

Editorial

Wednes, December 6, 2017

Calls for Recreation

The enigmatic cycle of our modern world has everyone in its grip- people devoting increasingly longer time and efforts in their work for higher financial returns which will be utilized for amassing more goods and services pushing up demands and subsequently the prices thus forcing people to work even harder to maintain their lifestyles and standards of living. This endless cycle of consumerism and capitalism needs to be slowed down before the mentality of the working public become so attuned to the singular objective of earning more to spend more, relegating all other social and personal activities and responsibilities as secondary considerations.

Recreation- a word that conjures up images of whiling away one's time in seemingly mundane matters and activities- is the remedy for all the tensions and pressures the busy modern world is imposing on the society. It may take any form and is the surest way to recharge and refresh the mind, body and soul to meet new challenges. It releases the pent -up frustrations one experienced in our daily grinds and struggles and takes our minds away from everything that confines and hinders our life. This becomes more relevant in our society with the increasing number of educated and knowledgeable young energetic generation vying for the limited opportunities this troubled state has to offer. The increasing delays and indifferences, not to mention the disorderliness and hindrances one has to bear to get anything done leaves a negative impact on our mindset which starts to manifest in the general attitude of the public- the dour expressions and wary exchanges tinged with suspicion and distrust, and even the occasional physical violence.

It will not be an exaggeration to point out that our society- especially the youths are being hemmed in from all sides thus making them feel emotionally suffocated, deprived of their liberties and their personal freedom infringed upon. On the one hand- social vigilanism that often borders on the fanatic and on the other hand, the armed forces treating everybody in the state with suspicion and distaste thereby distancing themselves from the people with each passing day, with the government not doing visibly enough to make things better for the common public.

It is high time to take recreation seriously- not with a frown and gritted teeth, but with our heart and soul leaving all the worries and frustrations behind- to be able to live our childhood again- even if for a very brief moment and be truly free of all obligations and responsibilities and pursue that one thing that brings us real and undiluted happiness. It is only when the mind, soul and the body are purified that we can focus on building a better life and a contented and happy society consequently.

WHENEVER YOU SEE CONSTRUCTION AND MINING EQUIPMENTS, JUST THINK OF US



Letters, Feedback and Suggestions to 'Imphal Times' can be sent to our e-mail : imphaltimes@gmail.com. For advertisement kindly contact: - 0385-2452159 (O)

Problem of 1949 Annexation of Manipur

By: Prof. Naorem Sanajoba
(Translated by Aheibam Koirang Singh) First Issue

In between two world wars (Inter-war period, 1919-1945), the political status of the states was very dynamic and characterised by fluidity. Its status and level changes and doesn't have a definable static character. To categorise the political status would be next to impossible. The state system that existed before the First World War does not match with the present times as the former was colonial times. A long historical past of imperialism and colonialism has made the matter more complicated and obscured. British paramountcy is neither colony, it infringes upon the independence of the states under monarchy, terminology which is not recognised by the international law. Because of it, the unfeasibility and impracticality of appropriately categorising the states' status of sovereign and semi-sovereign occurred during the time of paramountcy.

Political status of states during the inter-war period (1914-1945) and varied in the comity of nations. Categories altered. The political status of Manipur starting from pre-1947 to the year 1972 has been give above in the form of a chart. Firstly, the political status of Manipur in the pre-1947 was not included in the purview of colonialism. This has been treated as true by various colonial sources, Manipuri sources, and other independent sources. Philip Ziegler in his work, "Mountbatten: The Official Biography (1985)" writes, "As the boundaries of British India has gradually extended in the first half of the nineteenth century, an increasing number of princely states had entered into treaty arrangements with the new power, under which they accepted the presence of a British residents in their capitals and a degree of subordination to the Raj, but were not absorbed into the colonial bloc". James Crawford, while mentioning about the princely state stated that the native states in the Indian subcontinent are included in the purview of neither the protectorate state nor the colonial protectorate.

