

REORGANISATION OF NORTH-EAST INDIA A Study of Mizoram

R.N. PRASAD

I

The dimensions of state politics in India at macro-level are both horizontal and vertical. There is a slow but sure process of changing territorial alignment within the Indian federation with a view to approximation of such boundaries to what the people consider to be their cultural boundaries either through the creation of new states or through boundary adjustment. On the other hand, there is an increasing desire for power at the state level either expressed in terms of better union-state relations or for greater autonomy. Both these trends are mediated by the party system in the country.

II

The demand for autonomy/statehood is the result of many factors and forces which have been shaping and influencing the post-independence politics in this country. Some of the factors/forces may be mentioned here. States in India are the core areas for political activity. The federating units are heterogeneous units both linguistically and culturally. The States Reorganisation Commission has accepted the linguistic demands and the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 has also demarcated state boundaries in conformity with the dominant language of the region which has certainly fostered regional sentiments and stimulated demands for greater autonomy for states. The states created

on linguistic basis have stimulated all the divisive movements for protecting local interests especially employment and trading and as a consequence, the theory of "sons of the soil" has emerged. Besides, the bias of the Central Government in dealing with the government of the opposition parties, unprincipled handling of inter-state conflicts or disputes, emergence or contradictions in the system owing to capitalist path of development, emergence of regional parties/ethnic political party consolidating their position by developing protecting the language and culture through the policies of the State Government, failure of the Central Government in not respecting the constitutional provisions and for not honouring the federal spirit, dependence of the states on the centre for financial assistance, inadequate sources of revenue for the states, discrimination in allocation of grants in-aid and central loans, discrimination in the location of heavy industries and centrally sponsored projects and regional economic imbalances or uneven economic development of the region, are also responsible factors for the demand for state autonomy/statehood.

It is significant to note that the demand for state autonomy movement/statehood in India owes its origin largely to the efforts of the regional parties. The frustration, estrangement and feeling of deprivation coupled with the instinct of preserving 'distinct cultures, languages and traditions' on the part of the people of a defined region or particular nationality (or sub-national groups) prove to be the prime motive. That is why, the people of North-Eastern States particularly the Nagas and the Mizos (due to the diversities of culture, religion, race and language) also initiated their movements for autonomous status of different variations. Moreover, the demand for state autonomy/autonomy movement/statehood is raised from a wide spectrum of political commitments. In a political system, which has a written constitution, some of the norms of political system are laid down in the constitutional law itself and the political structures are, to a large extent shaped by the constitution. Likewise, the Constitution of India has also spurred the growth of many new political structures in this country. Taking advantage of the

feelings of the Mizo people such as frustration, deprivation and preservation of identity, culture, lands dialects, and customs/traditions and constitutional provisions, the Mizo Union, the first political party in the then Lushai Hills (Now Mizoram) since its inception in April 1946, raised the demand for achieving democratic system of administration for the Mizos and also fighting the vested interests of the Chiefs in the early 'fifties. Since August 1963, the party has carried on its crusade for statehood for the Mizo Hills and later submitted memoranda to the Union Government demanding separation from Assam. The formation of Autonomous Mizo Hills District Council for the Mizos and the Pawi-Lakher Regional Council for the major tribes (Pawis, Lakhers and Chakmas), the elevation of the Mizo Hills District to the status of Union Territory of Mizoram, and subsequently to statehood may be regarded as the result of the Mizo autonomy movement since independence, though strictly speaking, their statehood owes its origin to the emergence of a Mizo solidarity, against what is frequently described as exploitation of the Plainsmen.

The second feature is the changing status of the political units in India. The Indian Constitution created four types of states. The State Reorganisation Commission reduced them to two viz: Union Territories and states. Since 1972, there is a steady tendency for the Union Territories to grow into fullfledged states, because statehood means more autonomy for the government and more power for the ruling elite of a region.

III

The Lushai Hills, the Naga Hills the North Cachar Hills and the North-East frontier tracts were excluded areas under the Government of India Act, 1935. These excluded areas were guarded by the Inner Line which restricted the entry of outsiders without permit. In the Inner Line regulated areas, there was also no administration till the last day of the Raj. So the hills district, thus, developed a special kind of identity and this has remained a crucial factor in political development. But after, India attained

independence, the tribes of the hill areas of Assam demanded regional autonomy and better status within the constitutional framework. So the interim Government of India in 1947 realised the political aspirations of the people of the hill areas of Assam against the background of assurances given by the outgoing British rulers.

