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0.1 The CSCHR (*Civil Society Coalition for Human Rights in Manipur and the UN*) is a conglomeration of human rights organisations and other civil society groups with the common mission of cooperating with the various UN human rights mechanisms to ameliorate the human rights situation in the highly militarized and isolated environment of Manipur and its surrounding North East region of India. CSCHR has been coordinating the activities of the civil society to assist the Special Rapporteur’s visits to the region as well as making regular submission of stakeholder reports to the UPR process.

0.2 The present report is prepared through a series of consultations in order to assist the UN Human Rights Committee to draw the list of relevant issues for initiating the fourth review process with the Government of India under the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. The report presents a gist of the major human rights challenges facing the people of Manipur and the surrounding North East region of India. It is divided into five sections namely:

(1) Suspension of Right to Life, (Page 2-3)

(2) Lack of Effective Remedy, (Page 4-5)

(3) Non-recognition of Ethnic Minorities, (Page 6-8)

(4) Plundering of Natural Resources, and (Page 9-10)

(5) Political Right to Self-determination. (Page 11-13)

1. **Suspension of Right to Life**

1.1. The issue of the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act (AFSPA) came up prominently in the last review of India in 1997. The Human Rights Committee (here in after referred to as the Committee) it its Concluding Observation stated[[1]](#footnote-1) that

**the Committee remains concerned at the continuing reliance on special powers under legislations such as Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act … in areas declared to be disturbed and at serious human rights violations, in particular with respect to Articles 6, 7, 9 and 14 of the Covenant… The Committee noting that the examination of the constitutionality of the Armed Forces (Special Powers), long pending before the Supreme Court is due to be heard in August 1997, hopes that its provision will also be examined for their compatibility with the Covenant.**

1.2 After due hearing, where the counsel of National Human Rights Commission submitting the recommendation of the Committee before the Constitutional Bench, the Supreme Court pronounced its judgement on 27 November 1997. However, the judgement[[2]](#footnote-2) completely ignored the recommendations of the Human Rights Committee to examine the Covenant compatibility of the provisions of AFSPA.

1.3 Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women recommended the review/repeal of the AFSPA in 2000, 2007[[3]](#footnote-3) and 2014[[4]](#footnote-4). Stamping the act as racist, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination also recommended its repeal in 2007 followed by repeated communication under the Early Warning and Urgent Action Procedure. The Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights also recommended its repeal in 2008[[5]](#footnote-5).

1.4 It may be noted that the Professor Christof Heyns, UN Special Rapporteur on extra-judicial execution in his report after his official visit to India in 2012 gave a detailed legal analysis of the AFSPA[[6]](#footnote-6). He observed that[[7]](#footnote-7), “…the NHRC shared with the Special Rapporteur its views in support of AFSPA’s repeal … The Supreme Court of India ruled, however, in 1997 that AFSPA did not violate the Constitution. The Special Rapporteur is unclear about how the Supreme Court reached such a conclusion. …the powers granted under AFSPA are in reality broader than that allowable under the state of emergency as the right to life may effectively be suspended under the Act and the safe guards applicable in a state of emergency as absent.”

1.5 The Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defender, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women who visited India in 2011 and 2013 also made the same recommendation to repeal the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act. The Working Group on Universal Periodic Review (UPR) in all the three cycles (2008, 2012 and 2017) has recommended the repeal of AFSPA. But the Government of India has not accepted the recommendation persistently.

1.6 Manipuri people have been demanding the repeal of AFSPA since the day the bill was introduced in the Indian Parliament in 1958[[8]](#footnote-8). The Meria Paibi or the ‘torch holder’ are the middle aged women who stand vigil in the streets and bi-lane of Manipur in an effort to resist the military from picking up their sons and husband in the darkness of the night. Ms. Irom Sharmila, a young Manipur poet, carried out a hunger strike demanding the repeal of AFSPA. But she was arrested, forced fed and incarcerated in isolation for more than 15 years. Following the massive and sustained people’s agitation following the rape and murder of Ms. Thanjam Manorama, including the naked protest of 12 Meira Paibi in front of Kangla[[9]](#footnote-9), the Prime Minister of India assured Apunba Lup, civil society collective, who met him in his official residence that “AFSPA will be replaced by a more humane act”.

