the same and tried to preserve sovereignty of Manipur<sup>67</sup>. They were ready to clash with the agitators. Based on Mr. Stewart’s Report, the Governor then advised the agitators to preserve the sanctity of the temple and the agitation frittered away slowly on the fifth day after signing a no-side-sin agreement <sup>68</sup>.

Mizo Union was born due to the resentment of the people against the Chiefs, the Assam Lushai Hills District (Acquisition of Chiefs Rights) Act was enacted in 1954 <sup>69</sup>. As already mentioned, it had its impacts in the neighbouring states particularly Manipur in small or larger scale. Moreover, the biggest challenge to the political geography of Assam came from the Naga Hills too. The Naga Club, a representative

body of the Nagas in their petition (1929) to the Simon Commission prayed for the exclusion of the Naga Hills from the Reform Scheme and wanted to be placed 'directly under the British Government'. In 1946 the first political formation Naga National Council (NNC) came into existence. Two months before the Independence, the NNC resolved that as soon as India becomes independent the Naga Hills would cease to be a part of India. Tortuous negotiations followed. The NNC led by Zaphu Angami Phizo struck terror, formed the so-called Naga Federal Government and declared war on India in 1956. That was the beginning of insurgency in Nagaland with its significances with the bordering states especially Manipur<sup>70</sup>.

Coupled with the Zeliangrong (1930-1949) movements led by Haiphou Zadonang and carried on by Gaidinliu made the Tamenglong hills though suppressed but it revealed impact of the powerful current of peoples movements throughout India maintained Sarojini<sup>71</sup>. The leftist movements of Irawat and the Second Nupilal in the valley of Manipur were all fact of facts of historical importance. The consequences of the Merger of Manipur to the Dominion of India and the Government of India's attitude towards Manipur – at one time a princely kingdom, well known and for that matter, in the south east Asia in particular and the world in general, the merger of this entity to the Indian Union, and, thereby placing her in "Part C" State. This very historical event of extremely undermining and insulting the Manipuris is, in fact, the root cause of all sorts of movements specifically to the freedom fighters or insurgents or terrorists.

On a good-will mission KNA in their objectives included to maintain (i) unity of the Kukis (ii) cordial relations with the Nagas; and (iii) Close co-operation with the Valley people.<sup>72</sup> In May, 1947, Kuki-Naga unity Committee was formed to resolve the problems between the two communities<sup>73</sup>.

The efforts, however, could not last long even in month's time; both the communities were claiming and alleging each other for the cause of land.

In this regard, it is pertinent to highlight the contention of Gangte<sup>74</sup>:

*"Such protest and objections were much vehement among the Kukis than the Nagas. The former opposition to the new Village Authorities Act would seem to emanate from*

*the most conspicuous fact that all Kuki Chiefs did claim absolute and personal control over the village land, whereas Naga Chiefs would claim such authority over village land in the garb of the village council, consisting of the Chief and his Elders. In other words, the Kuki Chiefs are generally autocratic, while the Naga chief would adhere to acting in union, in the name of village authority”.*

Thus Kukis, since their defeat in the hands of Colonial ruler, during the Anglo-Kuki War (1917-1919) had already shattered in every aspects of live, secondly, their participation during the Second World War joining the INA under the leadership of Netaji Subhash Chandra fought against the British<sup>75</sup>, with a complete defeat at end, and now with the enforcement of the Act made the Kukis so desperate which altogether resorted to think to take up other path compelled to join the MNF movement. Their untold sufferings at the hands of colonial rulers during the first and the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, made them to long all the more for their lost freedom contended by Dena<sup>76</sup>.

In addition Haokip<sup>77</sup> had stated that the absence of visionary leadership and lack of acknowledgement by the Government of India concerning Kukis’ historical opposition to colonialism fell short of realizing an honourable political status for the people. Consequently, the socio-political condition of the Kukis in the post independent era was extremely vulnerable.

