

Conceptualising Northeast India: A Discursive Analysis on Diversity

Thongkhohal Haokip*

Abstract: *Northeast India is often illusively constructed, even by policy makers and social scientists, as a homogeneous entity of misty mountains inhabited by tribes who profess Christianity. The Siliguri corridor, which connects mainland India with the rest of the northeastern states, is regarded as the “Mongoloid Fringe”, from where the land of the mongoloid races starts. However, in reality, the region is as diverse as India in terms of race, ethnicity, culture and also religion. This paper traces the background of how all the states of the northeastern region came to be clubbed together as “Northeast” and also attempts to explain that the diversity of the region has to be taken into account to understand the problems associated with it. Various policies adopted by the Indian government towards the region are also analysed in brief for a better understanding of the region.*

Introduction

Northeast India, popularly known as the “seven sister states”, comprises Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura. The region covers an area of 262,000 sq. km. and accounts for 7.9 percent of total geographical area of the country. With a total population of 39 million (2001), it accounts for 3.8 percent of the total population of India. The region is physically isolated from the rest of India with a tenuous connection through a 21-kilometer long landmass, known as the “Siliguri corridor” or the “Chicken’s neck”. Sikkim was included into the northeastern states in 2002 due to its proximity to the area, a similar developmental problems and convenience in implementing developmental projects (Haokip 2006: 41). However, there are others who argue that although Sikkim does not qualify for inclusion in the Northeast as it does not meet the contiguity criteria, and it was only at Sikkim Chief Minister Pawan Kumar Chamling’s insistence that the Centre had agreed to the arrangement (Chakravarti, 2008: 11). The Chinese scholar and pilgrim Hiuen Tsang, who visited the plains of Assam in the first half of the seventh century described the region as covered with beautiful mountains, lush forests and wild life, and depicted a fairly advanced civilisation and rich cultural heritage in his narratives. Contrary to the mainland Indian perception of Northeast India as a culturally homogeneous region of mongoloid races, the region is diverse in almost every aspects; it is inhabited by a mosaic of societies characterised by diversity in ethnicity, language,

* The author is an independent scholar who recently completed his Ph.D. from the Department of Political Science, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong, India. Email: th.robert@yahoo.co.in

culture, religion, social organisation, economic pursuits, productive relations and participation in political process.

The diversity, obscurity and problems associated with the northeastern region made B.G. Verghese (2004: 280) describe the region as “another India, the most diverse part of a most diverse country, very different, relatively little known and certainly not too well understood, once a coy but now turbulent and in transition within the Indian transition.” J.B. Fuller (1909), in his introduction to Major Alan Playfair’s book on the Garos, wrote that, “The province of Assam at the far northeastern corner of India is a museum of nationalities.” It has been the meeting ground of different people who migrated to the region from Southwest China or Southeast Asia via Burma at various points of history. A substantial portion of the population is also composed of migrants during the British rule, one group consists of people recruited to serve the colonial administration in the region and the others are tea planters and cultivators. The Tai-Ahoms of Assam and the Khasis of Meghalaya (Gurdon, 1907: 11-12; Bareh, 1967: 35) claimed to have migrated from Southeast Asia through Burma. The Kuki of Manipur, Nagaland, Assam and Tripura, the Mizos of Mizoram and the Chins of Chin Hills in Burma believe that they migrated from Southern China, while the Garos migrated from the southern side of central Tibet (Playfair 1909: 10-16). The Nagas are also believed to be immigrants from southern Tibet and the Meiteis probably emigrated from the northwest borders of China in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Pemberton 1838: 36).

Historical Background

Northeast India is the northeastern borderland of South Asia and also the northwestern borderland of Southeast Asia.¹ The people of Northeast India have distinct ethnic and cultural identities, which are similar with the people of Southeast Asia and China than with people of the rest of India. The region has more geographical contact and proximity to other national states than the Indian mainland and interacts mostly with the present day Myanmar. The region had been known for her natural resources and maintained active trans-border trade with its neighbours during the pre-independence period (Pommaret, 1999: 285-303).

