



# Ethnic dimension in India-Myanmar Relations

T. Chongboi Haokip

*Centre for Indo-Pacific Studies,  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University,  
South-West Delhi, India- 110067  
[tchaokip55@gmail.com](mailto:tchaokip55@gmail.com)*

*Abstract- The study examines the changing dimensions of India-Myanmar Relations, the ethno-nationalist movement operating in northeast India and the peripheral region of Myanmar with special reference to the Kuki and Chin ethnic groups in relation to India-Myanmar relation. Both India and Myanmar are ethnically diverse nations which shared a porous international border with transnational nationalities on both the sides. The Kukis and Chins represents the transnational ethnic communities with shared historical past. Many studies on bilateral relations between India and Myanmar has been conducted, But the ethnic dimension has been ignored viz-a-viz the bilateral relations. The gist of this paper is to highlight the importance of understanding ethnic conflicts in the light of the study on India-Myanmar bilateral relations. In this paper the term Burma and Myanmar would be used interchangeably depending on the era. The term “Burma” would be used for the period before 1989 while “Myanmar” would referred to the period after 1989.*

**Keywords-** Ethno-nationalism, Ethnic groups, India, Myanmar, Relations, Kuki, Chin

## Introduction

Ethnicity and nationalism as a concept has come into regular usage rather recently. Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex stated that “the term ethnicity became increasingly crucial in the social sciences in the 1960’s, a period marked by the consolidation of the process of decolonization in Africa and Asia as numerous new nation states were created” (Guibernau and Rex 1997: 1). The collapse of Soviet Union results in fresh talk of ethnicity in the 1990’s. The world is facing the problem of ethnicity in one form or the other. A.D Smith and J Hutchinson (1996) said, “The end of history, it seems to have ushered in the era of ethnicity”. Further by the end of the twentieth century ethnic separatist-secessionist movements came up with new intensity, especially in multi-ethnic states. Multi-ethnic nations like India and Myanmar are no exception too, where secessionists or autonomy movements are based mainly on nationalism driven by ethnicity which in turn affects the pace of implementing its

foreign policy in relations to other countries. So, ethnicity deals with each ethnic group interaction with other groups in the realm of political, economic and social sphere.

## India and Myanmar Border

India and Myanmar shared 1643 km long border. This border region remain the most neglected and underdeveloped region since independence and inhabited by ethnic communities with history of continued unrest in both the countries. Interestingly, India’s foreign policy initiative under Look East Policy provides an opportunity to enhance the bilateral relation between India and Myanmar, the two neighbouring states with mosaic of diverse ethnic groups. It is stated that Northeast India has geographical contiguity with Myanmar and therefore natural and geographical problems are similar. Both the states shared a common problem of ethnic separatist movement in their respective regions, manifested in the form of insurgencies and minority right issues.

## Historical legacy

India and Myanmar are ethnically diverse nation with shared common historical, ethnic, cultural and religious ties. According to Myanmar Peace Monitor, in Myanmar there are as many as 135 ethnic groups clubbed into 8 major ethnic races. The problem of ethnic conflict dates back to the period of British colonialism. Both India and Myanmar, then known as Burma were under colonial rule and were a part of British India. Burma was under British India rule until it got separated from India in 1937 as per the recommendation of the Simon Commission. Gradually, India and Myanmar got independence one after another. India became independent in 1947 while Myanmar then known as Burma got independence in 1948. India established diplomatic relations with Burma from 1948. As a result they had long political history and contacts.



Ethnicity and nationalism have become closely intertwined in the demand for self-determination by ethnic communities which were freed from the bondage of colonial rulers. The colonial masters for administrative convenience demarcated the boundaries of the ethnic groups during their rule without consulting the ethnic groups, which later on posed a serious challenge after they left the territory for the ethnic group in question. The demarcation of these political boundaries left ethnic groups divided across the countries reducing the once mighty ethnic group into a state of minority in their new territory. In the process when these particular ethnic groups felt that their ethnic aspirations are neglected in the new set up they resort to ethnic mobilisation based on either political demands or armed movement in the form of insurgency, threatening territorial integrity of the state. Because of these issues, Myanmar and India have lately been facing unending ethnic separatist movement and intra-ethnic conflict in varying degree from time to time since independence. Therefore, the research delve into understanding the issues of ethnic nationalism as a legacy of British colonialism and the failure on the part of the respective state authority in subduing or apprehending the complex issues arising out of ethnic tensions, conflict, separatism or secessionist policy. It also draws the urgency for the peace reform process in the peripheral region.