Table No. 1 Transformation of Manipur State		
Period	Status of State	Order
Pre 1947*	International Protectorate	1
26 July 1947	Autonomous State (Constitution adopted)	2
11 August 1947	Associate state (sovereign within Indian Constitution)	3
15 August 1947	Sovereign state	4
18 October, 1948	Sovereign People's Republic (Assembly functions)	5
15 October 1949	Annexed state (Continuous state with suspended sovereignty)	6
January 21, 1972	Constituent state of India (Susp. Sovereignty)	7

Their status is same as international protectorate, I, myself, have earlier dwelt sufficiently enough on the issues of Manipur during those days of paramountcy. When the paramountcy came to an end, the state can exercise the option of joining either of the two dominions or remaining independent under particular political arrangement. Congress had persistently tried hard and made all possible efforts to substitute and replace the British paramountcy but the British have firmly taken the stance that it was beyond their jurisdiction.

The issue that needs to be clarified at the first instant is the interpretation of the native state by the British did not match and synchronise with interpretation of the British. From the viewpoint of the Congress leadership, states of Moghul, Maratha, and Sikh were very often found to be mentioned as native states. Manipur was never a part of it. Manipur in its historical past and contemporary times also was not mentioned in the "Blood relation" state of Sardar Patel. It is viewed from the perspective of the Congress' native state. Manipur belongs to the same category of separate state like Burma, Ceylon (Sri Lanka). Congress has falsely deemed the Indian subcontinent as a continuous state.

Manipur had its own political constitution in the year 1947. By virtue of it, despite being under international protectorate, Manipur became an autonomous state. Since the said constitution was given neither by the British nor by the Congress, the Manipur constitution stands unique and independent outside their political authority. VP

Menon himself writes that the status of the Manipur state was outside the purview of British India. And in August 1947 also, it was a part of neither India nor Pakistan.

On 11 August, 1947, Manipur after signing the Standstill and Accession Act which accordingly had agreed to hand over the three subjects to the (soon to be realised) Indian confederation remained as Associate State. Granville Austin, while describing the status of the states writes, "Somewhat later (Sic. after the Cabinet Mission) most of them (states) become loosely attached to the union government in a relationship more closely resembling confederation than federalism- although several threatened to remain independent". In the case of independence of the associate state, there has been widespread agreement.

James Crawford writes, "even if foreign affairs, defence and other subjects are handed over to another state, associate state remained independent as it happened to Western Samoa. He further mentioned that associate state can cease to be so basing on the principle of self-determination exercised through the free and genuine expression of the will of the people. In the case of Manipur becoming a case of associate state, the free and genuine expression of the people were bypassed. And also Manipur cannot ceased to be associate state, as no visible initiative is forthcoming from the metropolitan state (India) which would pave way for solutions of issues as Metropolitan state is day by day becoming more and more imperialist.

Leaving this aside, even after accession, the state doesn't lose

its independence. It has been very categorically mentioned in the Clause 7 & 8 of Accession Treaty, Clause 7 of the Instrument of Accession states:

"Nothing in this instrument shall be deemed to commit me (Manipur King) in any way to acceptance of any future constitution of India or to fetter my discretion to enter into arrangements with government of India under any such future constitution".

Clause 8 states:

"Nothing in this instrument affects the continuance of my sovereignty in and over this state, or save as provided by or under this instrument, the exercise of any powers, authority and rights now enjoyed by me as ruler of this state". On 15 August 1947, the political status of was elevated with Manipur becoming a sovereign status. Manipur in actuality became a sovereign peoples' republic when its assembly with its members elected through adult franchise had its session on 18 October 1948. When an independent Manipur became a part of India, there was a harsh change in the political status of Manipur. India annexed Manipur. The said annexation had been denounced and opposed altogether by the duly elected government of that contemporary time, hills and valley brethren, different parties, leftist movement. Today, it is being continued by organisations spearheading the liberation movement through resistance. During that time, only a fragment of Congressman pleaded for merger of Manipur.

(to be continued)

(This article is being reproduced again in the interest of our readers who had missed it)

National and International News

Trump's decision on Jerusalem could have deep repercussions

Courtesy : The Hindu

The U.S. President Donald Trump's move to recognise Jerusalem as Israel's capital on Wednesday could have deep repercussions across the region.