So the Government in order to look into the grievances and affairs of the hill people, appointed a sub-committee of the Constituent Assembly known as the North-East Frontier (Assam) Tribal and Excluded Areas Committee under the Chairmanship of Gopinath Bardoloi the then Chief Minister of Assam. The Bardoloi Committee made an on the spot study of the demands and aspirations of the hill people and submitted its recommendations for a simple and inexpensive set-up; (District Councils) of the hill areas which were later accepted and incorporated into Article 244 (2) of the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution. The Bardoloi Committee also provided for Regional Council for the tribes other than the main tribes. This scheme was conceived with a view to building up autonomous administration (District Council and Regional Council) in the hill areas of Assam so that the hill people could continue to follow their traditional way of life, preserving identity, cultures, customs and manner with such changes as they themselves might like to introduce. It was also felt that the Central and the State Governments would help them in securing the benefits of a democratic and liberal constitution of the country by promoting their educational and economic interests and protecting them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation as enshrined in the Directive Principles of the State policy.

The Government of Assam framed rules under paragraph 2 of the Sixth Schedule to the Indian Constitution called the Assam autonomous District (Constitutions of the District Councils) Rules 1951 for the autonomous district and the Pawi-Lakher (Constitution of Regional Council) Rules in 1952 for the autonomous region in the Lushai Hills District. According to the said rules, the Mizo Hills District Council the then Lushai Hills District Council) for Mizos and the Pawi-Lakher Regional Council for Pawi,

Lakher and Chakma tribes were constituted on April 25, 1952 and April 23, 1953. Though the Mizos continued to look after their distinctive functions envisaged in the Sixth Schedule with the setting up of the Mizo Hills District Council from 1952-1972, they were not satisfied with the Autonomous District Council, because, there was no provision in the Sixth Schedule to bring the council to participate in the developmental schemes and social welfare programme to the largest extent possible. Besides, the Mizo Union Party had been having control over the administration of the District Council for more than 18 years. So the Mizo Union Party as well as other political parties wanted the status of statehood and advocated peaceful means to achieve this objective.

IV

On April 2, 1960, Vishnu Sahay, the then Governor of Assam, wrote to the Prime Minister that the Mizo Hills District should be elevated to the status of Union Territory. In the meantime, the Mizo National Front insurgency broke out on the midnight of the 28th February 1966. The M.N.F. declared independence. The Government of India adopted military measures to counter the grave anti-national activity. The troops were despatched to the territory to aid the civil authorities. In order to break the backbone of the M.N.F. and as a counter-insurgency measure, the Mizo Leaders emphasised the creation of a separate state of Mizoram. Ultimately, the united efforts, continuous struggles, political skill and great sacrifices of the Mizos compelled the Government of India to agree to political settlement of the Mizo problem.

The Government came out with the proposal to elevate the Mizo Hills District to the status of Union Territory. The Government of India enacted the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971, by amending the Constitution of India (Twenty-Seventh Amendment) under which the Mizo Hills District became the Union Territory of Mizoram with a thirty-three member Legislative Assembly. It was envisaged in the Act that the Mizo Hills District Council

would stand dissolved and cease to exist from the date on which the Legislative Assembly of the Union Territory of Mizoram was constituted.

When the Mizos attained the Union Territory of Mizoram with Legislative Assembly to protect their own culture and way of life the Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas wanted to take advantage of the new political status. In fact, they expected more autonomy for their areas. So on September 7, 1971, the leaders of the three tribes submitted a memorandum to the Government of India demanding creation of a separate Union Territory for their areas. The Government could not accede to their demands, but instead agreed to create District Councils for their respective areas, covering the three tribes in the region-The Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas in order to protect their own distinct customs and cultures as envisaged in the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution. After the Union Territory of Mizoram was set-up, the Administrator of Mizoram passed an order as per the provisions of the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Mizoram adaption of Laws order, 1972 and the Government of Union Territories (Amendment) Act, 1971, creating three autonomous regions for three Regional Councils, one each for the Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas on April 12, 1972 in place of the Pawi-Lakher Regional Council. The Pawi-Lakher Regional Council was dissolved. As provided under paragraph 205 of the Sixth Schedule, every autonomous region existing immediately before the date on which the Mizoram Assembly was constituted, would become the District Council for the corresponding new District. As a result, the three Regional Councils were elevated to the status of the three District Councils such as the Lai District Council, the Mara District Council and the Chakma District Council on April 29, 1972 with headquarters at Lawngtlai, Saiha and Chawngte respectively.

