

Editorial

Monday August 20, 2018

The impact of Globalisation

Globalisation, governed primarily by a market-oriented philosophy, has a number of implications for modes of governance. In the realm of education, the institutions of higher education face new pressures and demands for accountability, access, quality, introduction of new technologies and curriculum. A number of countries have introduced reforms to meet the challenges arising out of such a situation, though the context and nature of reforms vary from one country to another. First is the concrete reference available for post secondary education gave rise to privatisation of higher education. The protagonists of privatisation see it as an alternative when the supply and demand do not match or when demands are diversified or when public education is seen as not promoting quality. Second, the Governments are under pressure to attract foreign capital; and this means providing a ready supply of skilled labour. This translates into pressure to increase the average level of education in the labour force. The higher levels of education are important in a society wherein the economy is becoming more knowledge-based than product-based. Third, there is the closer relationship between the private sector including multinational corporations and the state agencies concerned with product development and innovation.

Further, globalisation should have a profound impact on the production and transmission of knowledge, some have argued that this has not occurred; they are casting doubts on the capacity of globalisation to permeate knowledge production and transmission as per local needs. In the context of Asia, this seems more relevant. Sometimes, we even find people advocating the replacement of textbooks with the motion pictures or instructional television. At another level, even when there were attempts to use modern technology in higher education, it has remained limited to the use of computers. It appears that the educational practices at the classroom level have changed only a little in most developing countries of Asia.

In terms of labour market reforms, the Governments are under pressure to attract foreign capital and this requires a ready supply of skilled labour. Further the shift from manufacturing to the services sector is an important development in the nineties. Thus, the concerns about attaining quality and curricular relevance in higher education with reference to international standards and demands have become prominent. This has placed increased emphasis on mathematics and science in the curriculum, and techno-scientific areas of knowledge. Thus the discourse today is about the skills 'relevant for employment, and enterprise'. In the context of globalisation, two major developments have taken place. One is the inclusion of members of the business houses on the boards of the public universities in order to enhance the industry-institution linkages. This is expected to ensure the relevance of the contents of the curriculum and new academic programmes vis-à-vis the needs of the industry.

The advocates of globalisation today argue for internationalisation of curriculum. For them, a truly global university today is characterized by its engagement with the process of globalisation, its international networks, and its internationalised curriculum. The internationalisation of curriculum entails a complex interplay of history, politics, knowledge production, and its use as well as teaching and learning. All these, however, are influenced by international market conditions and professional orientation. If this is so, the internationalised curriculum involves the development of new skills, attitudes and knowledge among students and teachers alike. It requires creation of new learning practices, spaces, ethos and cultures.

However, there is a danger in such internationalisation of curriculum. For instance, it also means the homogenization of curriculum across all the nations and cultures. This obviously undermines the values of uniqueness and diversity in cultures. This may create conflicts at the local level, which can threaten the social harmony as is evident in some of the South Asian countries. In developing countries such as India, globalisation seems to be increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, thereby aggravating the problems of social inequality, which is also inherent in the education system as well.

Letters, Feedback and Suggestions to 'Imphal Times' can be sent to our e-mail : imphaltimes@gmail.com. For advertisement kindly contact: - 0385-2452159 (O). For time being readers can reach the office at Cell Phone No. 9862860745 for any purpose.

Manipur: The Boiling Bowl of Ethnicity

By- Dr. Aaron Lungleng
(... Contd. from yesterday)