Assam had interaction with the British East India Company as early as 1792, at the request of the king of Assam, “for commercial advantages” by a friendly and open intercourse.² The persisting internal strife and disorder led the Burmese to occupy the plains of Assam from 1817 to 1826 and Manipur from 1819 to 1826. At the request of the king of Assam the British defeated the Burmese who were forced to surrender their suzerainty over Assam and Manipur by the Treaty of Yandaboo in 1826. Eventually the British rulers annexed the whole region in the subsequent years, the Cachar plains in 1830, Khasi Hills (1833), Jaintia Hills (1835), Karbi Anglong or Mikir

Hills (1838), North Cachar Hills (1854), Naga Hills (1866-1904), Garo Hills (1872-73) and Mizo Hills (1890). These annexations brought about drastic changes in the polity as well as in the economy of the region, with the gradual decay of feudal institutions and the rise of capitalist economic entities.

The plain areas of the region, the Brahmaputra, Barak, Imphal and Agartala plains, and the hill areas have distinct cultures, traditions and histories. They have coexisted for the past several centuries, amidst cordial relations combined with conflicts as well as social, economic and political interdependence. The hill areas are mainly inhabited by different tribes who mostly profess Christianity. However, most of the tribes in Arunachal Pradesh are Buddhists and Hindus. Some of the major hill tribes of the region are the Mizos of Mizoram, Khasi, Jaintia and Garos of Meghalaya, the Nagas of Nagaland and Kukis who have settled in Manipur, Nagaland, Assam and Tripura. There are also tribes who have settled in the plains known as "plain tribes" like the Bodos, Mishings, Rabha, etc in Assam. The plain areas of the region are mainly inhabited by non-tribals, who are Hindus with a substantial number of Muslims. The Meiteis of Imphal and Barak valley, the Bengalis of Agartala valley and the Assamese of the Brahmaputra valley are the prominent plain dwellers.

In the past few decades there were conflicts around land, and ethnic enmity have intensified. In such baffling situation history has been used as a tool to protect identity and for its own good without taking into account the genuine rights of the others often leading to antagonism among them. Each community has rewritten exclusive histories of itself that speak of its own rights to the exclusion of the rest. Such nationalism based on ethnic and linguistic lines led the Assamese nationalists to propagate *Swadin Asom* which aims to re-read, re-interpret and even re-create history in order to build up the theoretical base that Assam had always been a free nation.

Origin of the Term

The term "Northeast" was first used by the British rulers to identify a geographical area. Alexander Mackenzie was perhaps the first to use the term "Northeast Frontier" to identify Assam, including the adjoining hill areas and the princely states of Manipur and Tripura in his book *History of the Government with the Hill Tribes of the North-East Frontier of Bengal* in 1884. When there was a plan to merge Assam with Eastern Bengal in the late 1890s and the beginning of 1900, there were proposals to name the new province as the "North Eastern Province" (Guha 1977: 73). Initially the term remained a geographical concept and throughout the colonial period the British rulers referred to Assam as the "Northeastern Frontier of Bengal". Thus, in the colonial period the area what now constitute the "Northeast" was considered to be a frontier of Bengal that needs to be protected and defended militarily.

Northeast India became a region merely through a geo-political accident. The separation of Burma from the Indian sub-continent in 1937 and the partition of 1947 virtually created what we now call the "Northeast". The Partition of India in 1947 caused the extreme geo-political isolation of the Northeast, making it the most regulated, a sensitive border region and the most exposed territory. In addition, the partition also caused the severance of the inland water, road and railway communications through the erstwhile East Pakistan and access to the Chittagong port was lost. The Chinese take over of Tibet and the virtual closure of the border with Burma added to the isolation of the region. This condition has not been conducive to the region's economic and political well-being and set its economy back by at least a quarter century (Verghese, 2001).

Before partition there was no idea of a separate northeastern region. The region does not fulfill the three traditional approaches to the definition of a region which are homogeneity, nodality or polarisation around some central place. In the words of Barrister Pakem (1985: 9), Northeast India is a region as the lack of sophisticated definition of a region for Northeast India does not make it a non-region. It is a region despite its varied physical features and its different economic, political and social systems. Thus, Northeast India is a region of diverse geographical features with a population characterised by diversity of ethnicity, language, culture, religion, social organisation and levels of economic development.

