

Shared Sovereignty and its Challenges in the Indo-Naga Political Settlement

Phyobenthung

Department of Political Science, Fazl Ali College, Mokokchung
phyoben@fac.ac.in

Abstract

Five years have passed since the signing of the Framework Agreement on 3rd August, 2015 between the government of India and the Naga nationalist group, the NSCN (IM), in New Delhi, considered to be a historic achievement. The Agreement based on shared sovereignty is now on the brink of collapse due to the differences between the two negotiating parties on the issue of separate flag and the constitution. The paper seeks to examine the idea of shared sovereignty between the two negotiating parties and critically analysed the challenges confronting the Naga peace talk.

Keywords: Framework agreement, shared sovereignty, territorial integrity, separate flag, separate constitution, Pan-Naga Hoho.

I. Introduction

The Naga political struggle has haunted both India and the Nagas for decades. Many attempts were made to bring the issue to its logical conclusion. However, in all these attempt one finds that there was an attempt by the Indian state to play the role of a big brother¹. This has only generated suspicion in the minds of the Naga nationalist groups, ultimately leading the issue to more and more complications.

Experience suggests that in this kind of nationalist conflict when the extremist sections are left out of the negotiation, the conflict is not likely resolved, because they are the real

stakeholders espousing “the cause”. Fortunately, in the ongoing peace process, almost all the extremist groups are engaged in the dialogue which in itself is a big achievement; given that the nationalist groups are often divide in approach and strategy. Both India and the Naga nationalist groups cannot afford to let this opportunity go without striking a deal for settlement.

The current Naga peace process started in 1997 with the signing of ceasefire between the Nationalist Socialist Council of Nagalim (Isak –Muivah) i.e. NSCN-IM, and has been

¹The first attempt to settle the problem was made in February 1948 popularly known as Akbar Hydari-NNC 9 Point Agreement was unilaterally scrapped by India after signing, because the interpretation of the last point of the Agreement i.e. “to decide their future after the expiry of 10 years” was construed as a disadvantage for the Indian State. Similarly the 16 Point Agreement 1960 signed between the Naga People's Convention and the Indian State that led to formation of the present Nagaland State under Indian Union was a strategy to divide the Nagas by co-opting the moderate element of the Nagas, thereby leaving out the real stakeholders, i.e. the nationalist section from the negotiation. Likewise, the infamous 1975 Shillong Accord signed between the Indian State and some section of the Naga Nationalists (i.e. the Naga National Council) was considered by the Nagas as a sell-out, leading to the formation of Nationalist Socialist Council of Nagalim in 1980.

continuing for the last 23 years. However, the negotiation seems to have reached a stalemate, where both the negotiating parties are not willing to budge their stand “for” and “against” on the issues of separate flag and separate constitution. As accepted by the Indian government the uniqueness of the Nagas, a unique solution is required, unless we see history repeating again.

This paper is an attempt to understand the idea of shared sovereignty based on the Framework Agreement signed on 3rd August, 2015 as an ideal solution for the protracted Indo-Naga conflict². It will also discuss the two major obstacles, namely, the separate flag and the separate Naga constitution, which has led to deadlock between the two negotiating parties.

II. The Concept of Shared Sovereignty

Sovereignty is derived from Latin word *superanus* meaning supreme. Jean Bodin introduced the concept of sovereignty in modern times, and defined it “as the absolute and perpetual commanding power of the state”, as the “supreme power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law” (Gaubu 2013: 179). This classical understanding of sovereignty believes in absoluteness, permanence, universality, inalienability and indivisibility of the state. Therefore legally speaking sovereignty is the supreme authority of the state. However, in practice this classical understanding faces many challenges as sovereignty has to share its authority with family, church, union, and local governments. Sovereignty is also forced to accommodate and recognise from the “conscientious objectors” (IBID: 196).