#### **Before the advent of the Britishers**

Before the advent of the Britishers, the Kukis and Chins inhabited a vast tract of territory which dispersed in three countries i.e. India, Myanmar and Chittagong Hill tracts of Bangladesh. This territory in question was given different names like 'Zalengam', 'Khulmigam', 'Kukiland' or 'Zogam', to designate this land. But the British colonial rule reduced them as a trans-border ethnic community separated by three international boundaries namely-India, Burma and Bangladesh. Piang (2013) stated that the Indo-Burma boundary was drawn without any consideration for cultural, linguistic, ethnic, religious and anthropological or racial origin but purely on the basis of political expediency or administrative convenience. This very reason is the root of ethnic Kuki-Chin nationalism for the re-establishment of their own homeland, wherein they preserve and promote their own traditions, culture and customs as a separate and distinct ethnic group.

#### **Chin Nationalist Movement**

When Burma gained independence in 1948, the ethnic Chin attempted to create a separate state with a democratically elected parliament but only special division, not state, was granted. Till 1960's the Chins were contented in the federal union of Burma. The government policy of making Buddhism the state religion in 1962 dissatisfied the Chin ethnic group. The 1974 constitution upgraded Chin special division to Chin state. Even then the Chins still suffer religious persecution. In 1988 the Chin National front, a group advocating democratic government was formed. Since the election of 1990, the *tatmadaw* has rapidly extended its control over Burma's northwest region, in the Chin state and Saigang Division. The outcome of the increased army presence resulted in the persecution and impoverishment of the Chins and other ethnic minorities like the Kukis and Nagas. At present in Myanmar not only Chins even the other ethnic minorities strive for autonomy in their respective areas and larger participation in the political set up of the country as a whole in a democratic way.

Over the next decade with the implementation of the 2008 constitution, the *Tatmadaw* (armed forces) introduced Border Guard Force (BGF) scheme, an attempt to absorb the ethnic ceasefire militia group into the national army, in 2009. Resisted by the ethnic groups of this scheme, the government declared all ceasefire agreements null and void.

However, remarkable is the Chin prompt response to the Union government announcement regarding implementation of permanent peace in the Union of Myanmar. Following this, on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2012 the representatives of Union Government and CNF signed a 9 point state level peace agreement at Hakha, Chin state. Moreover, on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2012, 15 point peace charter was signed in which travel restriction imposed on CNF lifted. This improves the condition of Chins to a certain extent. Another Union level agreement was also signed on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2012 by the CNF and 19 Peacemaking committee members. It was reported that the peace talk has the most attendees ever compared with other armed ethnic groups. As a result, CNA (Chin National Army) camps are set up in the state and trading is carried on along Indo-Burma border road. In this meeting an agreement to form an independent commission on human rights abuses in Chin state was decided. Observation of Chin National Day was also part of the terms of the chin ceasefire agreement among genuine federalism. Presently, the CNF reiterates for a nationwide ceasefire agreement between



the Government and the armed ethnic groups. This is a welcome step for enhancing ties with its neighbour India as well in fomenting connectivity and development initiative vis-a-vis India's look east policy.

