

*PRE-CONGRESS DISCUSSION DOCUMENT NO—2*

# **National Integration and Communist Party**

**COMMUNIST  
PARTY  
PUBLICATION**

**NATIONAL INTEGRATION  
and  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
AND  
CRITICAL NOTE ON  
PROGRAMME DRAFTS**

*BY*

E. M. S. Namboodiripad

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

*Published by :*  
Des Raj Chadha  
4, Ashoka Road  
NEW DELHI.

*Price : 50 nP.*

*Printed by :*  
Som Parkash  
Anupam Printing Press,  
Chahar Bagh,  
JULLUNDUR CITY.

P  
R  
E  
F  
A  
C  
E

The Tenali Convention decided to circulate the Note on national Integration and a critique of the Draft Programme by Com. E. M. S. Namboodiripad as documents for Pre-Congress Discussion. The Note on National Integration is being published accordingly. This note was submitted by Com. E. M. S. Namboodiripad to the National Council in 1962, but it never discussed it.

A brief critical note on the Programme Drafts sent by Com. E. M. S. Namboodiripad is also being published in this booklet.

*Secretariat*  
Central Organising Committee  
CPI

## NATIONAL INTEGRATION AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY

(By E. M. S. Namboodiripad)

### I. HISTORICAL PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

1. The emergence of communal and regional separatism as a political force is not new. It is as old as 1952 when the first general election took place. Innumerable political parties based either on communalism or regionalism participated in the election. Some of them did get fairly good representation in the Legislatures. But the majority which the Congress secured in the Central Parliament and in most of the State Legislatures gave its leaders confidence that they could successfully meet the challenge posed by these parties. Subsequent to the election, the congress leaders thought that the new orientation that they were giving to their policies—friendship and cooperation with the Socialist powers on a world-scale; adopting of the Socialist pattern, and subsequently Socialism, as the goal of the nation; the new perspective regarding planned economy; agrarian reform, etc—would secure them such solid support from the people that a crushing blow could be dealt to communalism and regionalism.

2. Subsequent developments showed how misplaced was their optimism in this regard. Parties based on communal and regional separatism grew stronger, rather than weaker. They were able to cash in on the growing discontent of the people against Congress policies to a far greater extent than Left Democratic Opposition. And by 1959, they had grown so serious that the then President of the AICC, Smt. Indira Gandhi, called a representative meeting of Congress workers to discuss the problem. That Conference decided to appoint a Committee to consider the whole question of what has since come to be known as

National Integration, This decision, however, was not implemented. In the meanwhile, the language disturbances in Assam took place and showed the explosive character of the situation.

3. It was against this background that the Bhavanagar session of the Congress, held in January 1961, adopted a resolution on National Integration. That resolution stated: "democracy, with its widespread system of elections, which is vitally important and which is the very basis of our Constitution, has also resulted in some ways in encouraging certain disintegrating forces. Under the cover of political and social activities, the old evils of communalism, casteism, provincialism and linguism have appeared again in some measure.....Communalism which has in the past done so much injury to the nation is again coming into evidence and taking advantage of the democratic apparatus to undermine this unity to encourage reactionary tendencies. Provincialism and linguism have also injured the cause for which the Congress stands. Caste, although losing its basic force, is beginning to function in a new political garb. If these tendencies are allowed to flourish, then India's progress will be gravely retarded and even freedom will be imperilled. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that every effort should be made to remove these evils and always to keep in view the unity and integrity of the nation. Adequate progress can only be based on a national scale, embracing all communities and states."

4. The adoption of the above resolution was followed by the appointment of the Committee envisaged earlier. Headed by Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Committee held two sittings at the end of which it submitted a report to the AICC. The report is divided into four parts. The first part deals with "National Outlook in the Fields of Education and other Spheres" and makes 10 recommendations. The second is in relation to "Promotion of opportunities for Minorities in the Economic Field" and makes 8 recommendations. The third part is on "Maintenance of Security of personnel and property" with 9 recommendations. The last part explains "role of the Congress Organisation" and has 9 recommendations.

5. In the meanwhile, the seriousness of the threat which communalism constitutes to national life was further underlined by the riots

which took place in Jabalpur, Saugar and other places in Madhya Pradesh. The meetings of the Indira Gandhi Committee were themselves held under the shadow of these riots. This naturally influenced the deliberations of the Committee. It is doubtful if the Committee would have considered the questions dealt with in the second part of its report had it not been for the fact that these communal riots did break out. It may be further noted that, as it is, the report did not deal with what are known as "Linguism", "Provincialism" and "Regionalism".

6. The communal riots caused concern to progressive elements outside the Congress too. Our Party expressed its concern through the report and resolution adopted at the Vijayawada Congress. The resolution stated: "Fissiparous and separatist tendencies based on caste, community, province and region have grown apace in recent years. They threaten one of the most precious heritage of our freedom movement—the unity of the nation. The patriotic elements belonging to all parties are deeply depressed by these phenomena". This was further expressed in the letter which Com. Ajoy Ghosh wrote to Pandit Nehru on May 18, 1961, in which he said: "In the light of what happened in Jabalpur and other places, it is evident that the Congress, by relying on its own influence alone, cannot wage an effective battle against communalism. Not merely is the influence of the Congress to-day considerably less than it was in the days of struggle for national freedom but also it is a well-known fact that many Congressmen themselves have come to imbibe communal ideas. At the same time, larger numbers of Congressmen are definitely non-communal. There are non-communal and secular-minded men and women in other parties also and many of those who belong to no party. In this situation and taking into account the seriousness of the menace, we feel that an appeal should be issued by you and by the Congress Working Committee to ask Congressmen in all parts of the country to join hands with other non-communal forces to wage a concerted struggle against communalism. Also we feel that it is high time that a Conference is convened of all the major secular parties and elements in the country to discuss communal problem in all its aspects and evolve ways and means to eradicate it".