At the time of Independence "Northeast" basically meant Assam and the princely states of Manipur and Tripura. In order to quell the various ethnic, cultural and political aspirations for self-government among various tribal groups, new states were carved out of Assam. The notion was that such groups require representation in the democratic process and that once they have voice and representation in the parliamentary democracy, many of their problems would be abated.

The state of Nagaland was created in 1963 by joining the then Naga Hills district of Assam and Tuensang Frontier division of North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) or the present Arunachal Pradesh.³ In 1969, the Indira Gandhi government intended to fulfill the long standing demands of the hill tribes by providing them an autonomous state within the state of Assam covering all the autonomous districts of Assam, i.e., the Garo Hills, Khasi and Jaintia Hills, Mikir Hills, North Cachar Hills and Mizo Hills district. The Assam Reorganisation (Meghalaya) Act of 1969 provided Meghalaya, comprising the United Khasi-Jaintia Hills district and Garo Hills district, a semi-autonomous state which came into effect on April 2, 1970. Subsequently it became a full-fledged state of India on January 21, 1972 with the passing of North Eastern Areas (Re-Organisation) Act, 1971.⁴ The Government of India, in July 1971, offered the proposal of turning Mizo Hills into a Union Territory and the insurgent group Mizo National Front (MNF) was ready to

accept the offer on condition that the status of Union Territory would be upgraded to statehood and therefore the Union Territory of Mizoram came into being on January 21, 1972 and subsequently the state of Mizoram was created on February 20, 1987.⁵ Even though the people of the NEFA did not voice for statehood, due to strategic reason the Indian government granted NEFA statehood by renaming it as Arunachal Pradesh in 1987.⁶

The concept of Northeast was formalised politically and the term became popular with the formation of the North Eastern Council (NEC) in 1971. Since its inception the NEC functions as a regional planning body for the whole northeastern states and thus it is the nodal agency for economic and social development of the region.

The Problem

There is a tendency by scholars and policymakers to club the whole northeastern states together as “Northeast” and use the term as an analytical category for the whole region. However, the practical relevance of clubbing all the eight states together and calling it the “Northeast” is always questioned. Udayon Misra points out that the use of the term “Northeast” is itself problematic as the region represents a varied cultural mosaic and has never considered itself to be one compact unit. He says, “One has to recognise that there are many different communities in the region and the dynamics of each single movement have to be taken care of, if any solution is to be achieved”. To him “New Delhi suffers from a strong misconception that by coming to an agreement with the “most powerful insurgent group” (that is, National Socialist Council of Nagaland-IM), it would be able to solve the problem and that the situation could be improved. It has failed in appreciating the complex nature of the problem. The positive fallout of the multifarious identity movements in the region has been that the civil society organizations have gathered strength and it is no longer possible to ignore them.”⁷ Wasbir Hussain also observes that, “By bracketing the eight northeastern Indian states, with its diverse tribes, customs and cultures, into what is called the ‘Northeast,’ we tend to ignore the distinct identity and sub-national aspirations of these ethnic groups. More so, such clubbing together of the region, in an attempt to look at it as a single entity, has led to stereotyping of the problems that plague the area. The fact that each state has a different set of location-specific concerns and grievances often gets blurred in the scheme of things of policy framers and government leaders who are supposed to address these issues” (Hussain, 2004).

It is true that the northeastern region shares certain common problems like ethnic unrests, insurgency, immigration, drug trafficking, communication gap, etc. However, there are severe intra-regional differences in social issues and ethno-political aspirations. The region is, in fact,

one of the most ethnically and linguistically diverse region in Asia and each state has its distinct cultures and traditions.

Diversity and Developmental Disparity

Northeast India, which occupies a remote corner of India, is one of the least developed regions of the country. This development begins with the region's initial absorption into the world economy as a marginal periphery, a part of frontier of the British rule and which eventually leads to the region's peripheral position within the Indian nation-state after independence (Ahmed and Biswas 2004: 50). The first Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru stated during the debate on the First Five Year Plan:

...it is admitted that there should be attempt to make every region, every part of India develop equally in so far as we can, and that we should remove the disparities that exist in India. There are some tremendous disparities. Some of our provinces, I would not name them, are extremely poor. They do not deserve to be poor (Nehru, 1952).