### **The Kuki Nationalist Movement**

The 'Kukis' comprised of an ethnic minority community which established their presence in three countries namely- Myanmar, India and Chittagong Hill tract of Bangladesh. In India they are found mainly in all the North-eastern states except in Arunachal Pradesh and Sikkim. In Myanmar the Kukis inhabited mainly the North-western part bordering India i.e. in Chin state and Saigang division. This scattering across international boundaries is mainly attributed to the British colonial policy. In the post- independence era the demand for a separate state dominated the political scenario of the Kukis. The Kuki National Assembly (KNA) was the frontrunner in this regard. Despite, the State Reorganisation Act passed by the parliament the aspirations of the Kukis remained unfulfilled. Sectarian politics do occurs within the Kuki ethnic groups. Certain sub-groups within the Kuki emerged to promote 'Zomi as an alternative name to Kuki'. This hinders the pace of Kuki ethno-nationalist movement to a certain extent.

The colonial administration paves the way for the ethnic Kukis of Northeast India to exert their strong ethnic consciousness in fighting the colonial power. This eventually, in the long run contributed to mushrooming of insurgent groups in Manipur. The Anglo-kuki war of 1917-1919 led to the defeat of the Kukis. This had a long impact on the history of the Kukis, which today led them scattered in three different countries .i.e. India, Bangladesh and Myanmar. With the end of colonial rule, power was transferred to the Indians and India became an independent and sovereign country. The repercussion of India's independence led to changes in the politics of India and especially in Northeast India. States were created on ethnic or community lines while some communities were left out e.g the Kukis etc. This led to kuki insurgency movement fighting for an independent Kukiland or Zalengam (Haokip 2008).According to Haokip (2010) this was one of the significant political steps taken up by the government for the Kukis aspirations for statehood or political dialogue. Looking at the Kukis great history and contribution on India's struggle for freedom by joining INA army the government has neglected their social and political contribution for a very long time.

Dissatisfied with the Central government inaction in regards to their aspirations, armed movement in the form of insurgency became rampant in the late 1990's. Discontentment and dissatisfaction of the ethnic Kukis resulted in the mushrooming of dozens of armed ethnic insurgent groups. As a result of the government counter insurgency measures, anti-government activities are common in the region. This in fact, hinders the development of the region occupied by the ethnic groups. Later on, insurgency became a hindrance for both the state and centre government in advancing Look East Policy.

A major political breakthrough could be experienced with the government introduction of 'Suspension of Operation (SoO)', a mechanism to look into the long standing issues of the Kuki groups through political dialogue with the armed Kuki insurgent groups under two umbrella- KNO and UPF. On 10 August 2005, the Army, the state government of Manipur and KNO signed SoO and the UPF on 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2008 respectively. Owing to the utter neglect of the Kukis cause by the government the once mighty ethnic groups had experienced immense socio-political and economic deprivation. Therefore, the plight of the ethnic Kuki and Chin's cause with intervention from the concerned government in power should be at the topmost priority.

### **Bilateral relations 1948 to 1962**

The British colonised India and Burma one after another during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Till 1937 Burma (Myanmar) was a part of British India. India got independence from colonial rule in 1947 while Burma got independence in 1948. This shows that India and Burma share a long political history and person to person contact in terms of economy, culture etc. The two countries signed Treaty of Friendship under the leadership of U Nu and Jawaharlal Nehru in 1951, which is believed to be the cementing force between India and Myanmar in due course of time (Burma centre Delhi 2011: 5). However the honeymoon period of India Myanmar relation was short lived. The military coup of Burma in 1962 led to change of leadership under Ne Win military junta. It can be said that since 1962 there has been no institutions of parliamentary democracy. This led to the beginning of sour relation between the two countries.

Both India and Myanmar faced the ethnic minority problem since independence. This issue figured at the top of the Indo-Myanmar post colonial interaction. Burma witnessed a turbulent period; there were many discontentment's on the part of the ethnic communities



over the outcome of the Panglong Agreement where all ethnic groups are not represented well. "Throughout the late 1940s and 1950s various other ethnic groups including the Karenni, Mon, Pao, Rakhine and Muslim Mujahids, took up arms in the country side. In 1958, General Ne Win briefly took control of the government during the short-lived Military caretaker administration before restoring to U Nu in 1960 in democratic elections" (Smith 1994: 25).