1.7 All the Government of India’s own committees and commissions[[10]](#footnote-10) set up to look into the matter, which are publicly available, have recommended the repeal of AFSPA. And yet the Act remains in the statue books even today. In fact the present government has gone a step further and is reportedly planning to make the provisions of AFSPA permanently for the North East region by amending the Criminal Procedure Code itself[[11]](#footnote-11).

1.8 CSCHR request the Committee to kindly conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Covenant compatibility of the provisions of AFSPA during the 4th review and to kindly seek the necessary information from the Government of India to do so.

1. **Lack of Effective Remedy**

2.1 Pending the repeal of AFSPA, the Committee remained concerned with the on-going violation, and in its concluding observation, it stated[[12]](#footnote-12)

**The Committee regrets that some parts of India have remained subject to declaration as disturbed area over many years – for example the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act has been applied throughout Manipur since 1980 and in some areas of that state for much longer – and that, in these areas, the State party is in effect using emergency powers without resorting to article 4, paragraph 3, of the Covenant.**

**Therefore: the Committee recommends that the application of these emergency powers be closely monitored so as to ensure strict compliance with the provisions of the Covenant**.

2.2 With little or no action from the side of the Government, civil society groups systematically documented enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killing, rape and torture under the shadow of AFSPA. The Extrajudicial Execution Victim Families Association, Manipur, (EEVFAM) and Human Rights Alert, (HRA) petitioned the Supreme Court of India[[13]](#footnote-13) seeking justice for a list of 1,528 victims of extrajudicial execution carried out from 1979 to 2012. The apex court after perusing report of its own fact finding commission and acknowledging the systematic violation of the right to life under AFSPA, pronounced a historic judgment in 2016 re-asserting that the criminal cases should be registered against the police and armed forces of the union and that criminal investigation should commence in each case of extrajudicial killing.

2.3 But this is easier said than done. The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) was assigned to investigate 98 cases where there is already a prima facie finding. But the CBI is not only carrying out the task in a very slow pace but also demonstrate extreme reluctance to do so. Witnesses and human rights defenders involved in the case are systematically intimidated and harassed. This has compelled the present UN Special Rapporteur on Summary, Arbitrary or Extrajudicial Execution, Ms Agnes Callamard and the UN Special Rapporteur on situation of Human Rights Defender, Mr Michel Forst to issue a public statement on 4 July, 2018 reiterating that “the Government of India has an obligation to ensure prompt, effective and thorough investigations into all allegations of potentially unlawful killings, and a failure to do so is a violation of its international obligations. Justice delayed is justice denied.” They also stated that “some of these families have been waiting decades for these cases to be fully investigated. It is unacceptable that CBI is failing to meet these deadlines and appears to lack good faith”. They further stated that “we are extremely concerned that the delay appears to be deliberate, undue and unreasonable and we condemn this lack of progress.”

2.4 Till date only 39 FIRs have been registered and eight charge sheets have been filed against some lower ranking Manipur Police personnel. Five final reports have been submitted stating that no charge can be made out. EEVFAM is challenging the report in the Session’s Court in Imphal.

2.5 No armed forces personnel of the Union involved in the killing have been indicted till date. In fact, in August 2018, when the first army officer, one Major Vijay Singh Balhara (now Colonel), was even named in the First Information Report, 356 serving army personnel moved the Supreme Court in a Writ Petition[[14]](#footnote-14) seeking class impunity from legal action in their conduct of counter insurgency operations. The number of army personnel signing the petition swelled up to more than 750. Even though the court finally dismissed the petition on 30 November 2018, such a demonstration of military valour in the court, supported by the Attorney General, has effectively stopped the proceeding in the EEVFAM case. The Supreme Court registry has not listed the case for hearing since September 2018.

