

Weaponisation of Food During Ethnic Conflict in Manipur: A Political Economy and Human Security Perspective

Dr. Soreiphy K¹, Dr. N Rosa Kashena²

¹Assistant Professor, Asufii Christian Institute Mao

²Don Bosco College Autonomous Maram

Abstract

The concept of food security and food as a fundamental human right is unequivocally acknowledged by international agreements and binding on the nation states. Weaponisation of food is an unethical and disturbing tactic which contravenes international humanitarian law and poses a grave threat to human dignity and lives. This paper examines weaponisation of food during the post-May 2023 ethnic conflict in Manipur, situating the state within broader global debates on food as a tool of coercion in intrastate and borderland conflicts. Drawing on political economy, human security, and structural violence frameworks, the study analyses how access to food and essential goods became strategically manipulated through highway blockades, market segmentation, and village-level mobility restrictions. Through secondary data the paper demonstrates that these mechanisms transformed everyday survival into a contested terrain, producing chronic and unevenly distributed food insecurity. Internally displaced persons, women, children, and the elderly were the vulnerable populations in such situations. The findings reveal that food insecurity in Manipur emerged less from overt starvation policy than from the control of infrastructure, securitisation of mobility, and the institutionalisation of slow, cumulative harm. This case challenges conventional distinctions between war and peace in food security scholarship, emphasizing the importance of human security approaches in low-intensity but protracted conflicts. Concerns under international humanitarian law and advocates for structural interventions, including de-politicised humanitarian corridors, protected market access, and civilian-centered infrastructure governance, to prevent the entrenchment of food insecurity as a tool of conflict are raised.

Keywords: Food security, Weaponisation, Manipur conflict, Political economy, Human security, Structural violence

Introduction

The survival, continuation and development of mankind is dependent upon availability of and access to adequate and nutritious food for everyone at all times. “Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”. (World Food Summit, 1996). Food security is a fundamental human right which is closely

Published: 28 February 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/IJSSR.2026.v3.i1.30871>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

linked to right to life and as such no person under any circumstances should be deprived of food. However, trends in modern warfare across conflicts zones indicates the increasing use of food as the most employed weapons because such tactics are implicit, ramifications are silent, and gradual yet far reaching and perpetrators often goes unpunished.

The United Nations recognizes the right to adequate food and made it legally binding upon the 172 countries under the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). It is also protected by regional treaties and national constitutions. Furthermore, the right to food of specific groups has been recognized in several international conventions. All human beings, regardless of their race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status have the right to adequate food and the right to be free from hunger. The Covenant enjoins upon the States to “respect, protect and fulfil”; which means first, the state must itself must not deprive anyone of access to adequate food; second, it must protect everyone from conditions of food deprivation; and third, when anyone is in fact without adequate food the state must proactively create an enabling environment where people become self-reliant for food or, where people are unable to do so, must ensure that it is provided. Every individual is a rights-holder, fully entitled to demand that the state perform these duties (FAO 2006).

The 1974 World Food Conference, Rome convened by the General Assembly of the United Nations issued a Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition. The conference was crucial as the question of food security was acknowledged for the first time as an issue which concern the whole mankind by proclaiming, “Every man, woman and child has the inalienable right to be free from hunger and malnutrition in order to develop fully and maintain their physical and mental faculties. Accordingly, the eradication of hunger is the common objective of all countries of the international community, especially the developed countries and others in a position to help”. Further, the declaration recognized that the well-being of the peoples of the world largely depends on the adequate production and distribution of food. as well as the establishment of a world food security system which would ensure adequate availability of, and reasonable prices for, food at all times, irrespective of periodic fluctuations and vagaries of weather and free of political and economic pressures, and should thus facilitate, amongst other things, the development process of developing countries.

As such, deprivation of food is a blatant violation of human right and using food as weapon is condemned and prohibited by international agreements and constitute a war crime. The 1997 Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions prohibits attacks on infrastructure critical to civilian survival, including crops and water systems. The Rome Statute (1998) in Article 8 defines “intentionally using starvation of civilians as a method of warfare by depriving them of objects indispensable to their survival, including willfully impeding relief supplies as provided for under the Geneva Conventions” as a war crime among many others.