V

Since Union Territory means lesser autonomy for the government and lesser or negligible power for the ruling

elite of a region, the ruling people's conference party in Mizoram submitted a memorandum to the then Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, on September 17, 1982 and demanded immediate conferment of statehood on the Union Territory of Mizoram to enable the state to have more powers and resources to manage its own affairs and develop itself in accordance with the social, linguistic and cultural needs of the Mizo people. On 30 June, 1986, the Memorandum of Settlement of Political problems was signed by the Home Secretary, R.D. Pradhan, Government of India, and Laldenga, on behalf of the Mizo National Front, and Lalkhama, Chief Secretary to the Government of Mizoram to ensure permanent peace and harmony in Mizoram. As incorporated in the Memorandum of Settlement, the Central Government agreed to confer statehood on the Union Territory of Mizoram to satisfy the desires and aspirations of the Mizo people with a number of special safeguards. The Union Government with a view to elevating the Union Territory to statehood introduced the Mizoram Statehood Bill, 1986 with special safeguards and provisions of forty elective seats in the Legislative Assembly and the 53rd Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1986, in the Parliament and got the bill passed by an absolute majority. The President of India also assented the Mizoram Statehood Bill 1986 on 14, August 1986. The state bill, thus, became an act but was not brought into force with immediate effect. On February 20, 1987, Mizoram was inaugurated as the 23rd state of the Indian Union. Thus the adoption of a Democratic Parliamentary form of Government with the goal of planned modernisation has created an impact on the Mizo society to an extent which, of course, may contribute to secularisation and political integration at a rapid rate. All that is necessary is to accelerate the progress and rapid socio-economic transformation of the Mizo people so that the goal of state building and nation-building is achieved soon.

Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipr, Tripura and Arunachal Pradesh have been given the status of full-fledged statehood by the re-organisation of North-East Region. Nagaland became a state in 1963. Most new states have been carved

out of Assam. The process of re-organisation of north-east region was ethno-cultural in a broad sense and anti-linguistic in a special sense, because none of the new states, except Mizoram has a dominant language and all of them had English as their official language. Indeed, the question of official language has stimulated all the divisive movements in north-east India. As a result, the Assamese have paid the price of their language. Most of the hill areas of Assam have left the state. More may still leave. This may only further strengthen the passion for their language. Besides all this, the reorganisation also aims at providing an opportunity to the people of various ethnic and linguistic origins in the region a hand to shape their own destiny as they like; making them free from the fear of domination by others and immunising them from the feeling that they are being exploited, or that the economy is tied to the plain areas of Assam. With this recognition, the administrative set-up of the entire region has been restructured so as to provide adequate opportunities to the people of different parts to associate themselves with the task of development. But these new states are financially dependent on the Union Government quite heavily -and so unable to take up individual developmental projects and the North-Eastern Council does not enjoy the necessary power and resources to do so. Therefore, although such states do not raise the broad issues of Union-State relations, they are quite jittery about the Central Government's interference in their states' politics. It is only in Assam that the broad issues of Union-State relations have come to focus.

VI

As it is, there is no way possible to state that with the reorganisation of north-east India, the region has undergone any qualitative change. Briefly, the reorganisation of states has failed to fulfil the socio-economic aspirations of most hills and plains people. The task of nation-building in the region has not been successful to the desired extent in spite of disintegration of the state of Assam. In a developing country like India, the major thrust has to be