The lofty goals of the founding fathers of the Indian nation-state did not materialise even after sixty years of independence. Not only the northeastern states are far from being at par with other Indian states in terms of development, even within the region there is huge disparity. Although the northeastern region shares certain problems there are severe intra-regional differences on economic development. The plain areas of the region, which are also the centre of administration, are more developed than the hill areas. Not only the hills and valleys are at different levels of economic development; the urban and rural areas of the valley exhibit economic disparities.

Even though the region is conceived as a tribal region, taking the region as a whole the non-tribal population is more than the tribals. The states of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Nagaland have tribal population as majority (See table). The region has a literacy rate of 65.77 percent as against the all India average of 65.2 percent. However, the literacy rate varies from state to state in the region from a lowest figure of 54.74 percent (Arunachal Pradesh) to the highest figure of 88.49 percent (Mizoram).

The similarities that exist between different states of the region should not overshadow the different stages of socio-cultural and politico-economic development (Misra 2000: 2). Udayon Misra further observes. "The use of the illusive construct, the *North-East*, has not only led to discriminations in matters of financial allocation to resource rich and larger states like Assam, but more importantly, to serious administrative mishandling by the Centre of the complexities of the region. The tendency of the Indian State to treat this extremely diverse region as one unit has resulted in the growth of totally incomplete and often misconceived notions about the different states that make up the northeastern part of the country. Such monolithic conceptions about a region, which stands out of for its diversity of cultures and civilisations, would only help to nourish

the biases and prejudices which have marked the Indian State's approach towards Assam and her neighbours since independence" (*Ibid*: 3).

Table 1. General Information of the Northeastern Region

State	Total Population (in million)	Percentage of ST Population	Literacy Rate (percentage)
Arunachal Pradesh	1.09	64.2	54.74
Assam	26.64	12.4	64.28
Manipur	2.39	34.2	68.87
Meghalaya	2.31	85.9	63.31
Mizoram	0.89	94.5	88.49
Nagaland	1.99	89.1	67.11
Sikkim	0.54	20.6	69.68
Tripura	3.19	31.1	73.66
Northeastern Region	39.04	26.9	65.77
India	1027.02	-	65.20

Source: Office of the Registrar General, India, 2001.

Ethnicity and Ethnic Nationalism

Ethnicity or ethnic consciousness rose steadily since the beginning of the twentieth century with renewed vigour in post-independence period. It culminated during the late 1980s and early 1990s, which found its expression in the rise of various insurgent movements demanding "ethnic homelands" ranging from autonomy to secessionism from India. In multi-ethnic or plural societies like Northeast India, diverse factors play their roles in shaping such ethnic consciousness. The ethnic consciousness that grows from their encounter with the dominant cultures leads to identity expansion.

The British were perceived to have laid the foundation for the emergence of ethnicity as a political force among the tribes. Since the advent of the British in the region, especially the first half of the twentieth century, education made great advances in the hill areas with the spread of Christianity and Christian Mission Schools. This led to the rise of small middle class among sections of each tribe. With British patronage the Naga Club was formed in 1918, which was perhaps "the first attempt at organised political opinion in the Naga Hills" (Misra, 2000, p. 29). The Mizos of the then Lushai Hills formed the Mizo Common People's Union in April 1946 and was later renamed as Mizo Union. The Kukis of Manipur also formed Kuki National Assembly (KNA) in the late 1950s to cater to their political interests.

Insurgency

Most of the northeastern states are infested with insurgency, which is mainly the offshoot of rising level of ethnicity. There are several wrong presumptions and accusations by many mainland Indian scholars that insurgency in the region is due to the spread of Christianity. If Christianity would have been the founding base of such groups fighting against the Indian state, the infamous Kuki-Naga conflict of the 1990s would not have taken place. Even among the Christian sects, the Kukis and Nagas mainly belong to Baptist denomination. Thus, insurgent movements in the region have to be understood based on the rise of ethnic consciousness and penchant for protection of identity and land through demarcation of a specified area as “ethnic homeland”.