Cassidy et al. (2013) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2023) demonstrate that global agricultural production provides sufficient calories to feed the world’s population, but unequal access and distribution systems create persistent food insecurity. Underscoring the contribution of human choices in creating conditions of food insecurity, Hannah Ritchie, a sustainability researcher at Oxford University opines “It is an important reminder that the

problems we face in feeding 8 billion people today – and even in the future with a few billion more – are not about biophysical limits; it’s not that we can’t produce enough calories. It’s about distribution and human choices on what we do with them.”

The World Bank Report on Poverty and Hunger (1986) introduced the distinction between food insecurity stemming from chronic poverty and low incomes, and transient food insecurity during periods of intense pressure such as natural disasters, economic collapse or conflicts. Across conflict studies, political economy, and human security scholarship, food insecurity is increasingly understood not as an incidental humanitarian failure but as a strategic modality of power. Contemporary literature demonstrates that deliberate manipulation of food systems—through blockades, market control, aid obstruction, and infrastructural violence—functions as a coercive instrument in both interstate and intrastate conflicts (Messer & Cohen, 2024). Peripheral and ethnically fragmented regions are especially vulnerable, where weak state capacity intersects with identity-based territorial claims. Situating Manipur within this global analytical frame reveals that food deprivation during the post-May 2023 ethnic violence reflects systemic conflict strategies rather than accidental scarcity, with profound implications for civilian survival, displacement, and health security.

Food access in conflict zones has long been framed as a humanitarian concern, yet recent political economy scholarship challenges this depoliticised view by foregrounding food as an instrument of coercion and control. Messer and Cohen (2024) conceptualise the “weaponisation of food” as the deliberate manipulation of availability, access, or affordability of food to punish, displace, or discipline populations. This framing is particularly relevant to Manipur, a borderland state in Northeast India with chronic infrastructural dependence on limited highway corridors and a long history of ethnic contention.

Objectives

The study is guided by four interrelated objectives. First, it examines food security as a fundamental human right recognised by international community. Secondly, it examines how food access has been deliberately manipulated and identify specific mechanisms through which food is weaponised during ethnic conflict in Manipur. Third, it analyses the impacts of these mechanisms on civilian survival, displacement patterns, and health outcomes. Finally, it situates Manipur within broader global debates on food as a weapon of war, contributing an empirically grounded South Asian borderland perspective to the literature.

Literature Review

The literature review follows a systematic approach drawing on peer-reviewed journals, academic books, and doctoral theses published between 2000 and 2025. Sources were identified through Google Scholar, SpringerLink, Sage, ProQuest, JSTOR, and the Oxford Research Encyclopedia. Search terms included “food security” “weaponisation of food,” “Manipur conflict,” “road blockades,” “humanitarian access,” and “ethnic violence India.” Only scholarly sources with empirical or theoretical relevance to food security, conflict political economy, and human security were included.

The literature converges around four major themes. First, global scholarship establishes food denial as a coercive strategy in modern conflicts, functioning through both state and non-state actors (Messer & Cohen, 2024; Haar et al., 2021). Second, region-specific studies document how recurrent road blockades in Manipur disrupt access to food and essential medicines, exacerbating chronic vulnerability (Yumnam et al., 2017; Bhaumik, 2007). Third, health-focused research links conflict exposure to malnutrition, maternal health decline, and breakdowns in healthcare access (Haar et al., 2021). Finally, borderland studies emphasise how peripheral regions like Manipur experience structural scarcity due to infrastructural dependence and political neglect (Sarma, 2020; Inkah, 2024).

Theoretical Framework

Three complementary theoretical lenses were kept in mind in the analysis of the paper i.e., the political economy of conflict, human security, and structural violence. From the perspective of a political economy, control over infrastructure, particularly National Highways 2 and 37 translates directly into control over markets and survival goods. Thus, blockades are used as mechanisms of economic warfare. Human security theory, as articulated in the UNDP's Human Development Report (1994), reframes food security as a fundamental survival entitlement rather than a secondary welfare issue. In Manipur, the erosion of food security constitutes a direct assault on human security, undermining civilian dignity and resilience.