According to the pluralist understanding sovereign can never be allowed to become absolute and irresponsible. Pluralists also argued that internally sovereignty has to justify the exercise of its special power. Sovereign is also limited by country's constitution, and cannot overstep its authority. Externally it is limited by international law, convention and practices. In short, there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty; rather, sovereignty is always shared by various organisations within and outside the state.

The classical understanding of sovereignty which was in vogue till the 20th century is now seen receding with the coming of globalisation. In addition to the forces of globalisation, the understanding of sovereignty as an absolute and exclusive power from both internal and external actors has been violated many times in the history. Stephen D. Krasner (1999: 25) mentioned four ways by which these violations occur, such as, convention, contract, coercion and imposition. Even in today's world we find several instances, where sovereignty is shared externally through contract between two or more entities, and internally through various forms of division of powers such as federation, autonomy etc.

Shared sovereignty would mean different things to different people depending on what context one uses. In the context of international legal sovereignty, it would mean ceding certain power to some party (bilateral, regional or multilateral) through voluntarily participation for mutual gain. For e.g. the United Nations, European Union, World Trade Organisations, North

²The Framework Agreement was signed on 3rd August, 2015 between the Indian state and the NSCN-IM in New Delhi in presence of the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi and host of dignitaries from both sides. The Agreement is speculated to have contained the broad contours of power sharing know as shared sovereignty.

Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) etc. Here sovereign states voluntarily participate to be a member of these Organisations. This participation entails them to share some of their sovereign powers to the supra-sovereign body. For e.g., acceptance of international law as a governing principle by the member state. Similarly NATO has power to make decisions with regard to the member nations in certain aspect, because the members voluntarily share their power with this organisation. The same idea of shared sovereignty also happens between two sovereign states. For e.g., the trade relations or border management between two sovereign states. This believe is according to the monistic understanding of sovereignty.

The Second type of shared sovereignty is to divide and share the sovereign power between and among different units within the state, such as, minority group, nationalist organisations etc. Here the power sharing is done by way of bilateral treaty exemplified by the Russian Federation; Autonomy as exemplified by Hongkong and Macau; different kinds of federal arrangement, ranging from confederation to consociational democracy exemplified by Switzerland; asymmetry and segmented federal form under Russian Federation etc. In this type of shared sovereignty, one sovereign is shared between two or more entities. This forms the pluralists understanding of sovereignty which believes in divisibility of sovereignty.

Many scholars, such as Rupensinghe (1996), Ulrich (2002) Tishkov (2002) have established the fact that federal-model strategy is the best form of government in multi-ethnic, multi-

nationals state, because this system provides the necessary space for developing, safeguarding, and preserving the different ethnic group's identity, resources and system. The degree of power sharing may vary from state to state. For instance, the Russian Federation allows some of its republics to enjoy a high level of independence even to the extent of having an independent foreign relations³, while the Indian federal system is known for its quasi federation character, i.e. a mixture of unitary and federal features.

III. Shared Sovereignty in the Context of Naga political Settlement

The Nagas are ethnic nationality comprising of different sub-ethnic groups. Though the very term “Naga” is contested by some as it is not a primordial origin, it is a reality and accepted fact that Nagas are considered to be a group of sub-ethnic communities residing at a contiguous area with shared historical and similar cultural attributes. This fact is accepted by the Nagas themselves as well as by the outsiders. So the question of Naga as a national identity has passed the stage of nationality formation.

The Nagas are fiercely independent. The Nagas have fought the Britishers to preserve their independence; however they were finally subjugated and incorporated under the British Indian sub-continent in 1879. Even while under the British India, Nagas have asserted for self-rule and petitioned the British-India to exclude the Nagas from the design of independent Indian sub-continent⁴.

Following the inability of the Britishers to officially recognise as a separate political entity at the time of their departure, the Naga

³Under Russian Federation, Chechnya enjoys independent foreign policy. For more see, Halbach, Uwe (2018).