### **Period of Isolationism 1962-1988**

India-Myanmar had strain ties after the overthrow of democratic government in the infamous military coup of 1962. In march 1962 the military junta under the leadership of Ne Win took hold of Burma's administration. It controlled economy of the country and pushed to the brink of the least developed country in the world during this time. The people faced hardship and all form of rights were abused and carried on in accordance with the wish of the ruling junta. "Under General Ne Win's Burma Socialist Programme Party Government (1962-1988), ethnic minority languages were openly downgraded and a tacit policy of ethnic, cultural and religious assimilation was instituted by the state" (Smith 1994: 18). The minorities were affected and many form of resistance in the form of armed insurgency flourished in all the nook and corner of the state. The military under State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) further tries to burmanise all the ethnic minorities by spreading the theory of 'Burmese family of races'- a family sharing one blood and historic origin (Smith 1994: 18). The chairman of SLORC, General Than Shwe has also taken a big initiative in this regard.

Unfortunately, the ethnic minorities were sceptical of the Junta policy and rejected the theory of same blood and common origin by most of the minority political parties. The demand for complete secession of their territories from Burma echoed in most of the ethnic minority inhabited area. "For the inhabitants of the Shan and Karenni states this meant that they were asserting a right to accession legally granted to both the territories in Burma's first independence constitution in 1947" (Smith 1999: 19). In the politics of Burma, the ethnic groups and the government are not in tandem with one another. Both are always at loggerhead against one another. The Burman centric- view that Burma is a homogeneous country was rejected by the ethnic minorities.

India's condemnation of military suppression of democracy in Burma led to expulsion of the Burmese Indian community, increasing its own isolation from the world. Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, a large number of ethnic Indians were expelled from Burma (Kamboj 2013: 3). The neutral stand of Myanmar during Chinese aggression of 1962 was seen by New Delhi as pro-Chinese tilt. India's commitment to democratic values during Indira Gandhi's tenure further aggravated the already strain relations. Kamboja states that "a commitment to democratic values was prioritized ahead of security concerns in the foreign policy toward Myanmar" (Kamboja 2013:3). India continued its policy of idealism even during Rajiv Gandhi's tenure. He visited Myanmar in the year 1987, the first ever visit by an Indian Prime Minister in almost 19 years.

### **The quadruple 8888 of Myanmar**

In 1988 SLORC was in power in Myanmar. India still lends its moral support to the pro- democracy movement in Burma. A small incident led to a democracy uprising which is known as 8-8-88 or quadruple 8 uprising. "The reason why it is called 8888 is that the gruesome massacre began on 8 August 1988, in which an unknown number of demonstrators, estimated to be in thousands, were killed" (Kipgen 2016:20). As a result of this gruesome event thousands of people belonging to different ethnic groups fled the country to take refuge in neighbouring countries, such as India, Thailand and Bangladesh.

"The Indian Embassy in Rangoon was active in helping pro-democracy activists. Embassy officials were in touch with opposition groups like the All Burma Federation of Student's Unions (ABFSU), Aung San Suu Kyi and U Nu during the uprising. Several reports indicate that India provided financial and material support to the Kachin Independence Army and the Karen National Union (KNU) that had joined the opposition to the military regime".(Kamboja 2013:4).

This incident is significant in the history of Burma's fight for democracy and also in the history of India-Myanmar Relations. "New Delhi was the sponsor of a United Nations (UN) resolution condemning the military junta of Myanmar for its violation of human rights in 1992" (Kumar 2013: 41). India became the first Asian government to publicly criticise SLORC. This incident resulted in strain relation between India and Myanmar as Indian government support towards pro-democracy



movement in Burma. India, the largest parliamentary democracy in Asia, felt obliged to support the pro-democracy movement in its neighbour. During this time Military junta and Chinese government strengthened their relations. Many insurgent groups of India took haven in Myanmar side of Indian border. This created domestic problems in India's North eastern region. Taking all these into consideration, on the advice of the military staff the government change its stance and followed a more realistic approach in its foreign policy. However, this strained relations continued till 1993.