2.6 Thousands of cases of egregious human rights violations, both documented and un-documented, remain un-investigated and has piled up in the last 61 years of AFSPA’s operation in Manipur. The prospect of an effective remedy in the judicial, administrative or legislative framework, as envisaged in article 2(3) of Covenant remain a pipe dream for the Manipuris and its cognate indigenous peoples of the North East Region. With the prospects of achieving justice getting dimmer and dimmer by the passing days; the victim groups, with support from civil society, Universities and State Human Rights Institutions, have started deliberating on the possibilities of instituting a transitional justice process to address the pressing needs of truth, justice, restitution and guarantee of non-repetition of the thousands of victims[[15]](#footnote-15).

2.7 CSCHR request the Committee to seek information from the Government of India of its policies and programs, if there is any, to provide effectively remedy to the thousands of victims of egregious human rights violations committed under the shadow of AFSPA since 1958.

1. **Non-Recognition of Ethnic Minorities**

3.1 Article 27 of the Covenant states: In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exit, persons belong to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other member of their groups, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion or to use their own language.

3.2 The discourse on minorities in India is confined primarily to religious minorities and to a limited extent linguistic minority[[16]](#footnote-16). The concept of ethnic minorities is conspicuous by its absence in all policy discourses. Whereas discriminatory practices such as permanent imposition of AFSPA are confined only to the ethnically distinct peoples of the North East, the legal and constitution protection and ameliorative measure that comes with the recognition of minority status is not available to them.

3.3 As the North East region is the least developed part of the country in term of investment and infrastructure, many inhabitant of the region migrate to the more prosperous parts of India for education and jobs. But the North easterner, who are racially distinct and culturally alien to the steeply hierarchical and caste riddle societies of mainland India, finds the cultural milieu alien and highly repressive to their own cultural expression. In 2012 thousands of people from the North East had to flee the metropolitan cities of India due to threat of xenophobic violence by the mainland Indians.[[17]](#footnote-17) Following the tragic event, the Union Home Ministry constituted an 11 member committee headed by retired IAS officer MP Bezbaruah to look in to the concerns of the people of the North East living in other parts of the country.[[18]](#footnote-18) But the recommendations of the committee remain largely unimplemented till date.

3.4 In a communication to the Government of India by the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants; the Special Rapporteur on minority issues; the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief dated 13 February 2019, in connection to Citizenship (Amendment) Bill 2016 (CAB), they stated:

**We note that a number of public protest against the bill have been reported, mainly in states of northeastern India, due to a widespread belief that the Government’s alleged intention behind the bill is to ultimately provoke demographic change in these region, which are heavily populated by Muslim and other ethnic and religious minorities.**

3.5 CAB is a bill that seeks to amendment of the Citizenship Act 1955 to allow illegal migrants citizenship on the basis of religion. If one is Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jain, Parsi or Christian from Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan one can become Indian citizens if the person has been a resident of India for six years instead of the mandatory 11 years. There was unprecedented protest across the North East region because in the live experience of the people of the region migrant population from the dominant communities have taken over their land, resources and political power in their own land. For example in Tripura the indigenous Borok people, who constituted 95% of the population when the kingdom merged with India in 1949, is now reduced to less than 20%. All the fertile agricultural land as well as the political power are in the hands of the Bengali Hindu population migrated from Bangladesh with active encouragement of the Government of India. This collective trauma of the ethnic minorities of the North East region of the possibility of the dominant Aryan Hindu population over swamping their own land is at the heart of the vehement protest seen across the region.

3.6 Many of the ethnically distinct people of the North East region self-identify themselves as indigenous peoples. In the sister state of Mizoram, even the State Assembly adopted resolutions twice (8 October 2015 and 15 March 2019) for the implementation the United Nations Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007. But this is only of symbolic significance as the Government of India does recognize that there are indigenous peoples in India or the entire population of India is indigenous to the country.