⁴The first such petition was submitted to the Simon Commission on 26th March 1928 by the Naga Club on behalf of the Naga tribes. For more, see “Naga Club Memo to Simon Commission 1929”.

nationalists declared independence on 14th August, 1947, one day prior to the declaration of Indian independence. However this declaration could not achieve international recognition and therefore the struggle continues.

In the post-colonial India, the Naga inhabited areas were incorporated into the Indian republic. At first, on its own volition, India placed the Naga territories under the ministry of External Affairs, but was unceremoniously stripped off and brought back to the ministry of Home affairs in 1972. This incorporation of Nagas into the Indian union was not without resistance, and the struggle for independence from India continues till today.

In order to resolve this nationality issue, the Indian state has made various attempts such as the Akbar Hydari-NNC Agreement 1948; the 16 Points Agreement 1960; the infamous Shillong Accord 1975; and finally the ongoing peace process since 1997 till date. However, all the previous attempts could not resolve the nationality question and the nationalist struggle continued with renewed vigour every time an Accord is signed. Therefore the ongoing peace process has sought to address this question by bringing all the stakeholders on board the negotiation and making it a broad-based agreement. Toward this end, the Framework Agreement was signed in 2015 to bring final settlement to the Indo-Naga political problem.

The Framework Agreement is revealed to have contained the idea of shared sovereignty as the formula for Indo-Naga political settlement.

Although the original text of the Framework Agreement is not produced in white paper, there is sufficient evidence in the public domain from the revelation made by the negotiators of both sides that shared sovereignty is the basis of the settlement. Here again the term shared sovereignty is not clearly defined. When asked about the meaning of shared sovereignty, the interlocutor RN Ravi replied “both sides have acknowledged the universal principle that in a democracy, sovereignty lies with the people. Government of India have acknowledged the uniqueness of the Nagas. This uniqueness will be reflected in the sharing of power⁵”. From what one understand by this term is that, the term is used in the sense of sharing of competencies or sharing of powers between the two entities, i.e. the Indian State and the Nagas. Therefore we can look at the areas where powers can be shared in a given circumstance.

Shared sovereignty in the context of Naga political settlement is used to imply special federal arrangement. This inference of special federal arrangement is for two reasons. Firstly because, even though the Naga nationalists declared independence in 1947, prior to Indian's independence declaration, this declaration was not accepted by India, at the same time there was lack of international recognition. Therefore the parallel governments run by these nationalist groups did not possess officially recognised sovereignty. All the actions of these nationalist groups were considered outlaw by the Indian government, although the Naga nationalists have always claimed that Naga sovereignty was

⁵RN Ravi, a retired Indian Police Service officer, was appointed as the Fourth interlocutor since 1997 by the government of India to represent the Indian state in the Indo-Naga peace talk. The Framework Agreement was signed by RN Ravi and Th. Muivah, the Prime Minister (*Ato Kilonser*) of NSCN-IM, in presence of host of dignitaries from both the parties in New Delhi. On several occasions, when asked to clarify the meaning of shared sovereignty, RN Ravi has implies that the meaning of shared sovereignty as sharing of competencies. Similar opinion is also expressed by the NSCN leaderships. For more see, “Ravi meet GPRN/NSCN, NNC/FGN”

illegally taken away by British and India. The secondly reason is a necessary extension from the first argument. That is, if the Naga sovereignty was not recognised by the Indian state, then, shared sovereignty, in this sense, only means sharing of India's sovereignty. Therefore this special federal arrangement is expected to be asymmetrical federalism by giving more powers to the Nagas than the existing normal power sharing. Otherwise there is no rationale of another federal arrangement, because India already has a federal form of government whereby the constitution of India has clearly delineated the powers into Union list, State list, Concurrent list and residuary power. Moreover, Nagaland state already enjoys special powers under Article 371A⁶. Therefore, it is expected that the ongoing power sharing arrangement will be more comprehensive and inclusive, because if it is “equivalent to” or “less than” what is already provided, there is no point of another power sharing initiative.