Galtung's (1969) concept of structural violence highlights how indirect harm through neglect, policy inertia, and tolerated blockades produces slow, cumulative suffering. Food deprivation in Manipur during the conflict is an example of "slow violence": non-spectacular, dispersed, yet lethally effective.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive and analytical design based on secondary data analysis to understand the concept of food security and food as a weapon in Manipur. Data is drawn from peer-reviewed scholarships, national and regional media coverage, documentaries, newspaper articles, and reports submitted by the Food and Agriculture organizations, Food Security Portal, and World Health Organization. Thematic analysis is guided by political economy, human security, and structural violence frameworks, focusing on mechanisms of food weaponisation, infrastructure control, and differential civilian vulnerabilities. The absence of precise nutritional data and the informal, overlapping nature of blockades are acknowledged as limitations; however, the impossibility of enumeration is treated as an empirical finding reflecting the normalisation of mobility restriction as a mode of conflict governance.

Mechanisms of Food Weaponisation in Manipur

Evidence from the sources indicates that three primary mechanisms of food weaponisation were evident in the case of recent Manipur conflict. First, the prolonged highway blockades that restricted rice transportation, LPG cylinders and medicines into both valley and hill districts. Second, ethnic segmentation of markets has produced absence of certain goods and

services, where minorities of each group faced exclusion or intimidation. Third due to agricultural abandonment in areas around the border of the hills and the valley has reduced local food production forcing dependence on disrupted supply chains. These mechanisms function synergistically, transforming everyday consumption into a site of conflict governance.

Mobility Restrictions, Blockades, and Food Access in Manipur (May 2023–May 2024)

After the 3 May 2023 event when violence erupted along the Torbung–Kangvai corridor following the ATSUM-led Tribal Solidarity March there was immediate stranded supply of trucks that disrupted the inflow of food, fuel, and medicines. Scholarly literature on Manipur's political economy has long emphasised the extreme vulnerability created by reliance on NH-2 (Imphal–Dimapur) and NH-37 (Imphal–Silchar) as near-exclusive supply lifelines; the events of May 2023 transformed this vulnerability into an acute humanitarian constraint (Ziipao, 2020; Yaipharemba, 2018). Weeks after the initial violence, Manipur experienced recurrent, undeclared, and highly localised blockades enforced by both Kuki-Zomi civil bodies, Meitei groups, and village-level committees. These restrictions took the form of checkpoints, road closures, intimidation of drivers, and sporadic shutdowns of markets. National highways and district roads linking Churachandpur, Kangpokpi, Bishnupur, and Imphal were repeatedly rendered obstructed, producing chronic uncertainty in food distribution rather than a complete but time-bound stoppage. Relief convoys were guided by armed escorts, commercial traders across the state recorded less movements due to risk, and food prices spiked in both relief camps and urban markets. Studies of consumer impact and transport labour in Manipur demonstrate that even short-duration blockades along NH-2 and NH-37 have disproportionate effects on food availability because inventories are thin and storage capacity is limited (Singh & Chiru, 2020; Welkim-Singh & Khoisnam, 2026). These mobility constraints led to rising malnutrition risk, disrupted maternal care, and the collapse of routine service delivery (Gangmei, 2023; Haar et al., 2021).

By mid-2023, blockade practices changed into rotational or selective disruptions. Civil society organisations such as the Committee on Tribal Unity (CoTU), Indigenous Tribal Leaders' Forum (ITLF), and other Kuki-Zo bodies periodically opened and closed highways, while Meitei groups responded with counter-bandhs in valley districts. In this the transition from episodic protest to infrastructural control was evident. Food insecurity became structural as markets were ethnically segmented with unpredictable supplies and delayed agricultural inputs. When analysed in the lenses of political geography this phase can be situated within a longer history of using highways as pressure points in ethnic bargaining where the post-2023 disruptions were unusually persistent and humanitarian in consequence (McDuié-Ra, 2024; Arora, 2020).