socio-economic development to achieve the goal of state-building and nation-building. It has also been experienced that after Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Manipur, Tripura and Arunachal Pradesh became states, the Central Government has been generous with its purse and pumped more funds in these fledgling territories than perhaps in any other state with a comparable population. So most people think that the benefits of planned development must be evenly distributed among the masses of the states. But a more serious problem is how one can hope for a non-exploitative development and equitable distribution of benefits within the capitalist society/market economy framework. It is time now to examine the adverse and cumulative effects of fast enlarging economy mainly due to the expansion of development activities in Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland, Tripura and Arunachal Pradesh. Since there is a capitalist path of modernisation and development, effects of fast enlarging money economy are bound to create vested interests—the neo-middle rich class of the contractors, the businessmen, the educated/political elites and the bureaucrat in the classless society of the tribesmen as it has happened in other federating units of India, in continued peace and tranquility. As a result, only a few persons in these states, are the beneficiaries who have become very rich in recent years where as the majority of tribesmen people are still on the old standard of living. This socio-economic disparity is widening such a distinction between the rich and the poor and the urban and the rural sections just like classes already existing in other parts of the country. Earlier, there was neither poverty nor middle class in the societies of the Nagas, the Mizos and the Arunachalis. Now the tribal economy has been exposed to the onslaught of capitalist economy during the last few decades despite the restrictive Inner Line Regulation. As regards the exploitation of the tribesmen, the emerging class of neo-middle rich is no less responsible for this phenomenon now than the crafty and the pioneer businessmen or the traders of the plains areas. It is thus clear that the reorganisation of states, the Inner Line Regulation and several restrictive enactments made

against the plains people cannot stop prevent the exploitation of the many for tribeman by the neo-rich class, so long, as a differential distribution of property prestige, income, education and authority within the tribal society continue. Because those groups of people, who acquire more property and prestige come to wield more power than others, and thereby help the beginning of exploitation of the poor by those classes/groups controlling the material means of production and the mode of production not only in terms of exchange but also in terms of allocation of the means of livelihood. So economic power is dialectically related to political power. This phenomenon is now very much visible in the tribal society of North-Eastern states.

The gulf between the rich and the poor is widening. So justification about the reorganisation of states on ethno-cultural and linguistic grounds and introduction of the Inner Line Regulation and its continuity in an inherently exploitative system to prevent exploitation of the tribesmen by the plains rich people and businessmen is not at all convincing. It, therefore, becomes absolutely incomprehensible to expect a non-exploitative society from an exploitative system. It is not that there has been no development but its benefits have been largely covered by a small group of well-off-natives. The indigenous working people have been pauperised. Of course, legal safeguards do provide some help. But Article 39, which enjoins upon the state to prevent concentration of wealth has not been able to prevent the development of monopolies in India, which shocked Jawaharlal Nehru leading to the appointment of Monopolies Commission. In the United States, even the passing of Anti-Trust Laws did not stop the development of the monopolies. In another context, it may be noted that even Article 370 has not prevented the increasing integration of Jammu and Kashmir in the market economy of India. The point, which is being made, is that social and economic forces are often too powerful for the wishes and hopes of leaders, howsoever well meaning and powerful they may be. Therefore, the reorganisation of states and policy of leaving the tribesman alone has not prevented either the widespread introduction of modern

values in the region or the exploitation of the less educated and economically poor by vested interests.

VII

The point which is being made here, is that the Inner Line Regulation and other protective land regulations, no doubt bar the plains people from owning landed property in the hill areas, but such regulations also generate a process of progressive concentration of vast landed property in the hands of the local middle class or a small group of well-off-natives and tend to aggravate the situation of rural poverty by pushing an increasingly larger section of the small and marginal farmers to the status of landless peasants. In this process, no fertile land will be retained for the cultivating families. Not only that such grossly unequal distribution of land also perpetuates the existing disparities of wealth as well as land alienation among the extremely poor tribesmen. This will certainly disturb social harmony. Thus social stratification based on private ownership of land has already become a reality. The emerging middle-class is neither opposed to the landed gentry nor to the Indian capitalist class. However, if the situation is to be improved even in a modest way, codification of tribal rights in land/forests, cadastral survey and land reforms will have to be implemented in an effective manner.

One of the provisions of North-East Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971 envisages the preservation of cultural identity of the tribesmen in isolation, but every one knows that cultural identity of a people is lost only under an exploitative order and not by the existence of another culture by their side. Besides, the belated emergence of the well-off-native class in these states has failed to displace ethnic identity as a factor in social, political and economic relations.