## REFERENCES

1. Naorem Sanajaoba : *Manipur : Past And Present, Vol.I, Mittal Publications, Delhi-35, 1988; p.307*
2. R.K. Maipaksana’s paper, “Constitutional Development of Manipur presented in the National Convention on Merger Issue organised by AMAWOVA, AMMES, KSO & DDM at G.M. Hall, Imphal, on 28-29 October, 1993
3. Ibid.
4. Jyotirmoy Roy : *History of Manipur, Eastlight Book House, 20, Strand Road, Calcutta, 1953, 1973 (Rep); p.150*
5. Dr. Kh. Sarojini Devi : *British Agency In Manipur, Linthoi Publication, Imphal, 2005; p.92*
6. R.K. Jhalajit : *A Short History of Manipur, R.K. Jhalajit Singh, Yaikul Hiruhanba Leikai, 1965, 1992 (Rep); p.336*
7. vide Palace Order No.30; p.1946
8. H. Bhuban Singh : *The Merger of Manipur, Pritam Haobam, Lamphel, Manipur, 1988, p.62*
9. *Ibid: p.63* (S.N. Pandey (ed): *Sources of the History of Manipur, National Publishing House, Delhi – 2, 1985; p.89*

10. *S.N. Pandey (ed): Sources of the History of Manipur, National Publishing House, Delhi – 2, 1985; p.89*
11. *N. Lokendra Singh : Unquiet Valley, Mittal Publication, New Delhi – 59, 1998, p.210)*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Prof. Ksh. Bimola, while delivering speech on the subject “Political Movements in Manipur” in the Refresher Course Programme of History Department, Manipur University, conducted by the Department of History with the sponsorship of U.G.C. on 7.3.2005*
14. *Lal Dena (ed): History of Modern Manipur (1826 – 1949), Orbit Publishers, Delhi – 55; 1991; p.168*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *N. Lokendra Singh: op. cit; p.215*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Anouba Yug, 1<sup>st</sup> December, 1947*
22. *W. Nabakumar’s paper “Communalism And Ethnic Divide – Anathema To Secular Society”, presented in the Two-Day National Seminar in North East India organised by the Department of History, Manipur University, Canchipur with the sponsorship of MAKAIAS, Kolkata, at Senate Hall, M.U. on 27-28 July, 2005*
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Kamkhenthang in his paper “Kuki Linguistic Groups in Historical Perspective” presented in the National Seminar on Kuki Society: Past, Present, Future organised and sponsored by the Kuki Research Forum in collaboration with the Kuki Students” Organisation held at Sielmat Christian College, Lamka, Churachandpur, Manipur on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2010*
27. *Pu Holkhomang Haokip, Ex M.P., Outer Parliamentary Constituency, at his residence, at Haokip Veng, Imphal, Manipur on 7/4/2012*
28. *W. Nabakumar : Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Sangkima : A Modern History of Mizoram, Spectrum Publication, Guwahati/Delhi, 2004; p.89*
34. *Dr. T.S. Gangte, The Kukis Under Contemporary Political Scenario (Unpublished Paper)*
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Dongzakai Gangte, 70 years, Chief of Hill Town, Churachandpur Manipur, interviewed on 12/8/2011*
37. *Position Paper & Declaration for an alternative arrangement intervention: United Naga Council, 2010*
38. *H. Bhubon : Op.cit; p.86*
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Lal Dena, Op. cit; p.169*
41. *H. Bhubon : Op.cit; p.87*
42. *Lal Dena : Ibid*
43. *N. Lokendra Singh : Op. cit: p.218*
44. *Dr. H. Kampu Gangte, one of the advisors to the Advisory Board, Manipur Territorial Council, deliberation with Laljalien Gangte, Compounder, Old Lambulane, at the residence of the Advisor in 1959*
45. *Ibid.*