By early 2024, mobility restriction in Manipur could no longer be analytically captured through a list of bandh dates. There was describe a condition of chronic transport insecurity, in which civilian movement, food access, and humanitarian delivery are continuously negotiated rather than guaranteed. Highways are framed as security spaces, markets as contingent privileges, and food access as a politicised resource.

This aligns with broader theoretical work on the weaponisation of food, where denial of access rather than explicit starvation policy produces humanitarian harm through infrastructural control (Messer & Cohen, 2024). The absence of a single, continuous blockade does not weaken this interpretation; rather, the rotational, selective, and localised nature of restrictions makes them harder to regulate and equally damaging in aggregate.

Findings

The analysis yields three interlinked findings that collectively demonstrate how food insecurity in Manipur functions as a conflict strategy rather than an incidental humanitarian failure. The first finding establishes that food access in Manipur has been structurally politicised through sustained control over transport infrastructure. National Highways 2 and 37 which are the primary supply veins for Manipur emerged as strategic assets in ethnic contestation rather than neutral public goods. Mobility restrictions, whether formal bandhs, rotational blockades, or informal village-level checkpoints, produced recurring disruptions in the flow of staple foods, fuel, medicines, and agricultural inputs. The absence of a single continuous blockade does not disprove this finding. Instead, the rotational, selective, and spatially fragmented nature of restrictions intensified uncertainty and scarcity, undermining market predictability and household food planning. This confirms political economy arguments that infrastructure control can function as an indirect yet effective mode of economic warfare in intrastate conflict settings.

The second finding highlights that civilian deprivation operates as an implicit but tolerated pressure tactic within ethnic bargaining. The cumulative effects of mobility restrictions produced foreseeable humanitarian consequences like price inflation, food deserts, aid dependency, and nutritional stress among displaced populations. Internally displaced persons (IDPs), urban informal workers, and people residing in the peripheries experienced more harm. This pattern indicates that deprivation was neither random nor evenly distributed but mapped onto ethnic geography, displacement status, and market access. Civilian suffering thus became a background condition through which political leverage was exercised, normalised, and sustained.

The third finding concerns the role of the state. The government's response prioritised securitisation like armed escorts, curfews, selective movement permissions over the protection of civilian food access. Humanitarian corridors remained contingent rather than guaranteed.

This approach effectively institutionalised structural violence. By tolerating or inadequately addressing prolonged mobility restrictions, the state allowed indirect harm to accumulate without overt acts of repression. Food insecurity was thereby governed through omission, inertia, and selective intervention rather than explicit policy, reinforcing slow and dispersed forms of civilian suffering.

Discussion and Analysis

The findings place Manipur evenly within global debates on the weaponisation of food, demonstrating that deprivation in contemporary conflicts is operated through denial of access

rather than through overt starvation policies. As in conflicts in Yemen, Syria, and Ethiopia, food insecurity in Manipur emerged through the obstruction of supply routes, market fragmentation, and restrictions on civilian mobility. Yet the Manipur case contributes an important and distinctive insight to this literature: food weaponisation can occur through fragmented, rotational, and deniable practices within a formally democratic setting, without the presence of declared war, formal sieges, or explicit starvation strategies. This challenges conventional binaries in food security and conflict scholarship that separate war from peace and highlights the need to analyse low-intensity but prolonged violence through a human security lens.

From a human security perspective, the erosion of food access in Manipur represents a direct assault on civilian survival and dignity. State-centric security paradigms prioritised order, territorial control, and securitisation of mobility, while the everyday requirements of civilian life like food, fuel, and medicine were treated as secondary concerns. As a result, food insecurity became an accepted collateral condition of conflict management rather than an urgent protection imperative. This reveals the limits of conventional security governance in ethnically fragmented regions, where maintaining control over space can take precedence over safeguarding access to basic survival goods.

Further it also demonstrates that food weaponisation in Manipur operated through political economy rather than explicit intent to starve. Control over transport infrastructure particularly national highways and feeder roads translated directly into control over markets, prices, and survival goods. These routes became logistical bottlenecks through which access to essential commodities was selectively enabled or denied, aligning with global scholarship that frames food denial as a form of infrastructural and structural violence rather than a humanitarian breakdown. Manipur's borderland geography intensified this dynamic where dependence on a narrow transport network, limited storage capacity, and long-standing infrastructural neglect magnified the consequences of even short-term disruptions, converting chronic vulnerability into acute and sustained food insecurity.