The reorganisation has failed to create an atmosphere of equanimity among the people of the seven new political units. It has further alienated the hills and plains people, thereby directly and indirectly augmenting mistrust and misunderstanding. The example of this fact is the occasional innocent people losing their lives.

The question to be raised is: Has the reorganisation of states on linguistic basis solved the problems of the states thus created? It has failed to protect the linguistic minorities of their linguistic rights besides giving rise to socio-economic problems. In this regard, S.K. Chaube in his article "Language Politics in Assam" published in *North-Eastern Affairs* (quarterly), October-December, 1972, Shillong, has aptly said that "the demand for a linguistic state is a peculiar middle class aspiration intended to establish its command on defined territories. It also aims at securing a control of the dominant group on the governmental offices. In the British period, most of the offices were shared by the British and the Bengalis. Introduction of Assamese as the medium is intended to complete the 'Assamese' grip on the offices of the state government." Thus the language movement was apparently emotional and cultural in character but there were solid economic reasons behind it. The regional political parties in the state provide leadership to both the state movement and the language movement in the state. From a political point of view, such movements lead to a sort of consolidation of the emerging middle class in the state which is no doubt true. But it is also to be noted that E.M.S. Namboodripad, the then Chief Minister of Kerala state, in a statement on April 14, 1967 said, that "the emergence of new political forces called for the recognition of the multilingual and multi national character of India and the need to make necessary adjustment in the federal character of the constitution". In a multilingual society, ethnic groups would entertain language appeals or linguistic appeal. Language is one the instruments to consolidate the group. This is considered as a symbol of an ethnic group.

VIII

Thus a deeper analysis of the reasons/causes for state autonomy/statehood and the adverse effects of the reorganisation of north-east region on its ethno-cultural and socio-economic political transition as mentioned in the foregoing pages, reveal that further reorganisation of

north-east India cannot be ruled out from the list of possibilities. The ethno-cultural and linguistic problems in Assam still continue. Assam has not been able to settle the perennial problems like political identity of the Bodos demanding the creation of a state on the northern banks of the Brahmaputra valley to be known as Bodoland, the major hill tribes—the Karbis of the Karbi Anglong District and the Dimasa Kacharis of North Cachar Hill District, demanding for an autonomous state and finally the Karbi-Dimasa-Kachari state and Bengali, which seriously threaten the solidarity of the state. Such a new identity seems to have emerged in the wake of both the language controversy and crisis of capitalist path of development. For sometime, the Garos in Meghalaya have identified themselves with the Khasi political aspirations. There is no reason to assume that the identification will remain fixed. Minority groups in Manipur have long been vocal in retaining their identities and having the aspirations for political and economic control within the areas of residence. Bengali percentage in Tripura is now 70 per cent. The result has been that political and administrative powers have passed from the hands of indigenous tribes to immigrant-Bengalis. Despite the fact, Tripura has yet to fully become a Bengali state, in as much as, non-Bengali interests predominate in the political process of that state. Besides, the hills masses of Tripura inspite of having their District Councils recently created under the Sixth Schedule to the Indian Constitution have not yet reconciled themselves with the present administrative set-up. They have their grievances of social and economic exploitation by outsiders (most Bengalis) and the negligent attitude of their state government. Similarly, the state of Mizoram has not yet finally settled the political identity of the Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas inhabiting the Chhaintuipui District. Although the Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas have been continuing to look after their distinctive functions as envisaged in the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution by the formation of the Pawi-Lakher Regional Council from 1953 to 1972 and the Lai District Council, the Mara District Council and the Chakma District Council from 1972 to till

date, identifying themselves with the Mizo political aspiration for sometime, yet they seem to be unreconciled with the Autonomous District Councils because there is no provision in the Sixth Schedule to bring the Council to participate in the development schemes and social welfare to the largest extent possible. But it is yet to be seen whether they will continue to maintain their identification keeping in view their distinct identity separate from that of the Mizo clans. However, the glaring example of this fact is the demand for creation of a separate Union Territory made by the leaders of the three tribes in 1971 for their areas. It, thus, signifies that the leaders of the three tribes-Pawi, Lakher, and Chakma have accepted the autonomous District Council only as a stop gap arrangement.

