

9

Aikya Kerala : Realization Of a Dream

The national question or the question of formation of states on a linguistic basis and of state autonomy in a federal set up, was, along with the agrarian question, the most powerful force behind the post-war revolutionary upsurge swaying millions of people throughout India. This same national question, however was diverted into reactionary and disruptive channels by imperialism. The religious twist given to the national question by pro-imperialist elements in the beginning gave birth to the cry of Pakistan and became the weapon with which the broadest possible unity of the Indian people against imperialism was disrupted, ending in one of the most terrible carnages in human history and the creation of two hostile states - the Indian Union and Pakistan.

A similar effort to make use of the national question against the democratic movement was made in 1946-47 by the Government of Travancore. Those were the years, as we have seen, in which a mighty mass movement with the two slogans, 'Down with the American Model' and 'End the Dewan Rule', was shaking the autocratic rule to its foundations. One of the weapons which the government used against this movement was the national sentiment of the TAMILIAN people of South Travancore. The holy anger of the common people of Tamil Nadu against their oppressors, the ruling family of Travancore and its feudal satellites, was successfully diverted into hatred for the nationality of these oppressors. 'Down with the Malayalees' was the slogan through which the TAMILIAN people of South Travancore were rallied against the democratic movement. On this basis was built what was known as the 'Independent Travancore'

movement, 'demanding' that Travancore should not join the Indian Union, obviously directed against the unity of the Indian democratic movement. Though formally an 'all-Travancore' movement, it was only among the TAMILIANS in South Travancore that it had some mass following.

While the Government of Travancore was thus utilizing the national aspirations of the TAMILIAN people of South Travancore, the Government of Cochin was in another manner using the national aspirations of the Malayalees. The first half of 1946 saw in Cochin a similar democratic upsurge as was witnessed in Travancore. The demand for responsible government was rallying behind it all sections of the people, as a result of which even the 1942 gulf between the Communists and the rest of the democratic camp was being bridged. Joint rallies, demonstrations, etc., were being organized to voice this united demand. On July 29, 1946, precisely when an all-Cochin demonstration and a general strike of the working class and hartal of the merchants throughout the state were scheduled to be organized, the Maharaja came out with an announcement that (1) he was in perfect sympathy with the people's demand for responsible government and was taking steps to introduce it; and that (2) it was his cherished desire to work towards merging Cochin in a United Kerala province. The Maharaja significantly added that, in introducing responsible government and in establishing a United Kerala, all the hereditary honours and privileges of the ruling families would be preserved.

The Maharaja's statement was hailed as an 'inspiring lead' by the bourgeois leadership of the national movement not only in Cochin but throughout Kerala. The KPCC, the Cochin Praja Mandalam and the Travancore State Congress declared in one voice that they were going to work towards the realization of the objective set before them by the 'magnanimous' Maharaja. They, in consultation with several other organizations, set up a United Kerala Committee and began preparations for a United Kerala Convention which was held in April 1947 under the chairmanship of the President of the KPCC. Naturally, it was inaugurated by the Maharaja of Cochin who became the patron of the United Kerala movement.

Having thus successfully won over the goodwill of the bourgeois leadership of the national movement, the Government of Cochin started an offensive against the democratic movement—first against its vanguard but gradually against the entire movement. This has already been referred to in the last chapter. It need only be mentioned here that, because of the clever manoeuvres of the authorities in Cochin on the issue of responsible government and United Kerala, a big section of the democrats remained loyal to the Maharaja. Even when the Praja Mandalam ministers were thrown out of office, it was sought to be explained away as having been caused by the machinations of the people surrounding the Maharaja; the Maharaja himself was portrayed as blameless. Thus the anti-feudal democratic edge of the movement was blunted.