The National Integration Conference held from 28th September

to the 1st of October, 1961, was not of the type suggested by Com. Ghosh in the above letter. What had been suggested by him was a Conference of secular parties. Actually, however, the Conference included the representatives of some communal parties. The National Integration Council formed after the Conference also included the leader of the Jan Sangh. By the time the first meeting of the Council was to be held, another member was added to it—the representative of the Hindu Mahasabha. While thus including representatives of Hindu Communalism, the Conference and the Council did not include representatives of the Muslim League, the Akalis, DMK, etc. This naturally led to legitimate criticism of the composition of the Conference, as well of the Council formed after the Conference. Our party, however, did not consider this to be strong enough ground to refrain from participating in their work. Com. Ajoy Ghosh and Dr. Ahmed participated in the Conference, while Com. E. M. S. Namboodiripad has been functioning in the National Integration Council and in the Sub-Committee appointed by the Council. Comrade Hiren Mukerjee functioned in the Emotional Integration Committee headed by Dr. Sampurnand.

8. In the meanwhile, the question of national integration has been dealt with by certain other bodies as well. These are :

(a) the Chief Ministers' Conference, [held in May-June 1961. The Conference discussed in detail the various recommendations made in the Indira Gandhi Committee's report. (The members of that Committee and the Congress President were also invited to attend the Chief Ministers' Conference). The Conference considered most of the recommendations made in part I, II, and III of the Report (leaving out the last part which is concerned exclusively with the role of the Congress as an organisation). Having come to some conclusions on each of these recommendations, another Conference of the Chief Ministers and Central Minister was held on August 10, 11th and 12th, 1961. The Conference had as the main subject for its discussion the question of language in its various aspects.

(b) the Emotional Integration Council with Dr. Sampurnand as its Chairman and Com. Hiren Mukerjee as one of its members. The Committee submitted a preliminary report on November 17, 1961. The Committee also submitted its final report in September this year. Com. Hiren Mukerjee, as a member of the Committee, submitted a sort of supplementary note :

(c) the Committee on "Religious and Moral Instruction", appointed by the Ministry of Education with Shri Prakash as its Chairman which submitted its report on December 21, 1959.

9. The above-mentioned bodies went in to the question of national intergration whether under direct governmental auspices, or under the auspices of the ruling party. The question has also been discussed by various non-official bodies, through Seminars, Conferences, etc. It is not possible to keep track of them all, or to bring together the various suggestions and recommendations made by them. Nor is it necessary, since a study of the above reports will be sufficient to show the way in which official thinking goes on regarding the basic issues involved.

## II. FUNDAMENTAL APPROACH OF MARXISM TO THE QUESTION

10. A study of this voluminous material does not help us to understand the fundamental reason why such a threat to national integration should make its appearance now. The various specific recommendations made in them, therefore, do not help to solve the most important problems connected with national integration. The fundamental problem was put as follows by Com. Ajoy Ghosh in the speech he delivered at the National Integration Conference, held in September-October, 1961 : "At the very outset we feel it necessary to emphasise certain contradictory aspects of the present situation. India is today administratively more united than ever in its history. Economic planning is carried out by central body. Above all, state power is no longer exercised as was the case in the past by the British who were interested in keeping up the accentuated conflicts inside the country. All these are factors favourable for the consolidation of the unity of the country and of the nation. Yet, as would be denied by none, fissiparous and disruptive tendencies have grown alarmingly in recent years. They threatened one of the most precious heritages of our freedom movement—the unity of the nation. What has then happened ? How has this happened ?"

Any study of the national integration, which does not try to find a correct answer to these questions will not help us. The analysis and series of solution contained in it is bound to be superficial. This happens

to be the case which all the recommendations made by the various official or Congress bodies mentioned above.

11. It should be recognised that our own Party is not free from the superficiality of approach mentioned above. While the Vijayawada resolution of the Party Congress and the speech delivered by Com. Ghosh at that Congress explains the political background against which these fissiparous and disruptive tendencies are emerging and growing stronger, our Party is yet to make a proper Marxist analysis of the growth of disintegrating forces in our national political life. While the above—quoted passage from Comrade Ghosh's speech at the National Integration Conference indicated an awareness of the need for a sufficiently deep study of the phenomenon, no such study has actually been made. The result, therefore, is that the party is not able to take a unified stand on the problem of national integration in general, and its various aspects like Communalism, Casteism, Linguism, Regionalism and Separatism. On every one of these questions, conflicting trends in theory and practice—revisionism in theory and right opportunism in practice, as well as dogmatism in theory and sectarianism in practice—have made their appearance and are preventing the Party from coming to correct conclusions. The enemies of the Party are naturally trying to take advantage of this situation in order to accentuate differences and to create a split in the Party.

12. It is, therefore, necessary for the Party to steer clear of these incorrect trends. It should take its firm stand on the solid ground of Marxism Leninism on the question of national unity. None of these fissiparous and disruptive forces that are making their appearance now in our political life can be understood if we do not understand the fundamental proposition of Marxism which Lenin Summed up in "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination". He said: "National movements did not first arise in Russia, nor are they peculiar to Russia alone. Throughout the world, the period of the final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements. The economic basis of these movements is that in order to achieve complete victory for commodity production the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, must have politically united territories with a population speaking the same language, while all obstacles to the development of

this language and to its consolidation in literature are removed. Language is the most important means of human intercourse; unity of language and unimpeded development are the most important conditions of a genuinely free and extensive commercial turnover corresponding to modern capitalism, of a free and broad grouping of the population in all their separate classes; finally, they are a condition for the close connection between the market and each and every proprietor and petty-proprietor, seller and buyer. The formation of *national states*, under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied, is therefore the tendency of every national movement. The deepest economic factors urge towards this goal, and for the whole of Western Europe, nay, for the entire civilised world, the *typical*, normal state for the capitalist period is, therefore, the national state".