3.7 Prof. Jame Anaya, the then Special Rapporteur of Indigenous Peoples in this communication to Government of India, in context of a petition by indigenous peoples of Manipur affected by construction of Tipaimuk dam, explained the current concept of indigenous peoples:

**… the understanding of the term “indigenous people” in the India and general Asia context “should put less emphasis on the early definition of aboriginality … [and instead] on the more recent approaches focusing on self-definition as indigenous and distinctly different from other groups within a state; on a *special attachment to and use of their traditional land* whereby their ancestral land and territory had a fundamental importance for their collective physical and cultural survival as peoples; on an experience of subjugation, marginalization, dispossession, expulsion or discrimination because these peoples have different cultures, way of life or means of production than the national hegemonic and dominant model.**

3.8 By using this yardstick the Special Rapporteur concluded:

**The affected communities belong to the Tangkhil Naga, Kuki and Meetei peoples of Manipur consider themselves to be distinct cultural groups with their own territories, culture and histories. Their grievances, stemming from their distinct cultural identities and deep connection to their traditional territories can easily be identified as the type of problems faced by other indigenous peoples worldwide with regards to the effects of development projects within their traditional land**.[[19]](#footnote-19)

3.9 This is in consonance with the General Comment no. 23 of ICCPR, paragraph 3.2. which states that “… one or the other aspect of the rights of the individuals protected under that article – for example, to enjoy a particular culture – may consist in a way of life which is closely associated with territory and use of its resources. This may particularly be true of members of indigenous communities constituting a minority”.

3.10 Even amongst the transgender population, the cultural expression of Manipuri transgender community is very different from the main-stream Indian transgender population. In mainstream India they are known as hijra, kinnar etc. whereas in Manipur they are known as nupimanbi, nupamanba, feita etc. with very different social organisation, cultural expression and livelihood options. When the Supreme Court of India made the historic judgement upholding the rights of the transgender population in the NALSA judgement of 2014 no mention was made of the Manipuri transgender community thereby overlooking the specific needs of this community living in highly militarize and marginalized social milieu. Therefore the non-recognition of ethnic minorities makes many of the marginalized communities and their specific cultural expression invisible and ultimately delegitimized them.

3.11 Human Rights Committee may kindly urge the Government of India to recognise the existence of ethnic minorities and indigenous people within its territories and give them the protection of Article 27 of the Covenant read with the Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples, 2007.

1. **Plundering of Natural Resources**

4.1 The violation of right to self-determination of indigenous peoples in Manipur as outlined in Article 1 (2) to pursue economic and Social rights is lucid clear in the pattern of aggressive, unsustainable and corporate led development processes and associated militarism in Manipur. A serious challenge is the failure to recognize the right to self-determination and self-determined development of indigenous peoples over their land and resources. The Government of India pursued expropriation of the land and natural resources of Manipur relying on the Indian security forces operating under AFPSA, 1958 in Manipur. The Government pursued extraction of minerals, viz, Limestone and Chromium, explore and drill oil and gas and to build series of hydroelectric projects all over the Rivers of Manipur. The Government of India granted license to Jubilant Oil and Gas Private Limited, a Dutch company, for exploration and drilling works in two oil blocks in Manipur without informing on the availability of oil and seeking consent of the indigenous peoples of Manipur.

4.2 The aggressive move to construct the 1500 MW Tipaimukh Multipurpose Hydroelectric Project, and signing of four MoUs on four mega dams on 28 August 2014, without the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous communities constitute a clear effort to undermine indigenous peoples' self-determination over their land and resources. The Ithai Dam of the 105 MW Loktak Multipurpose Hydroelectric Project submerged close to 80,000 acres of agriculture land in Manipur[[20]](#footnote-20). The Tipaimukh dam will submerge more than 27,000 hectares of forest land and will destroy livelihood sources of indigenous communities of Manipur.