The conflict marks a shift from episodic protest to a structural condition of deprivation. While the initial violence of May 2023 produced ad hoc and reactive mobility restrictions, these practices soon became routinised through selective passage, anticipatory withdrawal by traders, and village-level enforcement mechanisms. Over time, this produced a governance regime in which food access was continuously negotiated rather than guaranteed. Such conditions exemplify what theorists of structural violence describe as harm without spectacle—slow, cumulative, and normalised—where deprivation emerges from the everyday functioning of securitised infrastructure and contested governance rather than from dramatic or singular acts of coercion.

The impacts were unevenly distributed, intersecting with gender, age, and displacement to produce differentiated vulnerabilities. Women, as primary managers of household food and care, absorbed nutritional shocks by reducing their own intake and assuming intensified care responsibilities. Children and elderly populations faced heightened risks of malnutrition, untreated illness, and long-term health consequences. In this sense, food insecurity in Manipur cannot be understood merely as a problem of caloric shortfall; it constituted a

broader erosion of social reproduction, dignity, and resilience. Everyday survival itself became a contested terrain, revealing how conflict governance extended deep into the intimate and routine aspects of civilian life.

Normatively, these findings raise serious concerns under international humanitarian law, particularly regarding collective punishment and the obstruction of essential goods. Even in the absence of formally declared armed conflict, the sustained denial of food access violates core humanitarian principles. Policy responses must therefore move beyond reactive aid delivery toward structural safeguards, including depoliticised humanitarian corridors, protection of market access, and civilian-centred infrastructure governance. Without such measures, food insecurity risks remaining an embedded instrument of conflict rather than a resolvable humanitarian challenge.

Conclusion

This study has argued that food insecurity during the post-May 2023 ethnic conflict in Manipur cannot be classified as an incidental humanitarian failure or a temporary disruption caused by violence. Rather, it demonstrates how food access became embedded within the political economy of conflict, operating as a mode of power, pressure, and governance. Through sustained control over transport infrastructure, segmented markets, and normalised mobility restrictions, access to food and essential goods was selectively enabled or denied, transforming everyday survival into a contested terrain. Food deprivation in Manipur reflects a broader global pattern where denial of access rather than overt starvation policy emerges as a central mechanism of contemporary conflict.

The humanitarian consequences of food weaponisation were unevenly distributed. Internally displaced persons, women, children, and elderly populations experienced disproportionate harm, revealing how food insecurity intersects with displacement, gendered care responsibilities, and social marginalisation. The erosion of food access thus extended beyond nutritional deprivation to undermine social reproduction, dignity, and long-term resilience. Everyday acts of cooking, feeding, and caring normally taken for granted became sites of anxiety and negotiation, highlighting how deeply conflict governance penetrated civilian life.

By situating Manipur within global debates on the weaponisation of food, the paper contributes a distinctive perspective from a democratic yet deeply fragmented borderland context. Unlike classic siege warfare or declared armed conflicts, deprivation in Manipur unfolded through fragmented, rotational, and often deniable practices, blurring conventional distinctions between war and peace. These findings challenge dominant frameworks in food security scholarship that privilege formal conflict categories and underscores the analytical value of human security approaches in understanding low-intensity but protracted violence.

Empirically, it provides a grounded South Asian case enriching the global literature which is largely dominated by African and Middle Eastern conflicts. Normatively, it highlights the urgent need to treat food access as a core human security concern and calls for structural safeguards such as depoliticised humanitarian corridors and civilian-centred infrastructure governance to prevent the institutionalisation of food insecurity as a tool of conflict.