13. This fundamental Marxist-Leninist approach to the phenomenon of development of nations and national movements should never be lost sight of by our Party when it deals with the question of national integration in our own country. Particular mention should be made of this now, when the bourgeoisie in our country is equating "linguism" with casteism and communalism as "fissiparous trends", and, on that ground, even suggesting that the formation of linguistic states was a mistake. Any surrender to this bourgeois stand would be a departure from Marxism-Leninism.

14. Equally incorrect would it be to make a mechanical comparison of the conditions in Russia with those in India and to apply to India the principle of self-determination for all nationalities, including the right to separate. Lenin himself had warned against such mechanical application of the principle of self-determination to all countries regardless of differences among them.

Polemising against Rosa Luxemburg who argued that, since this principle is not included in the Programmes of West European Social Democratic Parties, it is wrong to put it in the Russian Party's Programme, Lenin says: "A comparison of the political and economic development of various countries as well as of the Marxian Programme is of enormous importance from the standpoint of Marxism, for, no doubt exists as to the general nature of modern states and general law of their development. But such a comparison must be drawn in a

sensible way. The elementary condition required for this is the elucidation of the question whether the historical epochs of the development of the countries contrasted are at all *comparable*".

Regarding the national question itself, he says that Rosa Luxemburg "has lost sight of the most important thing, i. e., the differences between countries where the bourgeois democratic reformation has long been completed and those where it has not yet been completed. This difference is the crux of the matter. The complete disregard of this difference transforms Rosa Luxemburg's exceedingly long article into a collection of empty, meaningless generalisations".

Lenin goes on to refer to the comparison between Austria and Russia made by Rosa Luxemburg, and says that under the circumstances in which the bourgeois democratic revolution was started and completed in Austria, it was perfectly natural for the Germans, Hungarians and Slavs in that country to gravitate "not towards separation from Austria, but on the contrary, towards the preservation of the integrity of Austria precisely in order to preserve national independence, which could have been completely crushed by more rapacious and powerful neighbours! Owing to this peculiar position, Austria assumed the form of a double centre (dual) state, and is not being transformed into a three centre (triune) state (Germans, Hungarians and Slavs)".

He then adds: "The peculiar conditions of Russia in regard to the national question are just the reverse of those we have in Austria. Russia is a state with a single national centre the Great Russian. The Great Russian occupy a gigantic uninterrupted stretch of territory and number about 70 million".

Analysing in detail the stand taken by Marx and Engels on the national question in relation to Poland and Ireland, Lenin says; "The conclusion that follows from all these critical remarks of Marx is clear: the working class should be the last to make a fetish of the national question since the development of capitalism does not necessarily awaken *all* nations to independent life. But to brush aside Mass national movements once they have started and to refuse to support what is progressive in them means, in effect, pandering to *nationalistic* prejudices.

what is recognising "one's own as the model nation" (or we will add on our part, as the nation possessing the exclusive privilege of forming a state).

15. Running like a thread throughout Lenin's writing on the principle of self-determination for non-Russian nationalities, including the right of separation, is recognition of the basic fact that the then Czarist empire was a state of Great Russian domination. "The peculiarity of this national state (Russian)" he says, "is, in the first place, that 'alien races' (which, on the whole, form the majority of the entire population—57 percent) inhabit precisely the border lands; secondly, that the oppression of these "alien races" is much worse than in the neighbouring states (and not in the European States alone); thirdly, that in a number of cases the oppressed nationalities inhabiting the border lands have campatriots across the border who enjoy greater national independence (suffice it to recall the Fins, the Swedes, the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Rumanians along the Western and Southern frontiers of the State); fourthly, the development of capitalism and the general level of culture are not infrequently higher in the border lands inhabited by "alien races" than in the centre of the state. Finally, it is precisely in the neighbouring Asiatic states that we observe incipient bourgeois revolutions and national movements, which partly affect kindred nationalities within the borders of Russia."

To which he adds: "It is precisely the concrete historical peculiarities of the national question in Russia that caused the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination in the present epoch to become a matter of special urgency in this regard."

16. It will be idle to argue these specific features which existed in Russia then exist in India today. The very manner in which capitalism developed in our country and generated the national movement is basically different from that of Russia. It is, therefore, necessary to analyse the specific features of the development of capitalism and of the national movement in our country in order that we may be able to apply the general principle of Marxism-Leninism to our own conditions. But before doing this, it is necessary for us to be clear in our minds that our approach to this question as to all other questions is opposed to the approach of the bourgeoisie.



National integration in general, and its various aspects like casteism, communalism, linguism and regionalism are not abstractions, as the bourgeoisie would have us believe when it speaks of these 'fissiparous trends' in contraposition to 'nationalism' in general. All these aspects of national integration, as well as the fact that problems of national integration have assumed importance at the present time, are the result of historical development. The working of these social, economic, political and cultural forces that led to the emergence of these separate problems, as well as the fact that the question of integration *versus* disintegration has come to the forefront now, have to be studied from a historical point of view. Furthermore, the study should be made not academically, but in a concrete way in relation to the class interests of the oppressed masses.

When such an approach is made, it will inevitably come into conflict with the approach of the bourgeoisie. There is, therefore, no question of our Party evolving a common programme of struggle against fissiparous trends and for national integration with the bourgeoisie, although, on several specific issues of struggle against fissiparous trends, we can and should carry on a continuous, systematic struggle against the bourgeois approach to national integration, even while joining hands with it on issues in order to isolate and defeat the more disruptive forces.

### III INDIA'S SPECIFIC CONDITIONS ANALYSED

16. The essential differences between Czarist Russia, in relation to which Lenin worked out his principle of self-determination for nationalities, and India is that capitalism became the dominant social system in our country not under the native bourgeoisie, but under foreign capital. The efforts to break the internal barriers for the exchange of commodities and thus to create a unified home market were successfully made in our country by the British rulers. Hence the domination of the bourgeoisie of the numerically largest nation within the country (which was the specific feature of the Czarist empire, where the Great Russian nationality which was not only numerically the largest but politically dominant in the country) is absent in India.