Insurgent groups in the region demand various levels of autonomy ranging from sovereignty, statehood to autonomous/development councils. These movements did not start as a militant one at the outset. When the grievances of ethnic communities were not redressed,, the discontentment manifested in the form of unrest. Subir Ghosh believes that “either frustration or sheer conviction that might is right pave the way for violence” (Ghosh, 2001: 141).

In some states like Assam and Tripura migration is the main cause of insurgency. The indigenous tribes in Tripura were reduced to a minority during the last century. The Assamese were also reduced to minority in various districts of lower Assam. In the words of Myron Weiner, illegal migration “was also the prime contributory factor behind the outbreak of insurgency in the State. There is a tendency to view illegal migration into Assam as a regional matter, affecting only the people of Assam. Its more dangerous dimension of greatly undermining our national security is ignored” (Weiner, 1978: 3).

Migration

Popular discourse on migration in Northeast India is about state sponsored migration towards the region. Migration into Northeast India is of two types - migration from other parts of India and migration from outside India which is generally termed as “influx” and the immigrants are often called “foreigners”. The large inflow of immigrants has resulted in huge demographic changes in the last century. Thus, as Myron Weiner pointed out, in a multi-ethnic developing country like India, migration tends to have destabilising effects and can arise intense conflict (Weiner, *op. cit.*).

During the British period, the colonial power encouraged large scale migration from different parts of British India and Nepal into the northeastern region. Raising land revenue was the motive behind this state sponsored migration. The tribals were brought by the British capitalists mainly from Bihar, Orissa, Chottanagpur, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh to labour in tea gardens

consequent upon the development of tea gardens in Assam, as the local supply of labour was too small (Gait, 1906: 413). The Bengali Muslim peasants from East Bengal migrated to the vast tracts of fertile lands in Assam. The Hindu Bengali migration was in the service sector and Marwari migration in trade, business and industry. These four separate spheres where migration was large in number have had long-run implications for the process of nationality formation in Assam and had intensified the competition for resources. The new Muslim League government of Assam formed in 1921 under the leadership of Sayed Mohammad Abdullah gave political impetus to migration in the name "grow more food" by easing land holding regulations for immigrants from Bengal Province (Barpujari, 1998: 37-38). The Partition of British India in August 1947 also resulted in quick and large scale mass migration.

Although some states make a big fuss about migrants from Bangladesh, in fact, in such states like Tripura and Meghalaya the percentage of non-tribals have decreased. In Meghalaya the non-tribal population has declined from 19.5 percent in 1971 to 19.42 percent in 1981, 14.47 percent in 1991 and further to 14.1 percent in 2001. The Khasi Students' Union (KSU) had made a hue and cry over the illegal influx of Bangladeshis into Meghalaya, the *war* people of Khasis also do immigrate to Bangladesh (Lyngdoh, 1999: 223). The partition of India could not cut-off the trade between the trans-border tribes in Meghalaya and Bangladesh besides the large scale smuggling in the border areas. There is a need to understand the existing economic relationship of people in the border areas and also ponder upon the other side of the story.

Since the crackdown of pro-democracy groups, especially the National League for Democracy of Burma in 1990, there has been an enormous immigration into the northeastern states like Manipur and Mizoram as the Indian government sympathise with the Burmese democracy activists. In December 2010, the Mizoram Kohhran Hruaitu Committee (Leader of Mizoram Churches Committee) expressed the need for census of Burmese nationals in Mizoram. It is alleged that there are about 100,000 Burmese nationals in Mizoram and most of them are Chins.⁸

India's Policy towards the Northeastern Region

Since independence the Indian government has adopted several policies towards the region. Many of these policies have changed in the past decades. Such policies were measures to solve the complex problems of alienation, insurgency, ethnicity/cultural identity and to bring about economic development in the northeastern region.

The first one and half decade of India's policy towards the northeastern region can be described as "Nehru-Elwin policy" where quick administrative expansion associated with the revivalist-protectionist approach towards tribal development in the hill areas was followed. It has accepted

the right of tribals to retain their way of life and identity and has sought to integrate them through democratic means into the federal frame of the Constitution of India (Sachdeva, 2004). Therefore, the post-colonial Indian state followed the British policy of Inner Line Regulation within the Nehruvian policy framework, which ensures non-interference from the people of the plains and also carve out an area of unimpeded self-development for the tribes of the region (Ahmed and Biswas, 2004: 3).