But, along with the loss of Meitribak, Nagas do not lose their sovereign village state. Therefore, mentioned may not be found in any historical treaty of Meitribak or the Awa or the Ahom and the Takhen (Tripura) that, Nagas pieces/fragments are subjected to. Unlike dynastic princely kingdom, the Nagas village state differs. To conquer/invade the Nagas one has to wage war to each and every village state in the hills. In Nagas traditional village republic state, other village does not hold any domination. Each sovereign village republic state enjoys separate autonomy and administration within their jurisdiction. In this society, the concept of submission does not subsist. The fall of the father shall be vengeance by their responsible kins or community as a whole. In such a circumstance, one may overpower anyone for some certain events, but the vengeance search party would lurk around until the heads of the games are brought home. Therefore, to venture endless warfare is undesired to the neighboring kingdom be it Ahom, Awa or the Kangleichas and even to the British. Therefore, noninterference in the Nagas affairs has been the policy ever since their first contact. So, instead of provocation, they are left isolated. Thus, semi or non-administrative zone comes about during the rule of the British East India Company. Since the ancient time, Nagas have been known to be generous and kind to the neighbors. Several times, neighboring kingdom men and royals pay a visit to the friendly Naga villages; they were treated as an honored guest due to generations' contacts through trade even in the time of headhunting. Their sympathetic treatment cannot therefore be taken as conquest in any sense. Today the dynastic princely subjects called the Kangleichas the central valley (Imphal valley), which is made up of only 700 square miles (Singh, 1980). The origin of the Meiteis cannot be precisely determined from the literature available. Horam observed that the origin of the Meiteis is obscure (Horam 1990, 4). Scholars differ sharply in their opinion on whether the Meiteis are Aryans or Mongoloids. There are those who claim that the Meiteis are descendants of Arjuna of Mahabharata and are therefore Aryan in origin. But the journey of Arjuna to Manipur by the sea cannot be Manipur/Kangleipak found in the Mahabharata.

Referring the folk tales, the mitei is the younger brother of the Nagas. Therefore, without the representation of the Nagas, Leiharaoba/Haojongba cannot be observed. This tradition is still practiced till today. "There can be little doubt that some time or other the Naga tribes to the north made one of their chiefs Rajah of Manipur, and that his family, while, like the Manchus in China and other conquerors, adopting the civilization of the country, retained some of their old customs. This is shown in the curious practice of Rane appearing in Naga costume; also in the palace a house built like a Naga's, and wherever he goes, he is attended by two or three Manipuris with Naga arms and accoutrements" (Sir James Johnstone, 1896). From time immemorial Nagas and Meitei does not, neither raid or conquering. It is suspected that a policy of inflicting one another and subjugation was not adopted between them which must be due to their bond of common descendant/brotherhood. Naturally, by origin if the elder brother is a Mongoloid than, younger brother must belong to the same unless matrimonial intervene to become blended or otherwise. So, traditional theory, which is widely accepted by scholars and writers, is that the Meiteis originated from the

Mongoloid race. Historians and scholars such as Roy, Thumra, Horam, Hodson, N. Tombi Singh, and Parratt support this tradition. N. Tombi Singh, a Meitei scholar, states, "Many... think that there is a basic difference between the valley people of Manipur (Meiteis) and those who are in hill areas. In fact, it is not so. The entire people of Manipur belong to the same ethnic group and trace their origin more or less to the Sino-Tibetan group of human species." (Singh, 1972). Despite the various claim, "It is difficult for the Meiteis to claim any racial purity due to their long stories of migration and a series of invasion by the Aryans, Shans, and Myanmar" (Singh 1988, 149). Beyond doubt, Meitei would show an admixture of race as seen through the many invasions by awe or expulsion to Ahom and Cachar. Such blended communities cannot be easily ascertained to one racial stock anthropologically. Yet, the majority of the population would manifest a mongoloid racial physiology due to intermingled to the same racial carrier than the smaller immigrant Bengali stock. Yet, Mongoloid-Aryans blended race existence is an admitted fact. "However, it is beyond doubt that they originally belonged to the Mongoloid race. Another group of Meitei people, who are the Brahmins believed to have come from Bengal with the coming of Hindu Vaishnavism during the seventeenth century. They are altogether a different people group, probably belonging to the Aryan race" (Rimai, 2017).

The Kuki
Sir James Johnstone (1896) said that the original home of the Kukis cannot be correctly ascertained, but there seem to be traces of them as far as south of the Malay Peninsula. Once during Hudson was on expedition in the south they happen to come across a travelling band and when asked where was their home, this was what T.C. Hudon (1911) quoted the words of Kuki chief, "we are like birds of the air, we make our nests here this year, and who knows where we shall build next year". It makes one understand beyond doubt that the Kukis are migrant nomadic tribe migrating from places to places up till the beginning of the 20th century. Whereas, the Nagas and Meiteis at that time had already set up a proper village state on the other hand the Meitei had established their own kingdom.