As a matter of fact, Indian capital developed in such a way that the territories occupied by that linguistic group which is numerically the largest, the Hindi speaking people, is economically less advanced than certain other territories. It is Bombay and Calcutta and not the cities of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh or Rajasthan that became the base of such industrialisation as took place in the country during the British rule. In relation to other indices of capitalist development, such as the growth of a professional middle class, the Hindi-speaking region was behind Bengal, South India and Bombay. Finally, the Hindi-speaking region itself was not unified enough to become a dominant national group in the political, not to speak of the economic life of the country.

Coming to language, literature and culture too, there was no question of the Hindi-speaking region dominating over the rest of the country in the days of the British rule. The question then was one of absolute equality of all Indian languages including Hindi, in that they all were equally suffering because of the domination of English. It was not till the 1920's that it became permissible among the educated middle class all over the country to use the mother tongue as the medium of communication between all.

17. Naturally, under these circumstances, the target of attack from all the democratic forces including the Marxists in India was the domination of the British ruling classes, as opposed to the Great Russian in Czarist Russia. It was in this struggle against these foreign rulers that our national movement took shape, national unity forged.

It should, however, be noted that, as soon as the anti-imperialist movement penetrated to the mass of our people, there emerged a strong mass movement not only for the development of all Indian languages, but for the formation of linguistic states. The first big mass national movement in which the peasantry was drawn into the movement at a big scale—the non-cooperation and Khilafat movement—also had the idea of linguistic states inscribed on its banner.

It should be further noted that, as early as the Lucknow (Congress-League) Pact, it came to be accepted in the national movement that the Constitution of independent India should be Federal and not

Unitary. At every phase in the history of discussions on the future set up of the free India State, everybody had to agree to its federal basis. This principle has become such an integral part of the political consciousness of the people that, at the time of the framing of the Constitution after the attainment of independence, even those who were in their heart of hearts advocates of the unitary principle had to agree to the federal basis of the constitution.

18. The acceptance by the entire anti-imperialist movement in the pre-independence period of these two principles—the federal basis of the Constitution and the formation of the linguistic states—shows that, despite the above-mentioned difference between Czarist Russia and pre-independence India, the crucial principle laid down by Lenin regarding the formation of national states as an integral part of the capitalist movement, as well as the connection which he traces between language and national development, are applicable to our country also.

It is, however these two crucial factors that are sought to be ignored by our bourgeoisie, when, in the name of national integration, they harp upon the theme of a strong centre which, in practice, renounces the federal basis of our Constitution and carry out a persistent campaign against what they call the 'mistake' of having formed the linguistic states.

In our Party also, it is natural that a trend should appear which ignores the historical significance of these two factors. This does in practice lead to trailing behind the bourgeoisie in its way of "fighting separatism".

19. While drawing attention to these specific features of the development of capitalism and national movement in our country, it is at the same time necessary for us to note that, despite their existence, the general tendency of our national movement was against the separation of the various linguistic groups inhabiting the country. The tendency of our national movement was for the utmost possible unity of the entire country consistent with the need for allowing all the linguistic and cultural groups to develop their languages and cultures, as well as making the States (formed on the basis of language) autonomous within the field of activities allotted to them. *The unity of the country is not to be*

*terposed to, but integrated with, the widest possible autonomy for the states formed on linguistic basis.* It is this that is denied by the separatist elements like DMK whose ideology finds reflection in our ranks too.

20. The economic basis for the particular form of political consciousness of the anti-imperialist movement which is opposed to separatism lies in the fact that, created as it was by the British rulers, the home market in the country was one and indivisible. It was in the interests of the bourgeoisie in the entire country to have the unity and integrity of this all-India market preserved. Those bourgeois groups which were already developing under the British were not basing themselves on any particular territory inhabited by a single linguistic group. Everyone of them was interested in extending its activities to territories inhabited by other linguistic groups. As a matter of fact, the most developed among them—the Gujaratis and the Marvadis—had connections as traders and industrialists with the territories inhabited by almost all linguistic groups. A common Indian citizenship as different from different citizenships for each linguistic groups, is, therefore, conducive to the development of the bourgeoisie as a whole: the right of every individual citizen of India to hold property, carry on trade, start industry and take up jobs in any part of the country is necessary for that "free and extensive commercial turnover corresponding to modern capitalism" in the interests of which, according to Lenin, development of language and the formation of national states are necessary.

21. At the same time, language being the most important means of human intercourse, its development is an unavoidable necessity if capitalism has to develop all over the country. It is impossible for the development of such democratic institutions as are necessary for genuine capitalist development if we continue to use a foreign language as the medium for education and for official work. Such a transition from English to the mother tongue as medium of instruction and official work can be brought about only if the states are formed on linguistic basis.

It should also be noted that, while the bourgeoisie as a whole is interested in keeping the unity and integrity of the Indian markets as a whole, there are undoubtedly developing elements in the various territories and regions of the country who are not strong enough to compete with the strongest and most dominant among the Indian bourgeoisie. A

fully unitary Indian state, it is feared, would be so much in the hands of the dominant sections that these growing elements would be thwarted by them.

22. It was inevitable, under these circumstances, that the aspiration for a united country should take the form of the well-known principle of "unity in diversity"—the federal principle of the Constitution and the linguistic basis for the formation of States.

#### IV. POST-INDEPENDENCE DEVELOPMENTS

23. The position, however, did not remain like this in the post-independence years. The urge for united India began to get weakened and ideas of separatism grew. This was, of course, most serious in Madras, where the DK and DMK championed the cause, of a separate Dravidanad and came on the political scene as serious forces as early as during the first general election. The same trend, however, appeared in different forms in other states as well. Particularly was this true of those areas which are predominantly inhabited by the tribal people, such as Jharkhand, Assam, etc. But even in areas where it did not take the extreme form of separatism, tendencies towards regionalism made their appearance and grew strong.