The Hmar identity crisis, a post eighties development, has emerged in Mizoram politics which has a geo-political significance due to strategic location. Hmar is one of the Mizo clans living in the north and north-eastern part of the Mizoram with a population of over thirteen thousand whose agnates are also living in the contiguous areas of Assam (South Cachar) and Manipur (Churachanpur area) having a population of 80,000 only. Both the tribesmen (Hmars and Mizos) worked together for improving the lot of the Mizo people, but recently the relation among them has become strained, because the Hmars' concentrated action plan is presently to establish a distinct ethno-cultural identity separate from the Mizos. A clearly perceptible unrest among the Hmar tribes has surfaced due to growing frustration, estrangement, feeling of deprivation and crisis of development administration. Therefore, the Hmars have found no other alternative but to organise themselves into a clan based political party named the Hmar People's Convention (H.P.C.) one the ethnic line of the Pawis, the Lakhers and the Chakmas in order to obtain the Autonomous District Council for their areas under the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution, though they are late in projecting their autonomy demand. The problem of the crisis of Hmar identity is, thus, nothing but a great challenge to the ethnic homogeneity of the Mizos in Mizoram.

Nagaland became a state in 1963 with a population of

only five lakhs that is far below the average population of any district in India. The creation of Nagaland signifies that the viability of a state in the country depends not on its population but on the distinctive ethno-cultural identity of the people. This has significantly inspired the other identity-conscious hills people of north-east India to fight for their statehood. Besides, Keeping in view the sociology of politics in India, one cannot be blind to the emerging trends as reflected by the aspirations and behaviour of various nationalities, sub-nationalities and ethnic groups. The disillusionment for not having obtained fair justice and proper accomodation in the political process of our country has been responsible for arousing a feeling of alienation. These feelings are reflected by the regional parties in the form of demand for autonomy to the states and for creation of statehood, though these regional political parties are generally the political front for the protection and consolidation of the interests of the emergent middle class and of their patrons—the landed gentry and the Indian capitalist class. However, in the context of the character of the Indian nation and federal character of the union, the regional parties are necessary elements to hold the heterogeneous country as one unit.

IX

A question arises as to what should be done for containing the possibility of further reorganisation of north-east India in particular and the rest of the country in general? The answer is the removal/eradication of social and economic grievances of both the plains and the hills people at the earliest possible moment so that they have a better and saner understanding of the whole situation. The growing ethno-cultural identity consciousness among the hills people has also been sharpened by the facts of social and economic injustice that has been in existence owing first to the mischievous policy of the colonial rulers and then the negligent attitude of the leaders of free India. The existing socio-economic structure and the capitalist path of development that the country has adopted after inde-

pendence, has sharpened not only the caste, religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic distinctions and communal tensions, it has also widened regional economic disparities, frustration, estrangement, feeling of deprivation, socio-economic injustice, negligence and insecurity coupled with the instinct of preserving the distinct cultures and traditions among various nationalities, sub-national groups and ethnic tribal groups. For instance, massive central grants to the north-eastern states have only helped to create a new properties "Middle Class", bereft of values and which thrives on crass opportunism, favouritism nepotism and corruption. The fruits of development in the form of huge central grants have been pocketed by the politician - bureaucrat - contractor lobby and the conditions of the common people have not registered even marginal improvement. It is also felt that no governments of the hills states of whatever political persuasion, have been able to formulate a plan for self-sustaining economic development for a society making the transition from a village based tribal structure to a more modern set-up. Thus the development process itself including the tribal welfare and other programmes of the Central and State Governments has given rise to new economic, political and social forces and institutions that generate the present social and political tensions. Hence it must be ensured that the benefits of development must reach the masses. If the tribesmen and the plains neglected poor people from oppression, deprivation, exploitation, under development, socio-economic injustice, land alienation and dependency are to be liberated, the present socio-economic structure of the country, which at present, increases/disparity, exploitation and injustice of all sorts, social evils, oppression and emergence of middle class, has to be radically restructured. Besides, a relevant point which is being made here is to be noted for future guidance that the "Opposition conclave" which met in Srinagar on October 5-7. 1983 has called for restructuring the Union State relations in their political, economic, legal and constitutional aspect so that the character of our multi-religious, multi-lingual and multi-culture country is preserved.