References

- Arora, V. (2020). Citizens, AFSPA, and bare life in Northeast India. *Sociological Bulletin*, 69(3), 299–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022920956746>
- Bhaumik, S. (2007). *Troubled periphery: Crisis of India's North East*. Sage Publications.
- Borah, S. (2023). Johan Galtung's conflict transformation theory and Manipur's ethnic conflict. *Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- Cassidy, E. S., West, P. C., Gerber, J. S., & Foley, J. A. (2013). Redefining agricultural yields: From tonnes to people nourished per hectare. *PLOS ONE*, 8(6), e66428. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066428>.
- Earth.com. (n.d.). *We already grow enough food, but much of it never reaches people*. <https://www.earth.com>
- Fernandes, W. (2018). *Blockades, bandhs and the struggle for autonomy in Northeast India*. North Eastern Social Research Centre.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2023). *The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2023*. FAO. <https://www.fao.org>.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2006). *The right to food in practice: Implementation at the national level*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (1996). *Rome declaration on world food security*. World Food Summit.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (n.d.). *The right to adequate food* (Fact Sheet No. 34).
- Gangmei, D. (2023). The crisis of education among marginalised learners in Manipur. In *Rethinking education in India* (pp. xx–xx). Taylor & Francis.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301>
- Haar, R. J., Read, R., Fast, L., Blanchet, K., & Rinaldi, S. (2021). Violence against healthcare in conflict: A systematic review. *Conflict and Health*, 15(1), Article 72. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13031-021-00372-7>
- Hameed, S., & D'Rozario, C. (2024). Viewing Indian polity from the prism of Manipur. *Sabrang India*. <https://sabrangindia.in>
- Inkah, S. (2024). Socio-economic ramifications of ethnic conflict in Manipur. *India Quarterly*. <https://journals.sagepub.com>
- International Criminal Court. (2021). *Rome statute of the International Criminal Court*.
- Kakoti, C. (2021). *Violent sacrifices: Indigenous resistance, identity, and development*. Central European University Press.

- Kipgen, J. (2025). Inter-ethnic conflict and civil society mobilisation in Manipur. *Asian Affairs*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- McDuie-Ra, D. (2024). Infrastructure, protest, and everyday insecurity in Imphal. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- Menon, M. (2024). Mobilisation of social movements and the local state in India's borderlands. *Contemporary South Asia*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- Messer, E., & Cohen, M. J. (2024). Food as a weapon. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Food Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780197762530.001.0001>
- Payeng, H., & Devi, A. (2025). Enduring border conflicts and shutdown politics in Northeast India. *Lex Localis*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- Reuters. (2023–2024). Explainers and field reporting on the Manipur conflict. <https://www.reuters.com>
- Sangai Express. (2023–2024). Regional reporting on Manipur violence and shutdowns. <https://www.thesangaiexpress.com>
- Sarma, J. (2020). *Seeing like a border: State practices and everyday governance in Northeast India* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Sharma, C. K. (2016). Bandhs, blockades, and the political economy of protest in Northeast India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(10), 52–59.
- Singh, K. T., & Chiru, P. R. (2020). Are bandhs and blockades economic adversity for consumers? A study of Manipur. *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- United Nations. (1974). *Universal declaration on the eradication of hunger and malnutrition*. OHCHR.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human development report 1994: New dimensions of human security*. UNDP.
- Welkim-Singh, L., & Khoisnam, N. (2026). Transport precarity and livelihood insecurity under highway blockades in Manipur. *Journal of North East India Studies*, xx(x), xx–xx.
- Wikipedia contributors. (2025). *Manipur violence (2023–2025)*. Retrieved February 25, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manipur_violence
- World Bank. (1986). *Poverty and hunger: Issues and options for food security in developing countries*. World Bank.
- Yaipharemba, I. (2018). Plight of truck drivers at NH-37 during economic blockades in Manipur. *Journal of North East India Studies*, 8(1), 85–102.
- Yumnam, V. (2025). Conflict, access, and health insecurity in Manipur. *Social Change and Development*, xx(x), xx–xx.



Yumnam, V., Dasgupta, R., & Chatterjee, P. (2017). *Conflict as a social determinant of health: Explorations from Manipur*. Springer.

Ziipao, R. R. (2020). *Infrastructure of injustice: State and politics in Manipur and Northeast India*. Routledge.