24. This new phenomenon should be traced to the manner in which development of capitalism proceeded in the post-Independence years and affected the economy and politics of the country. It is, therefore, necessary to analyse the major Economic and political developments that took place during the last 15 years.

25. The first important development to be noted in this connection is that, for the first time in the history of the country, India became politically and administratively united. A centralised administration came into existence and all the petty principalities and 'Indian States' were integrated into it. Those economic factors which, even under the British, tended to unite the country were now supplemented by certain factors which made themselves felt in the political and administrative fields.

26. This, however, was done by the bourgeoisie which was by no means single and original. It was composed of various groups, each of which had its own special interests and had, therefore, original conflicts among them. Furthermore, it was ever-growing; new sections were entering its ranks, while those that were already in existence grew in size. All this naturally led to competition between one group and another. Each of them, therefore, naturally tried to use the political and administrative machinery that had come into existence during this period in order to serve its own specific interests and, therefore, against its rivals. The realities of economic life, therefore, generated the forces of conflict in a situation in which politics and administration were being increasingly integrated.

27. To these conflicts within the capitalist class as a whole should be added the fact that whatever economic development is taking place is extremely uneven. It is true that the formerly backward states and regions have started developing. It is, however, equally indisputable that the lag between some of these formerly backward regions and the more advanced regions is widening, rather than being breached. There are whole states in the country, and within each state there are particular regions, whose development is below the average for the country as a whole and for the particular states respectively. This naturally leads to discontent in the states and regions which remain relatively backward. It is, therefore, inevitable that the whole people in such states and regions rally behind the bourgeoisie of these states and regions in demanding that the centre takes effective measures to overcome their backwardness.

28. It is natural that, led as they are by the bourgeoisie such people's movements against the policy of the centre take undesirable and unjustified forms; they are bound to make unreasonable demands on the Central Government and to take a generally chauvinistic attitude, so long as the bourgeoisie is at their head. If this is what is meant by the usual denunciation of provincialism and regionalism, then that denunciation is justified. It, however, remains true that, in most cases of provincialism and regionalism, the reason for the discontent is strong—the state or region concerned is, undoubtedly, being denied the legitimate share of the nation's overall development.

29. Developments in the political and cultural fields too tended

to generate the forces of disunity, rather than of unity. No more is English foisted on the people by alien rulers ; our own people are perfectly at liberty to throw it out in favour of their own languages. And has, therefore, been put to the situation in which all the languages in the country were equally being suppressed in favour of the foreign language that was dominant in the political, administrative and cultural life of the country. Being the language spoken by the largest number of people and, therefore, known in pre-independence years as national language, Hindi has come to be accepted as the language of Central administration and all-India communication. Hindi is eventually to replace English as the official language of the country and as medium of instruction at least in higher educational institutions.

This has led to two types of conflicts : (i) the conflict between those who are conservative enough to resist the very idea of change-over from English, to demand that English continue to be used for an indefinite time, and those who want a rapid transition from English to Indian languages ; (ii) the conflict among those who are united on the need for replacing English but who differ on which should replace it as the all-India language. Some want Hindi to take its place, while others want to treat all Indian languages alike. The latter, however, is an impossibility, since one language has to be used for all India purposes and this has necessarily to be Hindi. Now Hindi speaking linguistic groups therefore contain a much bigger proportion of those who champion the continuance of English indefinitely.

30. This led to acute controversy on the language issue which reached the time when the Constitution was being framed and which continues even now. Passions are roused in all parts of the country—both in favour of Hindi in Hindi-speaking and “against Hindi imperialism” in the non-Hindi-speaking regions. It is an index of the depth of feeling on this issue that those who are seeking a compromise on this issue have no other alternative than to suggest that English together with Hindi should continue to be an associate language and the link between various Universities until such time as the non-Hindi-speaking groups voluntarily agree to accept Hindi as the sole official language of the Centre and the link between various Universities.

31. The conflict, however, is not confined to Hindi-versus non-Hindi languages. It extends itself to the relations between different non-Hindi languages, as shown in the Assamese-Bengali controversy in Assam in 1960.

32. Together with such a growth “linguism” should also be noted another phenomenon—emergence of tribal separatism. The inevitable result of capitalist development is that forces of capitalism from the plains enter the hills inhabited by the tribal people. The economic and social life of the tribes, so far free from the penetration of capitalist forces, has now become subject to the working of the laws of capitalism. Land and other forms of property owned by the tribes begin to get alienated ; the community life that binds the tribes together gets disrupted ; pauperisation, if not proletarianisation, forces members of all tribal groups to leave the area of inhabitation of their tribes, leave their traditional jobs in the tribal community and seek jobs elsewhere. While the economic and social life of the tribal people is thus getting disrupted, exploiting classes and elements from the non-tribal areas are able to lord it over the territories and regions inhabited by the tribals. The conflict which consequently arises between the tribal and plains people takes various forms in various parts of the country. It has so far reached the most extreme form in the Assam hills where the violent movement developed between the Naga rebels and the administration on the issue of forming a fully separate independent Nagaland. In other places like Jharkhand, it has not taken this extreme form, but the fact that the demand for the formation of a separate Jharkhand State arose shows that the tribal problem is serious everywhere.

33. It is these economic and political factors that have led to the development of what is known as separatism. It has reached the most extreme form in Madras where the DK—DMK slogan of separate Dravidanad has become a serious political force and in Nagaland where the slogan of separate Nagaland has created an explosive situation.

If the economic and political developments that have led to these separatist movements are not reversed, not only will it be impossible to arrest the growth of these separatist movements but it is even likely that other similar movements arise in other parts of the country. For, the disparity in economic development, the question of language or languages

that should be used for administrative and educational purposes, and the conflict between tribals and plains people are agitating millions of people outside Madras and Assam as well. Even in those places where they have not reached the stage of demanding separation, it should be noted, violent passions are being roused on such issues as allocation of river waters, location of industry and other development projects etc.