The rising of SLORC in 1988 has done any good than harm. It was just a name change. The military continues its atrocities towards the people and the battle for control of Burma's history and tradition has intensified leading to name change of many existing names. For example, the change of country name from Burma to Myanmar etc. "The military also reinterpreted 'Burma's history too literally in racial or nationalistic terms" (Smith 1994: 22)

#### **India-Myanmar Relations since 1990**

The early 1990s brought a new turn in India's foreign policy especially at dealing with the Myanmar government. The result of NLD (National League for Democracy) landslide victory in 1990 general election under the leadership of Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi was crushed by the military junta and intensified its crackdown upon democratic activists. Many fled to India as a refugee and were given room by the Indian government. This aggravates the already strained relations. Ethnic minority groups had taken a great role in supporting democracy movement along with the NLD. But till 1992 India's relation with Myanmar continue to strain. "It was only in 1991, however, that a decision was taken to discontinue criticism of the Myanmar regime in All India Radio's (AIR) Burmese broadcasts. The visit to Yangon (then Rangoon) by the Indian Foreign Secretary in 1993 started the process of improving relations between the two countries" (Singh 2012: 4). India changes its foreign policy in dealing with Myanmar gradually. "Burma is the world's third largest source of refugees after Afghanistan and Iraq. Between 1995 and 2005, the flow of refugees has increased up to 800% in Burma's neighboring countries as a result of the military regime's widespread and systematic human rights abuses, military offensives, religious and ethnic persecution" (ALTSEAN-Myanmar (2008), Burma 20 Years On: Hungry As Ever For Democracy).

From 1993-2010, New Delhi initiated a policy of engagement with Myanmar. It adopted a more pro-active foreign policy which is realism. With a more pragmatic approach towards dealing with Myanmar coupled with the adoption of Look East Policy India and Myanmar enter a new phase of relations which focussed on closer engagement with Myanmar. The end of cold world and the era of globalisation also made New Delhi to rethink its foreign policy in general and with Myanmar in particular. New Delhi also has started to rethink its borders in the North eastern region which has become a haven for ethnic insurgent movement. To enhance its bilateral relations with the Southeast Asian countries, India initiated its ambitious Look East Policy. Both the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) led National Democratic alliance and Congress party led United Progressive Alliance (UPA) maintained the policy of constructive engagement with Myanmar (Kumar 2013: 42). The shift in its foreign policy enhanced economic cooperation between the two countries during 1994-1996. However, in 1995 India- Myanmar relations deteriorated when New Delhi conferred the Jawaharlal Nehru Award for promoting International Understanding to the noble peace laureate and pro-democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi (Burma centre Delhi 2011: 6).

#### **The Myanmar 2010 General Election**

The 2010 General Election was one of the 'Seven Step Roadmaps to Democracy' proposed by State Peace and Development Council. Under the guise of democratic reform the SPDC conducted election in 2010. In essence, the regime is just repackaging itself to make its rule more internationally acceptable without enacting much needed reforms" (ALTSEAN-Burma, Election and Democratic Reform 2017). Some believed that Myanmar ended the decades old military government. The NLD boycotted the election. However, the Chin Progressive Party formed on March 24, 2010 won 12 seats and became the 6<sup>th</sup> largest party. The CPP won 2 seats in the Pithuh Hludaw, 4 in the Amyotha Hludaw, 5 in the Chin State Hludaw and 1 in Sagaing Region Hludaw. The mission of CPP is to promote democracy and to fight for the right to have self-determination in Chin state (ALTSEAN-BURMA, Chin Progressive Party-CCP) 2015. "The democratisation of Myanmar encouraged New Delhi to pursue its Myanmar's policy more proactively. India anticipates that if Naypidaw continues with democracy, it may redefine their bilateral relations" (Kumar 2013: 42).