Furthermore, the very interpretation given to the United Kerala movement under the patronage of the Maharaja was as disruptive of the unity of the Indian democratic movement as the 'Down with Malayalees' movement in South Travancore. What the bourgeois leadership of the United Kerala movement wanted was not the unification of the contiguous areas of Madras, Cochin and Travancore where the Malayalam-speaking people form the majority, but the carving out of a multilingual province on the west coast. In this 'United Kerala' should be included, they demanded, not only the Tamil areas of South Travancore but other non-Malayalee areas like the northern Tulu and Canarese majority parts of South Kanara, Coorg, and the Tamil and tribal areas of the Nilgiris. This naturally roused intense indignation among the Tamilians, Kannadigas and the people of Coorg.

This chauvinistic interpretation of United Kerala was based on a falsified 'history' of Kerala according to which the ancient empire of Kerala stretched from Kanyakumari in the south to Gokarnam in the north. The Maharaja of Cochin's announcement on United Kerala in fact spoke of that ancient empire of Kerala whose restoration in all its glory was set before the people as the grand objective to be attained. Furthermore, the United Kerala Convention held in April 1947 paid tribute, by the erection of a statue before the Convention pandal, to Para-

surama of ancient myth, the legendary creator of Kerala. We have seen in earlier chapters how specious are the 'theories' of history based on the legend of Parasurama and how these 'theories' have their origin in the feudal-militarist ruling classes of medieval Kerala. That it was on this false 'theory of history' that the bourgeois organizers of the United Kerala movement based themselves shows the utterly reactionary character of their leadership over the movement.

Despite this, however, the movement rallied the democratic elements of Kerala. Although resenting the domination of the feudal elements headed by the Maharaja of Cochin, democratic sections of the people enthusiastically participated in the United Kerala Convention. The United Kerala Committee set up to continue the work of the Convention became the rallying centre of a large number of democratic organizations and groups. Never before in the history of Kerala had the slogan of United Kerala attracted such wide mass support. It seemed that everybody was for United Kerala.

Behind this apparent unity on the issue of United Kerala, very serious rifts emerged which became increasingly serious as days passed. The ruling family of Travancore and its satellites were opposed to United Kerala since it would lead to an undermining of their authority, at least to some extent; they were also determined that the Tamilians of South Travancore should not be allowed to join their brethren in the Madras part of Tamilnad. The bourgeoisie of Travancore for its part was anxious to keep the Tamilnad part of Travancore inside United Kerala, they were willing to give up their demand for United Kerala, if realizing it implied the relinquishing of the Tamil areas. The bourgeoisie of Cochin and Malabar were anxious to see Kerala united were at the same time afraid that United Kerala would be dominated by the economically stronger and politically better organized bourgeoisie of Travancore. These conflicts among the ruling classes of Kerala, on the one hand and of the neighbouring nationalities on the other, were fully exploited by the government of India and its states ministry to bring the states of Cochin and Travancore fully under its cont-

rol and to smash the demand for United Kerala.

When the Government of India and the states ministry initiated their policy of integration and merger of Indian states, Travancore and Cochin were among the few states excluded from this process on the ground that they were 'viable' states, like Mysore, Kashmir and Hyderabad. But, as integration and merger of 'non-viable' states were on the verge of being successfully concluded, the question arose of bringing them also under the full control of the states ministry. This was an important question for the additional reason that the democratic movement had already raised the slogan of uniting these two states with Malabar to form United Kerala. The states ministry, therefore, conceived the plan of uniting these two states to form a new Travancore-Cochin state.

This was presented before the champions of United Kerala as 'the first step' in the direction of realizing their goal: it was under this false plea that a section of the democratic people in Cochin and Travancore was led to accept it. As a matter of fact, however, it was a step, not in the direction of, but away from, the realization of United Kerala. For, not only did it continue the multilingual character of the new state of Travancore-Cochin, it also continued the division of both the Tamilian and the Malayalee peoples into those living in the state of Madras and in the new state of Travancore-Cochin; it at the same time perpetuated the rule of the Maharaja of Travancore as the Rajpramukh of the new state and provided for the payment of nearly Rs. 40 lakhs per year as allowance to the two ruling families of Travancore and Cochin. The Covenant which was drawn up as the basis for the formation of the new state and which was made part of the new Constitution of India made Travancore-Cochin a Part B state in whose affairs the Government of India had extensive powers of interference and control.