## V. BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIAN APPROACHES TO SEPARATISM

34. The bourgeoisie is blind to these realities of the economic and political developments in the country during the post-independence years. Neither the class as a whole nor the different sections and groups into which it is divided, are able to see that the problem of national integration is in essence that of forging unity in diversity in a multi-lingual— if we are to use the strictly correct Marxian term a multi-national—country in which capitalism is developing rapidly, but unevenly. Far from solving the real problems arising out of this situation its leaders satisfy themselves by just denouncing linguism, provincialism, regionalism and separatism as disruptive of national unity. Having made such a denunciation of these outward symptoms of a deep-seated malady which has its roots in the process of social change, they come to the facile conclusion that the remedy for the evils lies in such administrative measures as putting a ban on the propagation of separatist ideology, if not a ban on the parties and organisations which propagate them.

Such an approach on the part of the dominant All-India section of the bourgeoisie is matched by the approach of those sections of the bourgeoisie which are dominant in the non-Hindi-speaking states and regions which are lagging behind others in economic and cultural developments, and among the tribal people. While the dominant bourgeoisie uses the slogan of 'national unity and integration' to justify its domination in the entire country, the other sections plead the cause of 'justice' and stretch it sometimes to the point of political and administrative autonomy, even separation.

35. Failure to see this class nature of fissiparous tendencies like linguism, provincialism, regionalism and separatism takes our party too

towards the line of tailing behind either the dominant all-India bourgeoisie, or the bourgeoisie of the states, regions, linguistic groups and tribes.

The former leads a section of the Party to make a dogma of the slogan of 'national unity and integration' and repeat the same arguments as are advanced by the all-India leaders of the Congress. This, in practice, leads them to the position of supporting the Congress as against communal and separatist political parties. Such arguments and practices miss the basic and significant fact that the Congress approach to the question of national unity and integration is such as cannot be acceptable to broad sections of the people.

On the other hand, there is a section of the Party which makes a dogma of the particular point in Lenin's work which is related to the development of nations and the right to self-determination and would try to mechanically apply it to our own conditions. This dogmatic approach leads them, in practice, to a policy of tailing behind the DMK and other movements which are based on separatism. Even in those states and regions where the local bourgeoisie does not put forward the demand for separation, this approach rallies the Party behind the local bourgeoisie with regard to location of projects, division of waters, etc.

The essence of both approaches is the same—dogmatism in theory and tailism in practice. The difference is only with respect to the particular principle which is to be made a dogma—'national unity' or 'self-determination of nations'; also which section of the bourgeoisie to tail behind—the dominant all-India bourgeoisie, or the bourgeoisie that is dominant in different states, regions, linguistic groups and tribes.

36. The National Council, therefore, calls upon the entire party to launch a determined struggle against every manifestation of these anti-Marxian trends. The unity of the entire Party has to be built through a systematic struggle against bourgeois trends of all varieties (a) against the tendency of over centralisation and domination as well as against provincialism and regionalism; (b) against the efforts to develop Hindi and help it to dominate in the administrative and cultural life of the country at the expense of other languages, as well as against refusal

to recognize the special role of Hindi as the language of all-India communication; (c) against the landlords and capitalists of the plains who want to dominate the tribal belt, as well as against the growing bourgeois elements among the tribal people to set their people against the plains' people.

Such a struggle against all forms of disruption practised by different sections of the bourgeoisie cannot be conducted if the Party adopts the line of building unity with the Congress against the forces of separatism, as is advocated by some comrades; or the line of fighting the Congress in alliance with the forces of separatism, as some sections within the Party would like to do. It can be done only if the Party independently comes before the people with a programme of building the unity of India on the basis of recognition of the real diversity which exists because of its multi-lingual character, the uneven economic and cultural development of various states and regions and the existence of the various tribes inhabiting the various parts of India.

## VI. CASTEISM AND COMMUNALISM

37. The same thing applies to the other two aspects of the problem of national integration, or rather the other two "fissiparous trends" which are talked of in connection with national integration—casteism and communalism. Just as linguism, provincialism, regionalism and tribal separatism, so have communalism their roots in the concrete manner in which capitalist development has been and is still taking place in the country. These two phenomena can, therefore be understood and their concrete manifestations dealt with only through a scientific analysis of the social institution of the caste and religious community and how they are being changed in the process of capitalist development.

38. Caste is an ancient social institution. It grew and developed on the basis of relations of production existing under pre-capitalist social formations; as a matter of fact, it was, by and large, a particular form of division of labour in an economy where commodity production had not yet become the dominant feature of social life. Such a form of division of labour being inconsistent with the requirements of commodity production

—which began to become dominant in the economy of the country under the British regime—, caste became an anachronism. It, therefore, should have ceased to exist the moment commodity production became the dominant feature of the economic life of the country.

39. This, however, did not happen because:

*Firstly*, the new relations of production being developed by capitalism involve acute competition among the various sections of the nascent bourgeoisie. In this competition between different sections of the bourgeoisie, bourgeois elements developing from particular castes have greater opportunities for advancement. It is true that individuals belonging to all castes are able to develop as capitalist farmers, traders, industrialists, government officials, etc. But the number of such individuals is much less among the 'lower' castes than among the 'higher' castes; in the case of such castes as are in the lowest rung of the castes ladder (scheduled castes and scheduled tribes), they are virtually absent. The result is, that, by and large, the particular castes which were dominant in pre-capitalist social formations are able now to appropriate a bigger share of the fruits of capitalist development; they, therefore continue to be dominant in the new setup also. Furthermore, the development of capitalist relations in agriculture and industry leads to the ruination of the common people of the country belonging to all castes, particularly those in the 'lower' castes. Capitalist development does therefore appear to them as a process of enriching the 'higher' and impoverishing the 'lower' castes.