The probability of the Kukis migrating upward from the Burma cannot be amenable. But the genesis of the word 'Kuki' is woven into confusion and complexity. It is best guess that the term 'Kuki' must be given by the outsiders.

The precise description of Kuki by G. A. Grierson reveals in his Linguistic Survey of India, Vol-III, Part-III, Calcutta, 1904, P. 23 that, the Kukis, are migrants, shifting their village sites every 4 or 5 years and never take to permanent irrigation and terraced rice cultivation by means of irrigation. Their cattle are invariably 'Methun'. On the other hand, Nagas had permanent village sites and permanent irrigated and terraced rice fields and they keep ordinary Indian cattle. While Miri, Mrinal (2003) states that there is no historical information about the Kuki before the 19th century. Likewise, Johnstone, states that, Kuki settlement in Manipur was started from 1830 (Manipur and Naga Hills, 1896, p. 25) which affirms that Kukis are the last immigrants into the present northeast states of India.

Earlier, this Tibeto-Burman language speaker Kuki spread throughout northwestern Burma, and the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh. Now in Northeast India, they are present in all the

states except Arunachal Pradesh. "This dispersal across international borders is a culmination of punitive actions made by the British during their occupation of India" (T. Haokip, 2013). At some point of time, 'Chin' or 'Kuki' or 'Lushai/Zos' were compounded taking as synonymous. It was due to social and political isolation even non-Kukis are also at random amalgamate into the fold of Kuki speciously by the outsiders. On the basis of linguistic affinity G. A. Grierson placed the so-called Chin-Lushai-Kuki people in the Kuki-Chin group of Tibeto-Burman family. He, however, correctly states that the people do not themselves recognize these names (G. A. Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. III Part III, Calcutta 1904), thereby a generic group such as 'Khumli' who claimed to have originated from a 'Khu' meaning a 'cave' are said to be a total distinct ethnic group from the Kukis. Similarly, the **Hmars** (scattered in different parts of North-East India and Burma, most of them live in Churachandpur district and concentrate in and around Tipaimukh, Vangai ranges and Jiribam areas) strongly protested to be called a sub tribe of Kuki on the grounds that—the Hmars never called themselves even from their forefathers and would never do so in future. They believed that they were also originated from 'Suilung' somewhere in china similar to the Paite who believed that they were originated from "Chinnuai" (Chinwe) somewhere from Southern part of China or Chin hills. Different Zomi tribes hold the common belief that they originally emerged out of a cave or hole. This mythological cave is known by various names like Khuul, Khur, Khurui, Khurtubijur, Sinlung, Chirlung, etc. by various tribes like Thadou (Shaw 1929:24-26), Lushai (Shakespeare: 1912), Lakher (Parry 1976:4), Tedim/Paite-Chin (Kamkhenthang 1967:1-2) and Moyon-Monsang, etc. There is another Chin-Kuki-Mizo group who claimed to be a 'lost tribe' of Israel, a descendant of Bnei Menashe. Several hundreds have immigrated back to Israel during the late 1990's. Due to such different notion of ethnicity resulted to **Hmar-Kuki** conflict in 1960 and in 1997-1998 there was an instance of violent ethnic clash between the **Thadous** and the **Paite** owing to the policy of **Kukiazation**. Dr. H. Kamkhenthang therefore, contends that Kuki or Chin terms are used only in reference to the outside world, but not in use among and within the group. The ethnos of belonging to the Chin-Kuki group did not have a common name anymore after it was disowned by the ethnos who were once known as Kuki. Excepting **Thadou**, most of the tribes now want to identify themselves by their individual tribal names and not as Kukis. (Dr. H. Kamkhenthang, "Groping for Identity", pp. 1-16.)