Any recognition of Israel's control over the city will be welcomed by Israel, a close American ally, and be popular with pro-Israel evangelical Christian voters who make up a key part of Mr. Trump's base. But it could also trigger violence in the region, derail a developing U.S.-West Asia peace plan before it even gets off the ground and infuriate key allies in the Arab world and in the West. Conflicting claims

Israel claims all of Jerusalem as its capital, while the Palestinians claim the city's eastern sector, captured by Israel in the 1967 Mideast war, as the capital of a future independent state. These rival claims lie at the heart of the decades-long Israel-Palestine conflict. The conflict is focused largely on the Old City, home to Jerusalem's most important Jewish, Christian and Muslim holy sites, and in particular on a hilltop compound revered by Jews and Muslims. The compound, known to Jews as the Temple Mount, is the spot where the biblical Jewish Temples stood thousands of years ago and is considered the holiest site in Judaism. Today, it is home to the Al Aqsa Mosque, the third-holiest site in Islam, and the iconic gold-topped Dome of the Rock. While Israel controls the city and its government is based there, its annexation of east Jerusalem is not

internationally recognised. The international community overwhelmingly says the final status of Jerusalem should be resolved through negotiations.

Why is Trump doing this? On the campaign trail, Mr. Trump took a strong pro-Israel stance and promised to relocate the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv, where most countries keep their embassies, to Jerusalem. Since taking office, he has learned that such a move is easier to talk about than to carry out.

Under American law, the President must sign a waiver every six months that leaves the embassy in Tel Aviv. In June, Mr. Trump renewed the waiver, as a string of predecessors have done. This week, another six-month deadline passed without Mr. Trump renewing it.

U.S. officials say Mr. Trump will again sign the waiver but will also instruct the State Department on Wednesday to begin the multi-year process of moving the U.S. Embassy to the holy city. The officials say the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital will be an acknowledgement of "historical and current reality" rather than a political statement but that moving the embassy will not happen immediately.

The officials spoke to reporters on condition of anonymity because they were not authorised to publicly discuss Mr. Trump's announcement beforehand.

How does this help Trump? Beyond electoral concerns, there seems to be little upside for Mr. Trump in making a change.

Trump's biggest supporters on the global stage.

What effect will this have? On the ground, very little will change. Mr. Netanyahu's office and official residence are in Jerusalem, as are the country's parliament, Supreme Court and Foreign Ministry. Visiting world leaders immediately travel to Jerusalem for meetings with Israeli officials.

Much of Jerusalem is an open city where Jews and Palestinians can move about freely, though a separation barrier built by Israel more than a decade ago slices through several Arab neighborhoods and requires tens of thousands of Palestinians to pass through crowded checkpoints to reach the centre of the city.

Interaction between the sides is minimal and there are large disparities between wealthier Jewish neighbourhoods and impoverished Palestinian ones. In addition, most of the city's more than 300,000 Palestinians do not hold Israeli citizenship and instead are "residents."

But a U.S. declaration carries deep symbolic meaning by essentially imposing a solution for one of the core issues in the conflict.

How does this help Trump? Beyond electoral concerns, there seems to be little upside for Mr. Trump in making a change.

Recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital could allow Mr. Trump to say that he kept a campaign promise. It also will thrill Israel, whose Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, is one of

in the coming months. His son-in-law and close adviser, Jared Kushner, is leading that effort and a close aide, Jason Greenblatt, has crisscrossed the region for talks with Israelis, Palestinians and other Arab leaders.

The Palestinians have warned that changing the status of Jerusalem would mean the end of those peace efforts. They also have warned of mass street protests — something that could easily erupt into full-scale violence.

International opposition to the move, including from key American allies, also has grown increasingly strident. In recent days, the European Union, Germany and France have all implored Mr. Trump not to take action on Jerusalem. The 57-member Organization of Islamic Cooperation said changing Jerusalem's status would amount to "naked aggression" against the Arab and Muslim world, and the head of the Arab League said it would be a "dangerous measure that would have repercussions" across West Asia.

Perhaps most significantly, Saudi Arabia spoke out strongly against the possible American step. The Saudis are a key American ally necessary for any attempt to forge a region-wide peace.

Will there really be violence? Israeli security officials say they are monitoring the situation and prepared for all scenarios. Israel and the Palestinians also maintain discreet security ties in the West Bank that have helped prevent violence from escalating in recent years.