There was drastic change in India's policy towards the northeastern region in the early 1960s due to its defeat against the Chinese aggression in 1962. It was the first setback in India's foreign policy and changed the course of India's security and even foreign policy. This brought back the colonial approach considering the region as a "frontier" that needs to be protected and defended militarily.

In the aftermath of Indian independence many tribes of Northeast India started demanding various levels of autonomy and even secession from the Indian union. Thus, in the early 1970s there was a conception that the region "required political representation; the diverse tribal cultures and diverse sub-nationalities required participation in 'mainstream' democratic process" (Ramesh, 2005).

By the turn of the century the Government of India came out of its state-centric security approach and launched the second phase the Look East policy. In this new phase India is looking towards a partnership with the ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nation) countries, both within BIMSTEC (Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation) and the India-ASEAN Summit dialogue as, integrally linked to economic and security interests of the northeastern region.⁹ The union government initiated dialogue with certain insurgent groups and also offered olive branch to all the remaining groups.

Conclusion

There is often an illusive generalisation about the whole northeastern region as a homogeneous entity. Such stereotyping needs to be avoided for practical purposes and dynamics associated with the region. In this globalised world there is also a need to change both the perspective and approach towards the region, while taking into account the diversity and disparity.

Migration has to be viewed in a different perspective rather than as a threat. Instead of fencing the borders there should be a policy of issuing temporary work permits and better management of borders as nations are coming closer. Issuing of work permits has been widely propagated and

practiced in a number of western countries and even in West Asia. This scheme will not only allow migrants to come legally into the region, it will also discourage illegal migration, and promote healthy economic cooperation between the Northeast and its neighbouring countries.

Since the early 1990s the Government of India has started negotiating with the various insurgent groups of the region. It would be wrong to presume that settling the major insurgent group(s) would end violence in the region. In order to derive a lasting solution to the decades old insurgencies in the region, the diversity of the region, their culture and aspirations, have to be understood and taken into account and dealt with each group differently.

Notes

¹ Peter Kunstadter in his two-volume edited book *Southeast Asian Tribes, Minorities and Nations* published by the Princeton University Press in 1967 says that the region has a large population of tribal and minority peoples whose languages are more closely related to the languages of Southeast Asia than to those of the Indian subcontinent and their cultures too resembling the cultures of their neighbours in Southeast Asia.

² Minutes of Cornwallis (October 3, 1792) cited in Bhuyan, S.K. (1949). *Anglo-Assamese Relation, 1771-1826*. Gauhati: Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies in Assam, p. 301.

³ The Naga Hills-Tuensang Area Act, 1957 (Act number 42 of 1957) form the Naga Hills and Tuensang area of Assam as an administrative unit comprising the tribal areas which at such commencement were known as the Naga Hills District and Tuensang Frontier Division of the North East Frontier Agency by Amending the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution of India.

⁴ The North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971 provide for the establishment of the states of Manipur and Tripura and to provide for the formation of the state of Meghalaya and of the union territories of Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh by reorganisation of the existing state of Assam and for matters connected therewith.

⁵ The poor handling of the famine (mautam) of 1959-60 and inadequate relief measure caused great frustration among the Mizos, coupled with the imposition of Assamese as the official language in the state accelerated the politics of negativism. The Mizo National Famine Front was formed in 1960 to launch relief operations and it was converted into a political party known as Mizo National Front (MNF) in October 1961 with Laldenga as its president.

⁶ When India became an independent nation on August 15, 1947 the North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) was administrated by the Ministry of External Affairs with the Governor of Assam acting as agent to the President of India. In 1972 NEFA became a Union Territory under the Congress Government of Indira Gandhi and acquired the name Arunachal Pradesh. After three years, in 1975, it acquired a legislature. And finally, on February 20, 1987, statehood was granted to Arunachal Pradesh by the Congress Government of Rajiv Gandhi, and it became the 25th State of the Union of India.