4.3 The pursuance of these unsustainable and destructive development processes violated article 1 (2) of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which recognize the rights of all peoples to pursue their economic, social and cultural goals, and to manage and dispose of their own resources, and further not to be deprived of their means of subsistence.

4.4 The Government’s facilitation of involvement of International Financial Institution, in particular the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank and Japan International Cooperation Agency in financing Trans Asian Road project, the high voltage transmission and distribution lines without the consultation and consent of indigenous peoples further facilitated the expropriation of their land and natural resources and construction of mega dams, oil exploration efforts etc[[21]](#footnote-21) . The massive destruction of agriculture land, forest and contamination of Barak River, Irang River, Ejei River etc by Trans Asian Railway already weakened peoples economic self- reliance and self-determination[[22]](#footnote-22) .

4.5 Indian paramilitary forces, operating under the AFSPA, 1958, to counter self-determination movements are also deployed and involved in introducing unsustainable projects that led to confiscation and destruction of agriculture land, forest and other resources of Manipur. There are several cases where military officials manning the Loktak Project facilities committed human rights violations, viz arbitrary killings and summary execution of indigenous populace of Manipur[[23]](#footnote-23) .

4.6 Indigenous Peoples and women’s call for protection of productive agricultural land for prolonged economic subsistence and for sustainable and people friendly development are also met with brute and violent repression of indigenous women[[24]](#footnote-24). Centre for Social Development, NGOs based Manipur, is harassed by suspending their account under the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act for the stated reason of “raising the issue of the uranium mining in Meghalaya in global forum”[[25]](#footnote-25).

4.7 Indeed the UN Special Rapporteur on Indigenous Peoples Rights, Mr. James Anaya expressed strong condemnation with the Mapithel dam construction and the militarization process and application of emergency legislations in 2008. Land grabbing is also carried out for militarization purposes in the region, where huge tract of prime agriculture land and forest are acquired for military and allied activities. The CERD committee have also issued repeated communications to the Government of India on the Early-Warming Measures and Urgent Procedure of the Committee on Elimination of Racial Discrimination.[[26]](#footnote-26) But there is no response from the Government of India.

4.8 CSCHR would like urge the Committee to raise the issue enforcing a moratorium on all mega and unsustainable development projects which failed to take the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous communities of Manipur and which led to expropriation of indigenous peoples land and resources such as the construction of mega dams, oil exploration, mining and other unsustainable development processes, that led to conscription of agriculture land, forest and other survival sources of indigenous peoples.

**5. Political Right to Self-Determination**

5.1 HR Committee during India’s third periodic review stressed the need to address the issue of “armed insurgency” by political means. The Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee, 1997, stated[[27]](#footnote-27):

**In this respect, bearing in mind the provisions of article 1, 19 and 25 of the Covenant:**

**the Committee endorses the views of the National Human Rights Commission that the problems in areas affected by terrorism and armed insurgency are essentially political in character and that the approach to resolving such problem must also, essentially, be political, and emphasises that terrorism should be fought with means that are compatible with the Covenant.**

5.2 During the second review of the Human Rights Committee, members belonging to France (Madame Chanet), Egypt (Mr. Shafei), erstwhile USSR (Mr. Myulldson) and Sweden (Mr. Bertil Wennergren) raised the issue of the self-determination of the border state. Mr. Bertil Wennergren made the following statement:

**“Para 10 (India Report) reads that India has ever since its independence has accepted its adherence to self-determination and said that is coexistent with the principle of Sovereign equality … I will make an example. According to the constitution, Parliament may by law admit a new State. Well, there you recognised that self-determination of a people and a nation and a State to ask for admission into the Union. So far, you recognise self-determination. But when the admission has been granted, then the people and the nation, well they will be consumed by the people of India and these people do not exist any longer and then self-determination of that people will not exist any longer, legally speaking I mean. And then, because if that people that nation wants to depart, wants to leave the Union, I cannot see any possibility to do so…”**

5.3 The constitution of India is silent on the legal and legitimate processes to deal with the democratic aspiration of the peoples and nations to depart from the Union. The law that attacks the activities of the groups with such aspiration is the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA)[[28]](#footnote-28). Under the UAPA “secession” is included in the definition of “terrorist”. Section 2(i) states “secession of a part of the territory of India from the Union” “includes the assertion of any claim to determine whether such part will remain a part of the territory of India”.