In 2011, Thein Sein, the newly elected president of Myanmar, paid a visit to India from October 12<sup>th</sup>- 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011. This led to a new level of India-Myanmar relations. India congratulated Myanmar on their transition towards more democratic form of government and offered necessary assistance in further strengthening this transition. The Indian Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh visited Myanmar from May 27<sup>th</sup> -29<sup>th</sup>, 2012 which took bilateral cooperation to the higher level. This was the first ever visit of an Indian Prime Minister after a gap of twenty five years. During the visit, India and Myanmar signed 12 Memorandums of Understanding on matters of mutual concerns wherein development and connectivity were the key watch word. Singh (2012) reiterated the need for stability in the region through planned development in the form of proper infrastructure development in the border region like road connectivity.

Since 2014 civilian government under the leadership of Aung San Suu Kyi is restored in Myanmar. In India the Congress party led United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government under Prime Minister Singh from 1994- 2014 came to an end and the BJP-led NDA Government under Narendra Modi begin its rule from 2014 onwards. The present government under the leadership of Narendra Modi also tries to enhance the already existing relations with Myanmar any change 'Look East Policy' to 'Act East Policy' to give a more pro-active stand. The relation between India and Myanmar is cordial at present. Both realised the importance of being a neighbouring states and took up various measures to help each other.

### **Boundary Demarcation and Impact on Kuki and Chins**

Border management between India and Myanmar has always been one of the most important challenges for the two countries. It is connected with wide ranges of issues like security threat from insurgent groups since there are many insurgent groups in the northeast region, in the economic front it is a fertile ground for economic activity from the trans-border people. It provides an opportunity for unlocking the opportunities of cross-border connectivity and infrastructure development while managing the challenges it poses. India also has porous international border with Bangladesh, which is marked by the issue of infiltration in the region.

Parameswaran (2018) was critical of the recent development in border management between India and Myanmar. He argued that it is a "far more complex

process than is often appreciated, particularly given the volume of traffic, the presence of dozens of (formal and informal) border crossings, and the fact that Indian tribal communities along the border have free movement".

For the first time a meeting was organised by the central government with the chief ministers of northeastern states which share a porous border with Myanmar and discussed issues concerning Myanmar border with active participation of state governments.

"The meeting was attended by Minister of State for Home Kiren Rijiju, besides Pema Khandu, N Biren Singh and Lal Thanhawla, the chief ministers of Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur and Mizoram, respectively and Nagaland Home Minister Yanthungo Patton. The government emphasise on setting up better infrastructure, connectivity and providing basic facilities along the long neglected Indo-Myanmar porous border in a phased manner- short-term (3 years), Medium term (3 to 6 years) and Long-term (6 to 10 years). There are more than 240 villages with over 2.5 lakh people within 10 km of the Indo-Myanmar border, Singh urged these bordering states to bring these areas under active policing. In a move to make Act East Policy more proactive, the government has taken various steps to enhance the development of the border region. The government has increased the budget allocation under Border Area Development Programme (BADP) to 17 Border States which was Rs 990 crore in 2016-2017, has been raised to Rs 1,100 crore in 2017-2018. "Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh were released Rs 567.39 crore during the last three years. For integrated development of 41 model villages Rs 92.39 crore were released in the last financial year, which included three villages in Manipur and one village in Nagaland" (Financial Express, June 12, 2017).

From the above, it can be concluded that a lot has been done by the government in furthering its look east policy which aimed at enhancing economic and strategic development of the region. Encouraging model village and border haat in the border region is an encouraging steps as well as challenging task ahead for both the government. However, still need to be done to establish a lasting solution to the long neglected region

### **Conclusion**

India should maintain friendly relations with Myanmar so as to bring economic growth and opportunity for the people on both sides of India and Myanmar especially the



Kuki and Chin groups. India- Myanmar border trade should be encouraged. There should be proper coordination between the states and the centres, infrastructure in northeast be given a priority.

On the Myanmar front all attempt should be maintained to follow the policy of inclusivity, whereby ethnic minorities be given an opportunity to grow in tandem with the mainstream policies. Their culture, values and traditions need to be protected. Even today the ethnic minority crisis is one of the most central issues facing Myanmar and its neighbour India's northeast. Moreover, the inter-ethnic ties between Kukis and Chins on both side of the border in particular and all ethnic groups in general should not be underestimated.