*Secondly*, even though the particular (caste) form of division of Labour has ceased to exist, the social consciousness which is crystallised in the manners and customs of the people continue to be caste-oriented. Even those who have broken, and continue to break, the centuries-old rules of caste in relation to their professions, who do not observe the rules of caste behaviour when outside the home, strictly observe the rules of caste in the home and in respect of all social customs and manners.

40. These two factors are not unrelated to, but act and react on, each other. The first generates acute competitions and rivalries between sections of the bourgeoisie belonging to the 'higher' and 'lower' castes in general, and between the various castes in each category. The bourgeoisie

belonging to each caste, therefore, seeks to secure advantages for itself at the expense of the other and, to this end, utilises the caste sentiment. In doing this, they see a handy instrument in the second factor—the remnants of caste consciousness among the masses are thus turned by the bourgeoisie into caste passions. On the other hand, it is just because caste consciousness and caste prejudices among the masses that the unequal development, which is the inevitable companion of the development of capitalist relations, becomes inequality between various castes in a new way. In other words, caste inequality which was the characteristic feature of pre-capitalist society in India is now further strengthened by inequality of development under capitalist development and gives rise to discontent and agitation on the part of various castes in relation to division of jobs and professions, opportunities for development in the lines of industries and trade, etc.

41. The struggle against casteism, therefore, should be based on a two-pronged attack: (a) against all remnants of inequality between castes which was the characteristic feature of precapitalist society—for full equality of all citizens of the country irrespective of the caste into which they are born; for special measures to raise the level of life of those who belong to the formerly 'lower' castes; (b) against the uneven development which is inevitable if the process of modernisation is to take place under the domination of the bourgeoisie for a just and fair division of all developmental opportunities among the various states, regions, and groups of people. Only by uniting the masses of people belonging to all castes, high and low, for such a two-pronged attack can the evil of casteism be fought and overcome.

42. Far from doing this, the bourgeoisie intensify the conflicts between the 'higher' and 'lower' castes. Here again, two sections of the bourgeoisie take two different stands which are contradictory to each other and, in the process, divides the people along caste lines. Furthermore, in the absence of a correct class approach, our own Party is, to a certain extent, influenced by these different approaches.

43. The bourgeoisie belonging to the 'higher' castes uses the struggle against casteism as the means through which a formal, juridical equality between all castes is maintained, but behind this is continued

the real inequality between 'high' and 'low' castes. Such, for instance, is the struggle waged by the 'nationalist' sections in all parties and organisations who demand that reservations and other concessions to be given to the 'backward communities' should be based not on caste but on the economic condition. This argument forgets the fact that there are certain castes which, due to historical reasons, have continued to be and still are backward *as castes* and that their backwardness can, therefore, be overcome only if they are helped *as castes* to become equal to other castes. In several other ways too, the formerly 'lower' and 'backward' castes have to be helped to overcome their low standard and backward conditions if casteism is to be liquidated.

44. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie belonging to the 'lower' castes refuse to recognise the fact that, if the inequality of their castes *as castes* is to be ended, they have to unite with the masses belonging to the 'higher' castes. For, the interest of the masses belonging to all castes, the interests of the country, demand the abolition of the caste itself as an institution. The existence of caste consciousness, caste prejudices, discontent on the basis of castes—all these are impediments in the way of developments of the country as a whole and, therefore, of the development of the 'lower' and 'backward' castes themselves. Caste separatism therefore hinders, rather than helps, the advancement of the 'lower' castes themselves.

45. Our Party, therefore, should be vigilant against the ideological offensive launched by the bourgeoisie—either those sections of it which belong to the 'high' castes, or those who hail from the 'low' castes. Here again, the Party should launch a two-pronged ideological offensive—(a) against all forms and manifestations of 'high caste' domination, masquerading in the name of struggle against casteism for special measures to help the 'low' castes to advance more rapidly than the 'high' castes, so that they can shortly be equal to them; (b) against the petty short-sighted approach of the bourgeoisie belonging to the 'lower' castes who fail to see the immense harm done to the low castes themselves arising by the division of the masses as between the 'high' and 'low' castes. The Party should carry on systematic ideological work among the masses belonging to all castes for eradication of all remnants of caste as an institution and to generate the unity of the masses of the working people through the process of class struggle.

46. The other fissiparous trend which has to be combated—communalism—is related to the religious community which is an institution not peculiar to India. Different religious communities, and even conflicts between them, exist in several other countries. But the problem of relations between different religious communities in India has its own peculiar feature. The two religious communities which may be said to be dominant in our country—the Hindus and the Muslims—have behind them a history of continuous political conflicts. It is true that history is not a one-sided story of conflicts alone, as was sedulously propagated by British historians; co-operation and brotherhood had developed at various stages between the two communities. It is, nevertheless, a fact that conflicts have taken place between them at various phases in our history. All the more is this true of the British rule when the rulers deliberately followed the policy of 'divide and rule'. Political and administrative measures to keep them divided, and to incite quarrels between them, were supplemented by the ideological poisoning of the minds of the people by the one-sided distortion of Indian history. The result of all this was that, at the very time when the Indian people were more and more uniting themselves against [the British the relations between the two major religious communities were getting further and further strained. Every time a mass anti-imperialist movement reached the zenith of militancy, Hindus and Muslims were turned against each other; the unity of the anti-imperialist movement was thus weakened. This naturally led to the inevitable partition of India and all that followed.

47. Such a historical development of the relations between Hindus and Muslims to a certain extent, those between Hindus and Sikhs and Muslims as well—has led to a mixing up of religion and politics. While everybody pays lip service to the modern concept of a secular state, religion, in practice, interferes in the political life of the nation. Extreme viewpoints among the Hindus lead to the concept of Hindu Rashtra which is openly proclaimed by certain organisations. Other religious groups too have given birth to their own variants of the anti-secular concept—Deen Ilahi; the superiority of the Panth; the Christian way of life and approach to all questions, including political education; etc. Organisations and parties which base themselves on these anti-secular concepts spring up all over the country and become a menace to the nation. Particularly is this true of the organisations and

parties which speak in the name of Hindu Dharma, since not only is their approach anti-secular; they chauvinistically demand the suppression of the freedom of conscience of minority religious groups.