⁷ Udayon Misra's view is also taken from session report of "Civil Society Dialogue on Peace in the Northeast", prepared by Sminr Kr. Das and Paula Banerjee in October 2001, published by Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, available electronically at <http://www.mvrc.ac.in/civilsocietydialogue1.htm> (accessed on March 5, 2011)

⁸ The issue of census on Burmese nationals appeared on various electronic medias on December 17 and 18, 2010 with the heading "Mizoram Governor wants census of Burmese nationals in state".

⁹ "Year End Review 2004", *Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India*. New Delhi.

References

- Ahmed, Rafiul and Biswas, Prasenajit (2004). *Political Economy of Underdevelopment of North-East India*. New Delhi: Akansha.
- Bareh, Hamlet (1967). *The History and Culture of the Khasi People*. Shillong.
- Barpujari, H.K. (1998). *North-East India: Problems, Policies and Prospects*. Delhi: Spectrum Publications.

-
- Chakravarti, Mahadev, "Social Change in North-East India: Partition, Ethnicity, Revivalism, Globalization", *H.L. Gupta Endowment lectures (4)*, North East India History Association.
- Fuller, J.B. (1909), "Introduction", written for Alan Playfair, *The Garos*. London, p. xiii.
- Gait, Edward (1906). *A History of Assam*. Guwahati: Eastern Publishers (Indian reprint 2008).
- Ghosh, Subir (2001). *Frontier Travails-Northeast: The Politics of Mess*. Delhi: Macmillan.
- Guha, Amalendu (1977). *Planter-Raj to Swaraj: Freedom Struggle and Electoral Politics in Assam 1826-1947*. New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1977 (reprint 1988).
- Gurdon, P.R.T. (1907). *The Khasis*. London: Cosmo Publishers (reprint).
- Haokip, Thongkholal (2006), "The British Northeast Frontier Policy and the Kukis", *Ahsijolheng Annual Magazine 2006*, A publication of Kuki Students' Organisation, Shillong.
- Hussain, Wasbir (2004), "India's North-East: The Problem", paper presented as part of the "Interaction on the North East" *Observer Research Foundation*, New Delhi November 18
- Lyngdoh, Morning (1999), "Ethnicity, Religion and language: A Case Study of Khasis in Meghalaya", in Kailash S. Aggarwal (ed.). *Dynamics of Identity and Inter group Relations in North-East India*. Shimla: IIAS.
- Mackenzie, Alexander (1884). *North East Frontier of India*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2001. First published in 1884 as *History of the Government with the Hill Tribes of the North-East Frontier of Bengal*.
- Misra, Udayon (2000). *The Periphery Strikes Back: Challenges to the Nation-State in Assam and Nagaland*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advance Studies.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal (1952), Parliamentary Debate on the *First Five year Plan*, PC, Government of India.
- Pakem, B (1985). Introduction, in B. Pakem (ed.). *Regionalism in India: With Special Reference to North-East India*. New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications.
- Pemberton, Robert Boileau (1838). *The Eastern Frontier of India*. (Photographically reproduced by Mittal Publications, 2008).
- Pommaret, Françoise (1999), "Ancient Trade Partners: Bhutan, Cooch Bihar and Assam (17th-19th Centuries)", *Journal Asiatique*. 287: 285-303. English translation available online at <http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/journal/vol2no1/v2n/ancienttrade.pdf> (Electronically accessed on July 27, 2006)
- Sachdeva, Gulshan (2004), "Fiscal Governance in the Northeast", *Dialogue*, Vol. 5, No. 4, April-June.
- Ramesh, Jairam (2005), "Northeast India in New Asia" *Seminar*, No. 550, June.
- Verghese, B.G. (2001), "Unfinished Business in the Northeast: Priorities towards Restructuring, Reform, Reconciliation and Resurgence", Seventh Kamal Kumari Lecture.
- Verghese, B.G. 2004. *India's Northeast Resurgent: Ethnicity, Insurgency, Governance, Development*. New Delhi: Konark Publishers, 1996 (2nd revised).
- Weiner, Myron (1978). *Sons of the Soil: Migration and Ethnic Conflict in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.