Discourse on Peaceful Co-existence

1. Claim over land and dominance: From the documented historical views, land and dominance among the Nagas and Meitei does not overlap in Manipur but ethnically and distinctly marked since time immemorial. Both Hill and valley coexist in friendliness without any imposition or subjugation to one another. Ever since the inception of Princely state or settlement of the Republic village states, it is observed that they were not invasive nor interfering but protective yet sympathetic to one another. Therefore, Ibohi's "the land belongs to the state" is a rhetoric statement and a sacrilege to universal human rights. Such notion is trepidation to peaceful coexistence within complex and assorted ethnic identities. One has to understand the reality of imaginary demarcation for one time convenience (as seen in the

conquest/conquered status) is impermanent, but distort historical rights over inheritance and uniqueness of one's nation. However, it is apparent to refine and reshape as- "there is a time for everything under heaven". Another, unfortunate claim over the land right considering Kukis are the indigenous dominant ethnic group of Manipur and that the Kukis were in supreme command over all the hills and valley of Manipur. Sominthang Doungel (Secy Political Affairs Kuki Inpi Manipur) claimed that Kukis are the overlord to the hills East of Imphal valley extended up to the Burma border contiguous to the Thongdut State and part of Somra Tract. The western and northwestern part of Imphal Valley, the Lushai Hills of Assam, the North-West and the Imphal Valley in the North-East, the areas were occupied by the Manluns (Zou), the South-East of Imphal valley extending upto the areas of Kabo Valley, The Doungel-Kuki chief, the North-East of Imphal Valley, the North-East of Imphal Valley, extending Chingai sub-division of Ukhrul district to the un-administered area of Somra Tract (SOMINTHANG DOUNGEL). Secy. Political Affairs Kuki Inpi Manipur). According to him, we could conclude that Mizoram, Manipur and part of Burma is the homeland of the Kukis. Such rhetorical claim is a direct insult either to the Meitei or the Nagas and the Zomis who are the aboriginal since time immemorial. However, the turning down the owner as non-existence on top of that, the Nagas ancestral land is termed as rather absurd, ridiculous and unfounded. The concocted story cannot become history. The Kuki appearance in Manipur was said to be during the 1850s who came into Naga ancestral lands in Manipur after they were defeated by the Burmese. Nowhere in the history Kukis are recorded neither aboriginal nor dominant ethnic group in Manipur either by the Britisher or the Chronicle of the Kings except to mention as a nomadic immigrant or refugee from Burma and Chittagong Hill track. Further, the President of Manipur State Darbar issued by Captain Harvey Order No. 11 of 18.8.1931 declared that the Kukis were not permitted the use of Fire Arms due to their savagery acts being committed against the Nagas and for jeopardizing the peaceful atmospheres in the hilly Naga territory. In the part 2 of the same Order, the Kukis were granted Fire Arms on loan merely for protections against wild animals only. The standing Order of the President Manipur State Dabar, TA Sharp in his Order No. 9 of 09.09.1933 declared that the Kukis shall pay annual House tax to the Chief of the Naga Village a sum of Rs.6/ per annum. Again, the standing Order of the President of Manipur State Dabar T.A Sharp in his Order No. 2 of 23.7.1941 declared that, the Kukis shall obtain prior permissions from Naga Village Chief for settlement within the Naga territory. The refugee status is reaffirmed by the relief fund that was sanctioned to a bona fide refugee in 1970s, during R. Suisa (first Naga Member of Parliament in the Lok Sabha of India) who sympathize the pathetic condition of the Burmese Chin ethnic Kukis refugees in Manipur. The Refugee Relief Fund was sanctioned by the Finance Ministry of Home affairs GOI, Vide Memo P.3/9/66 and payment was made to the Kuki refugees through the State Govt of Manipur Vide. Memo No. 01/R/RFL and the amounts of which were distributed to the Kukis refugees as follows - 1. First payment: 22 April, 1957, 2. Second payment: 07 July, 1959, 3. Third payment: 28 February, 1966 and 4. Fourth payment: 18 July, 1968 respectively.

(To be continued)