So what are the areas that can be shared? Schedule 7 of the Indian constitution provides the power sharing formula between the Union and the States, wherein the Union government enjoys exclusive power over 100 items, and the States enjoy exclusive jurisdiction in 61 items. There are also 52 items under Concurrent list which is shared by both the Union and the states. In addition to these, Part XI (Article 245-263) of the constitution provides further power relations between the union and the states. The items in the union list are those of national interest, such

as foreign affairs, defence, atomic energy, railways, currency, airways, judiciary, mineral oil resources, Reserve Bank of India, Union Public Service Commission, Central Bureau of Investigation, etc.

In the context of shared sovereignty, it is expected that some of these items such as foreign affairs, defence, mineral resources etc. are to be shared between Indian government and the Nagas. These items are of common concern. For instance, sharing of foreign policy is justified especially given the circumstances that the Nagas are spread across international boundaries⁷. In the field of defence, joint defence management is prudent given the strategic geo-military location of the Naga territory⁸. History shows that on many occasions Nagas have bravely fought against their enemies to safeguard their borders. As Th. Muivah stated during the signing of Framework Agreement, “Nagas can be trustworthy and take into confidence for any policy in the northeast and beyond”. Given that the land is considered sacred for the Nagas and tied to her identity, she will not easily give up the responsibility of border security to India alone. They have fought to safeguard their land before and will continue to do so with the help of India if possible and alone if necessary. Similarly in the area of land ownership, the Nagas have a unique form of ownership which is different from the rest of India. In Naga society land belongs to the clan, village and community. This makes it difficult for the government to freely use and dispose off

⁶Article 371A of the Indian constitution, *inter alia*, provides special power to the State of Nagaland in the field of religious and social practices of the Nagas, Naga customary law and practices, administration of civil and criminal justice involving decisions according to Naga customary law, and ownership and transfer of land and its resources.

⁷According to Naga Hoho, the apex body of the Naga tribes, there are 36 Naga tribes found in Myanmar, commonly known as Eastern Nagas. At least seven of these tribes are found both in India and Myanmar. For more on this, see, Naga Hoho (2002), *White Paper on Naga Integration*.

⁸The present Nagaland state is roughly 16,000 sq.km in size. However, there are Naga tribes in Manipur, Assam, and Arunachal. It has international boundary with Myanmar and China.

the land and its resources. At present this unique land ownership is protected by the special constitutional provision under Article 371A. Therefore, under the special federal arrangement, the ownership, usage and disposal of land and its resources (both surface and underground) can be shared between the two parties.

In the same way there are many areas such as official language, national identity, election system, customary law, flag and other symbolic elements etc. whereby the power sharing formula that is uniquely suited to the situation will help develop more trust between the government of India and the Nagas. And such solution can become a model solution in the world to resolve similar cases of ethno-nationalism.

IV. Challenges

The idea of shared sovereignty in the Indo-Naga political settlement is faced with several challenges. These challenges can be broadly classified as internal and external challenges. The internal challenges are those issues and challenges within the Naga society such as the differences among the various factions of the nationalist groups, the formation of Pan Naga Hoho. The external challenges come from the neighbouring states of Naga inhabited areas and the central government. The external challenges are the territorial integrity and the issue of

separate flag and constitution. These challenges have to be resolved one way or the other in order to realise the idea of shared sovereignty.

Internal Challenges:

a) Differences among the nationalist groups: From the lone Naga nationalist group, i.e. NNC in 1946, there are now nine different factional groups espousing for the same Naga cause. From the existing nine groups, seven groups came together and formed the Working Committee of Naga National Political Groups (NNPGs) on December 13, 2016 to negotiate with the government of India⁹. Except the NSCN (K), which is based in Myanmar, all the nationalist factions in India are currently engaged in negotiation with government of India in two groupings, i.e. the NSCN (IM) and the NNPG. Similar to the Framework Agreement, the Indian state also signed “Agreed position” with the NNPGs on November 17, 2017, which is based on the recognition of Naga political and historical right to self-determination¹⁰. In spite of the declaration that there will be only one Naga solution, the parallel negotiations with two different Naga groups, i.e. the NSCN (IM) and the NNPGs, and the tacit differences between the two Naga negotiating groups on the issue of symbolic elements is obvious. While the NSCN (IM)