46. *N. Joykumar Singh: Social Movements in Manipur, Mittal Publications, N. Delhi 59, 1992; p.112*
47. *N. Lokendra Singh, Op. cit: p.231*
48. *Imphal Free Press : 28.9.2011*
49. *Ramchandra Guha : India After Gandhi, Harper Collin Publishers, 10 East 53<sup>rd</sup> Street, New York, NY10022, 2007; p.281*
50. *N. Joykumar Singh : Revolutionary Movements in Manipur, Akansha Publishing House, N. Delhi, 2005; p.31*
51. *Lal Dena Op. cit; p.80*
52. *Ibid: p.81*
53. *Colonial Policy and Practice in Manipur, Imphal Free Press; 3-11/8/2011)*
54. *H. Bhuban Singh, Op. cit; p.130*
55. *Ibid: pp.290-291*
56. *P.M. Gangte : Customary Laws of Meiteis And Mizo Societies in Manipur, Akansha Publishing House, Dec. 2, 2008; p.37*
57. *The Extra-Ordinary Gazette of Manipur, Notification No.1/15/54 dated 17, January, 1957, Vol. No.6-E-4, Imphal, Thursday, April, 1957. The same was earlier published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Pt.II section 1 dated 16<sup>th</sup> December, 1956 as Act No. 80 of 1956*
58. *T.S. Gangte, "Struggle for Identity and Land among the Hill Peoples of Manipur in Easterly Quarterly, Vol-4, Issue-II, Delhi, 2007, July-September; p.97*
59. *Lal Dena, "Nationality Formation : The Case of Kuki" in Ngamkhohao Haokip and Michael Lunminthang (eds): Kuki Society - Past, Present, Future, KRF and Maxford Books, Del.2, 2011; p.207*
60. *In pursuance of the Resolution No.1 of the Kuki National Assembly passed at its General Assembly meeting held at Thingkhanphai Village, Churachandpur (then Manipur South District) from 19-22 January, 1960*
61. *P.M. Gangte : Op. cit; p.39*
62. *Ibid.*
63. *Dr. Satkhokai Chongloi's paper "Political Position and Aspiration of the Kuki People" presented in the Seminar-cum-Workshop" understanding Diverse Political Perspectives : Evolving strategies for peaceful coexistence in Manipur And Its Neighbours. Jointly sponsored by His Excellency, the Governor of Manipur, Peace Core Team Manipur (PCTM) And Henry Martyr Institute (HMI) Hyderabad, organised by Peoples Dialogues Initiatives (PDI) in collaboration with All India Peace and Solidarity Organization (AIPSO) and United Religions Initiatives (URI), CC, Manipur on 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2011 at Mani Mandir Iskon, Sangaiprou, Airport Road, Imphal, Manipur.*
64. *Information provided by Lhingjaneng Gangte, age 72, Ex-MLA, Old Lambulane, Imphal, Manipur on 6/3/2011*
65. *H. Bhubon Singh : Op. cit; p.142*
66. *ibid: p.80*
67. *Lal Dena: Op. Cit; p.171*
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Dr. Animesh Roy : Mizoram : Dynamics of Change Pearl Publishers, Calcutta-6, 1982, p.41.*
70. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 70<sup>th</sup> Session, Delhi, 2009-10, Indian History Congress, Kolkata, 2010-11, p.391.*
71. *Kh. Sorojini Devi : British Political Agency in Manipur (1835 – 1947), Linthoi Publications, MLA Quarter, Colony, Majorkhul, Imphal, 2005; p.88*
72. *Declaration of KNA Working Committee, 11 August, 1947 in N. Sanajaoba's Past, Present, 1993 – Manipur Treaties and Documents (1110-1971, Vol.I.*
73. *Resolution No.1, 27 May, 1947, of the Kuki and Naga Unity Conference held at Mao Naga Village, Mr. S.L. Lunneh (Kuki) presided over the Conference and Mr. Lorho (Naga) was the Secretary*

74. T.S. Gangte, "Kuki-Naga Ethnicity In Current Manipur Politics", in *H. Dwijasekhar Sharma (ed): New Insights Into the Glorious Heritage of Manipur, Vol-3, Akansha Publishing House, Oct-2, 2009; p.680*
75. *Freedom Fighters of Manipur, 1985, Congress Centenary Year, Freedom Fighters Cell, MPCC(I)*
76. *Ngamkhohao Haokip and Michael Lunminthang : Op. Cit; pp.205-206*
77. *Seilen Haokip Rhetories of Kuki Nationalism – A Treatise, Lustre Print, N. Delhi : 2010; p.6*