5.4 However, such criminalization of the political discourses cannot deter the democratic aspirations of the people of Manipur. As a matter of fact, Manipur with just 0.2% of the population of India constitute a woofing 65% of the total detentions under the UAPA across the country[[29]](#footnote-29)! How does one explain this paradox? The answer perhaps can be seen from the history. Manipur, which stood an independent kingdom in the western frontier of South East Asia for at least two millennia, was forcibly merged into the Dominion of India on 15 October 1949. In doing so, India under minded the democratically elected popular Assembly and Council of Ministers already functioning then under the Manipur Constitution Act of 1947. No plebiscite/referendum of the people of Manipur was ever conducted, thereby violating the Right to Self-determination of the Manipur nation.

5.5 Elaborating on this issue of the right to self-determination of Manipur, the Committee on Human Rights (COHR), Manipur had already submitted an alternate report during the third periodic review of India for consideration of the Human Rights Committee in February 1997.

5.6 When the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggaya visited India in 2011 and met a group of HRD from Manipur in Guwahati she wrote the following in her report submitted to the General Assembly and Human Rights Council[[30]](#footnote-30):

**At the time of the visit, Manipur was reportedly the state worst affected by militarization with more than half a dozen human rights groups having been banned as terrorist due to their self-determination advocacy.**

5.7 Proposal for a UN monitored Plebiscite by the proscribed United National Liberation Front (UNLF) of Manipur to resolve “the politico-military conflict in Manipur” has no taker in the corridors of power in New Delhi[[31]](#footnote-31). Instead the Chairman of UNLF Mr. Rajkumar Meghen was arrested charged with waging war against the State by the National Investigating Agency. He is serving his prison term in Guwahahti Central Jail[[32]](#footnote-32).

5.8 The proscribed Revolutionary People’s Front submitted a memorandum to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Chairman of the Decolonization Committee (Committee of 24) “for de-colonisation of the Manipur from Indian colonialism and alien racist regime, enlisting Manipur in the list of the non-self-governing territories of the United Nations and, restoration of independence and sovereignty of Manipur”.[[33]](#footnote-33)

5.9 The present Chief Minister of Manipur Mr. N. Biren Singh was once arrested on charges of sedition, when he was the editor of a vernacular newspaper in the year 2000, for reporting the speech of an well respected octogenarian social worker (late) Mr. Thongnaojam Iboyaima claiming that Manipur has every right to restore its independence under international law.[[34]](#footnote-34)

5.10 More recently in February 2019, a Manipuri student leader Veewon Thokchom studying in Delhi, who posted in his personnel facebook accounts photos of the heavy handed police crackdown on the popular *anti-Citizenship Amendment Bill* movement with a comment “self-determination is the only option left”, was arrested by a combined team of Manipur police and Delhi police. He was criminally charged with sedition and taken back to Manipur for trial[[35]](#footnote-35).

5.11 CSCHR would like to request the Human Rights Committee to urge the Government of India to drop its reservation on Article 1 of the Covenant and to let the people of Manipur freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic and social development.

**Conclusion**

CSCHR would like to thank the members of the United Nations Human Rights Committee for their kind attention to the serious human right situation in Manipur and we hope that the concerns expressed herewith will be reflected in the List of Issues drawn up for initiating the 4th review process of the Government of India on the implementation of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. CSCHR would like to assure the Committee that we would be in close communication with the Committee and will be submitting a more comprehensive report of the human right situation of Manipur and the surrounding North East region of India to assist the Committee in having a meaningful engagement with the Government of India.
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