⁹There have been tremendous efforts by the civil society organisations for the various Naga factions to come together for the common cause. For instance, the Forum for Naga Reconciliation (FNR) was formed in 2008 by the *Naga Shisha Hoho*, to promote unity among the Naga factions through the process of reconciliation. Under the initiative of this Forum reconciliation meetings were held in neutral venue such as Chiang Mai, Thailand, and such other places where various nationalist groups along with other Naga civil society organisations participated. Similarly, through the initiative of the Nagaland Tribes Council (NTC) the six Naga Nationalist groups (later joined by the Khango Konyak faction of NSCN-K) came together to form the NNPGs.

¹⁰As revealed by the Convenor of the Working Group of the NNPGs, the “Agreed Position/Preamble” contains statement of “recognition by India the political and historical rights of the Nagas to self-determine their future in consonance with their distinct identity. That, the two parties agreed to work out the details of the relationship which is honourable, inclusive with due regard to contemporary realities”. See, “A Letter by N.Kitovi Zhimomi, Convenor, WC, NNPGs to Gen. (Rtd.) Nyemlang Konyak, Chairman, NSCN (K)”.

group argues that the symbolic elements should be addressed and included in the final agreement, the NNPGs are of the position that these symbolic elements should be left out for future negotiation in the post-settlement. These differences have stood in the way for inking the final settlement.

b) Pan Naga Hoho: The proposed Pan Naga Hoho is envisaged to be parliament-like body for the Nagas. Its original idea is to endow the body with all the decision making powers ranging from political, economic and socio-cultural. This Hoho is supposed to be bicameral legislative body with the upper house having an equal representation from all the Naga tribes constituted according to Naga customary law. The lower house is to be constituted from the directly elected representatives based on proportional representation of electorates. While this is the proposed designed of the Pan Naga Hoho, the contemporary realities of the existing state boundaries have compelled the negotiating parties to re-interpret this original idea. Now, both the Naga negotiating parties seem to have compromised on the original idea of an all comprehensive power of the Pan Naga Hoho, rather there is a talk of Pan Naga Hoho with limited power in the field of customary law, and without territorial integrity. However a Pan Naga Hoho without a wholesome integration including physical-geographical, political-administration, and

socio-cultural-economy integration seem to be toothless and unworkable. It is an undeniable fact that a partial integration in the form of Pan Naga Hoho without the physical-geographical integration will not be acceptable to the people of Nagaland, and it will open a new era of complicated conflict¹¹.

As stated, territorial integration is of course more complicated issue than one can imagine. Rearrangement of territorial boundaries affecting multiple states will not only hurt the pride and ego of the affected states but some unpleasant hardship is bound to occur. However, as NSCN leader VS Atem argued, Naga problem cannot be solved through Manipuri or Assamese interest, and that the Nagas are not infringing on the rights of these people, rather Nagas are only fighting for their rights¹².

External Challenges:

a) Territorial integrity: It is difficult to imagine a shared sovereignty without territorial integrity. If the Nagas are not brought under one administrative unit in the form of integration, the idea of shared sovereignty will just be a fantasy and hollow, for the very fact that a sub-unit within an existing federal unit (for example, autonomy within the state of Manipur, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh) will be too little or small to swallow the concept of “shared sovereignty”. It will be like an advance jet fighter without a launching pad.

¹¹There are already similar pan-Naga organisations such as Naga Hoho, Naga Students' Federation, Naga Mothers' Association, Naga Peoples' Movement for Human Rights, etc. There is a strong apprehension from the people residing in the state of Nagaland that unless there is a wholesome integration of Naga inhabited areas, partial integration without the physical and economic integration will give rise to a deadly conflict among the various Naga tribes, therefore this partial integration is not acceptable.