48. Far from effectively combating these anti-secular trends, the bourgeoisie gives concessions to them and strengthens them. Its leaders do not take a consistently secular stand, but are themselves victims of religious obscurantism. They try to distort the whole concept of secularism; they would have the people believe that, instead of complete separation of religion and politics from each other, secularism means freedom for all religious faiths to equally interfere in the political life of the people. This approach of the bourgeoisie can be clearly seen in such official documents as the report of the Sri Prakasha and Sampurnanand Committees referred to earlier. Furthermore, the concession that they give to the communalism of the majority community can be seen in the fact mentioned earlier that, in constituting the National Integration Council the Central Government had no hesitation in appointing the representatives of the Jan Sangh and Hindu Mahasabha while scrupulously keeping out the representatives of non-Hindu communal organisations.

49. Our Party, therefore, has the duty to fight an uncompromising struggle for the consistent implementation of the principle of secularism. Even the slightest departure from that principle should be exposed and fought. While defending the right of every religious community—whether it is the majority or minority—as well as of those who have no faith in any religion to believe in and practise whatever religion they like or to remain irreligious, the Party should fight against all forms of intrusion of religion in the social, economic, political and administrative life of the nation. Equally opposing the efforts of the leaders of all religious groups to interfere in the public life of the country, we should, concentrate the fire on the chauvinistic leaders of the majority religious community—the Hindus. At the same time, we should continue to point out to the minority religious groups that their legitimate rights can be defended and protected only on the basis of a consistent application of the principle of secularism.

50. It is clear from the above analysis of the concrete way in which fissiparous trends like casteism, communalism, linguism, regionalism and tribal separatism manifest themselves that our Party has to take



independent stand on all of them. It will be suicidal for us to tail behind the bourgeoisie under the mistaken assumption that its leaders are putting up an effective and consistent fight against those forces which are disrupting the unity of the nation and preventing its integration. On the other hand, we have to sharply expose before the people the inherent weaknesses of the policies pursued by the bourgeoisie which accentuate the conflict on the questions of language, provincial and regional inequality, caste, communal and tribal discontent. Against these policies pursued by the bourgeoisie, we should advance a programme which will help the nation to find proper solutions for all these questions. The elements of such a programme of building national unity are given below :-

(A) ON THE QUESTION OF SEPARATISM : We are opposed to all forms of separatism, such as the DMK slogan of Dravidanad, the slogan of an independent Nagaland, etc. We cannot, however, agree to the manner in which the Congress leadership and the Central Government seek to fight separatism. We have, on the other hand, to firmly oppose the tendency shown by them to consider India a unitary state with a highly centralised administration. The twin principles should be firmly adhered to. Concrete slogans and demands calculated to bring about a consistent application of these two principles should be worked out.

(B) ON THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE : We firmly adhere to the principle of replacing English by the regional languages at the state level and Hindi at the Centre as official language. The transition from English to Hindi at the centre should be simultaneous with the same from English to the regional languages in the states ; the preparation for this transition which is being made by the Centre with regard to Hindi should also be made with all necessary Central assistance in the states. At the same time, for the transition period (the duration of which should be decided with the consent of the non-Hindi-speaking regions), English should be given the status of an associate official language. The above guiding lines should be applied to the question of medium of instruction as well, the aim in this respect being as rapid a transition as possible from English to the regional languages with necessary guarantees for a high standard of knowledge in Hindi and English.

(C) ON THE QUESTION OF PROVINCIALISM AND REGIONALISM : This should be considered a question of the most rapid reduction of provincial and regional disparities in development. The allocation of funds for developmental plans, location of projects, division of waters, etc., should be made on certain generally known principles which would ensure that every state and region will receive approximately the share which is its due on the basis of population. As for the demands relating to recarving of the boundaries of states which have become serious in certain regions, all such questions should be solved on the principle of linguistic states whose borders are to be fixed with village as the unit and putting contiguous areas which have a majority speaking one language in that linguistic state.

(D) THE PROBLEM OF TRIBAL DISCONTENT can be solved only if the Government bases itself on the need for protecting the tribal people from the exploitation of landlord and capitalist elements from the plains. Tribals should be assisted in modernising themselves, but the process of modernisation should be left to the Tribals. The solution will differ from area to area and tribe to tribe ; in some places it may be necessary to form autonomous areas within a particular state or region ; in certain other places, even while having no such local autonomy special safeguarded will have to be given to protect the property and social life of the tribal people.

(E) Our Party is opposed to Casteism. It, however, cannot endorse the stand taken by the leaders of the bourgeoisie according to which any step taken to help the 'lower' castes to overcome their low status amounts to casteism. Not only educational concessions, but even reservation in government jobs will have to be continued for several years ; the basis of which should be no economic condition the degree of the hangover of social oppression which particular castes have been subjected for centuries. At the same time, certain criteria should be laid down in order to fix the stage at which a particular caste may be considered to have freed itself from these hangovers of past social oppression.

(F) With regard to *communalism*, we have to take a firm stand on the principle of secularism and fight against all forms of intrusion of religion in the political life of the country. We should carry on a

consistent campaign among the people against the tendency of religious leaders asking their followers to form themselves into political parties and organisations, to vote in a particular way, etc., as a community

Various concrete questions arising out of the above have to be considered in detail by the National Council in so far as they relate to all-India questions and by the State Councils in relation to provincial questions.

The National Council should be constituted in certain regions, all such questions should be referred to the Councils of linguistic states whose borders are to be fixed on the basis of the language spoken in those areas which have a major language in that linguistic state.

THE PROBLEM OF TRIBAL SETTLEMENT can be dealt with by the Government in the following manner:— The Government should take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people.

(b) The Government should take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people.

The Government should take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people. The Government should also take steps to ensure that the tribal areas are not disturbed by the settlement of non-tribal people.