India's policy towards Myanmar is no longer guided by any ideology rather it is based on giving importance to national interest with dealing with neighbouring states. In international politics there is no permanent foe and ally. National interest comes above other in realist understanding of power. Despite all odds India is trying its best to mend the relationship in any possible way by helping Myanmar in infrastructure development or enhancing bilateral ties. India also needs Myanmar to check anti- national elements operating in its north-eastern region from the Myanmar side of the border. Nevertheless, Indian diasporas also can play a crucial role in enhancing ties between the two nations. The government should focus on the real need of the people at the border, like basic proper infrastructure for health and schools. This will in the long run help the countless number of peoples suffering in the region. For a healthy relation between India and Myanmar ethnic dimension cannot be neglected. Due importance should be given to address the long standing issue of insurgent movements.

#### References

Anthony D. Smith (1986), *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, New York: Basil Blackwell.

ALTSEAN-MYANMAR (2008), Burma 20 Years On: Hungry As Ever For Democracy Available At: <https://www.scribd.com/document/4465646/Burma-20-Years-on-Hungry-as-Ever-for-Democracy>

ALTSEAN-BURMA, Chin Progressive Party-CCP available at: <http://english.innpi.info/2015/09/chin-progressive-party-cpp.html>

ALTSEAN-BURMA, Election and Democratic Reform accessed on 2, july 2017, Available at <http://www.altsean.org/Research/2010/Key%20Facts/Burning%20Issues.php>

\*About the North Eastern Council Available at: <http://Necouncil.Gov.In/>

Burma centre Delhi (2011), *India-Burma Relations: Trends and Developments (1990-2011)*.

Financial Express, June 12, 2017, Panel to be set up for better infrastructure along Indo-Myanmar border: Rajnath Singh, retrieved at: <https://www.financialexpress.com/economy/panel-to-be-set-up-for-better-infrastructure-along-indo-myanmar-border-rajnath-singh/714589/> on 17<sup>th</sup> july , 2018

Haokip, P.S (2008), *Zale'n-Gam: The Kuki Nation*, India: Saurabh Printers Pvt. Ltd.

Haokip, Seilen (2010), *Rhetorics of Kuki Nationalism: A Treatise*, New Delhi: Lustra Print

Hutchinson, John and Smith, D. Anthony (1996), *Ethnicity*, Newyork: Oxford University Press.

Kamboj, Anil (2013), "India's Engagement with Myanmar", *World Focus*, Vol. XXXVI (10): pp. 3-9. Kamboj,

Kipgen, Nehginpao (2014), "Ethnicity in Myanmar and its importance to the success of Democracy", *Ethnopolitics: Formerly Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, Routledge: pp. 1-13, Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2014.926610>

Kumar, Satish (2013), "Domestic Problems in Myanmar and India-Myanmar Relations", *World Focus*, XXXIV(10): 39-45.

Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex. (1997). *The Ethnicity Reader : Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Migration*. Cambridge, UK : Malden, MA :Polity Press ; Blackwell Publishers

Parameswaran, Prashanth (January 06, 2018), What's With the New India-Myanmar Border Pact?, the diplomat, Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2018/01/whats-with-the-new-india-myanmar-border-pact/>



Piang, Lam Khan (2013), “Ethnic Mobilisation for Decolonisation: Colonial Legacy (the Case of the Zo people in Northeast India)”, *Asian Ethnicity*, Vol. 14(3): pp. 342-363.

.Smith, M. J. (1994), *Ethnic Groups in Burma Development, Democracy and Human Rights*, London: Anti-Slavery International.

Smith, Martin (1999), *Burma: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity*, London: Zed Books Ltd.

Singh, Udai Bhanu and Shruti Pandalai (2012), “Myanmar: The Need for Infrastructure Integration”, in Rumel Dahiya and Ashok K Behuria (eds.) *India's Neighbourhood: Challenges in the Next Two Decades*, New Delhi: Pentagon Security International.