¹²VS Atem, NSCN leader, is considered to be the chief architect of the NSCN negotiation group and the chief spokesperson of the group. See, Radnadip Chaudhury. 2016.

One should understand that the persistent struggle of the Naga nationalist groups is not confined to increasing the power and status of the state of Nagaland alone but the main objective is the recognition of the Nagas as one nationality. In this regard the self-contradictory position of the Indian leaders has only added more confusion to the already existing complex problem. On the one hand, the Indian political leaders have assured the neighbouring states of the inviolability of their territorial integrity; on the other hand, they have promised the Naga negotiating groups of a unique settlement based on the political and historical uniqueness of the Nagas¹³. For the Naga negotiating parties, the recognition of the uniqueness of the Nagas means that the Nagas are one ethnic nation and independent prior to British India and therefore territorial integrity should be a pre-requisite for the final settlement of the Naga political problem. There seems to be no converging point in this regard at the moment. This has led some people to advocate for emotional integration rather than physical geographical integration¹⁴.

b) The Issue of Separate flag and Constitution: Under the concept of shared sovereignty separate flag and constitution should have been a natural outcome. As discussed above, the Nagas struggle for sovereignty was recognised when the current cease fire and peace process first started in 1997 with three preconditions, namely, talks

at Prime ministerial level, talks without precondition, and talks in third countries. This indicates that the Indian government accepted the Naga group as a separate entity qualified for negotiation. However, the final settlement seems to have reached a deadlock because of the Indian government unwillingness to concede these two demands of the Naga nationalists. To argue that these two demands are not within the ambit of negotiation is not to acknowledge the genuine desire of the Nagas. We can understand the position of the Indian state, that is, the principle of one country one constitution, in the process of containing Jammu and Kashmir; however this should not be the reason for withholding the settlement of Naga political problem. Such reluctance only shows the insincere attitude of the Indian government to resolve the Naga issue for good. Indian government's approach to the issue seems to be guided by conflict management strategy rather than conflict resolution. This will create a bad precedent in the future for India. It will only create a trust deficit in the minds of others.

One should understand that Naga struggle is on the one hand a struggle for independence; on the other hand, it is also an identity struggle, which is to protect and preserve the separate identity of the Nagas. It is only fair that a minority nationality like the Nagas is assured of protecting and preserving their identity. Therefore the symbolic issues are

During the election campaign rally in Imphal, Manipur, the then Home Minister of India, Rajnath Singh, announced that "no force in the world could disintegrate Manipur's territory". Such statement has only added fuel to the fire. See, IANS, the *Morung Express* (February 19, 2017).

People who advocate for emotional integration are the present Chief Minister of Nagaland, Neiphiu Rio and others, who argue that if territorial integrity is not possible at least Nagas should have an emotional integration by having a common body that takes care of the social and cultural aspect of the Nagas. In this regard several Resolutions have been adopted by the Nagaland Legislative Assembly. See, Chakrabarty, Rakhi.

important in the context of Naga political settlement. Symbolic elements such as flag, anthem, emblem and constitution are an important indicators of the distinct identity. Therefore, it may be possible to compromise certain issues under the substantive items; however, it will be difficult to sell in the domestic constituency a compromised solution without these symbolic elements. It is also not an impossible issue for the Indian government to recognise these symbolic components of the Nagas. This is not going to lessen Indian's prestige; it will show the maturity of India's approach towards its minority nationalities. Most importantly it will help resolve the century old separatist movement. To deny these rights just to prove the case of J&K is not wise strategy.

V. Conclusion

On the eve of signing the ceasefire and the subsequent peace process between Indian government and NSCN (Nationalist Socialist Council of Nagalim), three important terms were agreed upon by the two parties which are: Talk at prime ministerial level, talk without condition, and talk in third countries¹⁵. All these terms are now blatantly violated one by one. The prime ministerial level talk has now come down to governor/interlocutor level; talks without condition is now conditioned by the Indian

constitution and the inviolability of territory of the states; and the base of negotiation has shifted from Zurich-Bangkok-New Delhi to Dimapur. With multiple changes of hands of the negotiators from the Indian side, there is an evidence of slowly undermining the Naga struggle. India seems to be guided purely by the strategy of conflict management, rather than an honest effort of conflict resolution. The veracity of this conflict management approach is questioned by many keen observers with an apprehension in mind that history might repeat itself, and the final resolution of the Naga political problem may elude this time again.

On the other hand, there is a clear indication that the Naga people are eager to settle the long standing Indo-Naga political problem on the basis of the idea of shared sovereignty. By bringing all the stakeholders including the civil society organisations, tribal bodies, the elected representatives, along with all the different nationalist groups, in the consultation process for the final agreement, the government of India has certainly laid a strong foundation to bring an honourable settlement. However, unless the government of India is sincere in addressing all the issues including the symbolic issues, a final, comprehensive and enduring peace agreement may not be achieved anytime soon.

¹⁵As a prelude to the ceasefire agreement, these three preconditions were arrived at the Paris Agreement 1995 between the NSCN led by Th. Muivah and the Indian government led by the then prime minister PV Narasimha Rao. For more on this, see, RH. Raising. "NSCN (IM) gives update on Framework Agreement, Political Negotiation with India".

References

- “A Letter by N. Kitovi Zhimomi, Convenor, WC, NNPGs to Gen. (Rtd.) Nyemlang Konyak, Chairman, NSCN (K)” <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1473027373019494/permalink/2797298647259020> (accessed August 06, 2020).
- Chakrabarty, Rakhi. 2012. Neiphiu Rio wants Emotional Integration of Nagas. *The Times of India October 19*. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Neiphiu-Rio-wants-emotional-integration-of-Nagas/articleshow/16871967.cms>
- Choudhury, Radnadip. 2016. “Naga Group Still Hope for Physical Integration” *Deccan Herald* August 16 <https://www.deccanherald.com/content/495458/naga-groups-still-hope-physical.html>
- Gauba, O.P 2013. *An Introduction to Political Theory*. Macmillan, New Delhi
- Halbach, Uwe. 2018. “Chechnya's Status Within the Russian Federation”. SWP Research Paper 2, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Ludwigkirchplatz, Berlin. https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2018RP02_hlb.pdf (accessed July 21, 2020).
- IANS. 2017. “168 Candidates in Fray for First Phase Manipur Polls”. *Morung Express* February 19. https://issuu.com/morung_express/docs/february_20th__2017/3.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- “Naga Club Memo to Simon Commission 1929”. *The Naga Republic*, <https://www.thenagarepublic.com/files/naga-club-memo-to-simon-commission-1929/> (accessed July 21, 2020).
- Naga Hoho. 2002. *White Paper on Naga Integration*. Compiled by Naga Hoho.
- “ R a v i m e e t G P R N / N S C N , N N C / F G N ” , <http://nagalandpost.com/ChannelNews/State/StateNews.aspx?news=TkVXUzEwMDA5MDc1Ng%3d%3d> (accessed June 25, 2020)
- Rh. Raising, “NSCN (IM) gives update on Framework Agreement, Political Negotiation with India”, <https://www.thenagarepublic.com/files/nscn-im-gives-update-on-framework-agreement-political-negotiation-with-india/> (accessed July 21, 2020).
- Rupensinghe, Kumar. 1996. “Governance and Conflict Resolution in Multi-Ethnic Societies” in Rupensinghe and Valery Tishkov (eds.), *Ethnicity and Power in the Contemporary World*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press. 210-220.
- Tishkov, Valery. 2002. “The Pros and Cons of Ethnic Federalism in Russia” in Dr. Rafael Khakimov (ed.) *Federalism in Russia*, Institute of History, Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, Kazan Institute of Federalism, Kazan, 149-160.