With this ended one phase of the struggle for United Kerala—the phase in which there was some hope that, if the people remained united, they could make the Government of India itself implement the slogan of United Kerala. That was the time when the all-India leadership of the Congress had to

resort to various stratagems like the appointment of the Dhar Commission, the publication of its report, its further examination by the J.V.P. Committee, etc., to sidetrack the people from the question of the formation of linguistic states. The inauguration of the Constitutions of India in 1950, following as it did the unification of Travancore and Cochin into one state, put new obstacles in the way of United Kerala. The modification of the Covenant of the unification of Travancore and Cochin; the transformation of the new Travancore-Cochin from the status of a Part B state to a Part A state; the ratification by the Indian Parliament as well as by the legislatures of Madras and Travancore-Cochin states; all these extremely difficult processes had to be gone through if a United Kerala state was to be formed. The United Kerala movement under bourgeois leadership therefore died a natural death; the United Kerala Committee which functioned for a couple of years was liquidated.

II

Though the United Kerala movement under bourgeois leadership was thus disrupted, the democratic upsurge out of which that movement arose did not come to an end. On the contrary it grew stronger and stronger with the passage of time.

It was in the midst of the biggest wave of mass actions achieving their highest forms in Punnapra-Vayalar and North Malabar that the KPCC-sponsored United Kerala movement arose. The brutal terror unleashed to suppress the common people who participated in these actions was ineffective. Though for a short while it succeeded in establishing a deathly calm in Ambalapuzha-Chertala taluks and in North Malabar, it ultimately released a far bigger wave of mass actions. In less than a year after the sanguinary massacre of Vayalar, tens of thousands of voices shouted: 'Vayalar blood is our blood', 'Release the heroes of Punnapra-Vayalar', 'Try and punish the police officers who murdered at Vayalar'. Not only Communists, but Socialists, Congressmen, all democrats, took up the cause of Punnapra-Vayalar as their own. Karivellore and Kavumpayi in North Malabar (the two places where peasants were

shot dead in Chirakkal taluk) also became symbols of the new phase of the struggle for land and democracy. The prestige and popularity of the Communist Party, the leader and organizer of these revolutionary actions, grew as never before.

The first elections to the legislatures of Travancore and Cochin, which took place in February and September 1948, respectively, showed that the left and democratic forces were uniting against the Congress. The Communist Party and the newly-formed Kerala Socialist Party (a party composed of the majority of the Congress Socialists in Kerala recruited in the years after 1942) formed a united front in Travancore to fight the Congress. They also united in boycotting the elections in Cochin. There also was an agreement between these two parties and the Travancore Tamilnad Congress in South Travancore. Though the candidates of the Communist — KSP United Front in Travancore did not secure a single seat, their joint campaign served to educate the people on the task of fighting for genuine democracy. Furthermore, the fact that they secured over two lakhs out of a total of over 20 lakh votes polled, added to the further fact that out of the balance, over five lakhs were polled by the Travancore Tamilnad Congress, showed that there was as solid mass basis for the struggle against the Congress.

Similarly in Cochin, though the boycott of the elections was comparatively ineffective, the campaign that the two parties together carried on against the Praja Mandalam and the People's Congress (an organization of the stooges of the palace) served to show that a new force was rising to fight reactionaries of all hues. It would have been far more effective, of course, if, as in Travancore, the two parties had jointly fought the election and consolidated the democratic forces. But the fact that they pursued the same policy in fighting reaction was a significant development since it indicated, as did the joint participation in the Travancore election, the emergence of a united revolutionary opposition.

Meanwhile, extra-parliamentary struggles were also breaking out on a big scale. Special mention should be made of two of these struggles.

The *Paliyam Satyagraha* to assert the right of untouchables to walk along certain roads that were prohibited to them was significant in two respects. First, it was directed against the biggest landlord in Cochin, and therefore, struck a sympathetic chord among the touchable peasants as well as among the untouchables; it was in fact a big mass action of the peasantry against feudal landlords, though it was not fought on a directly agrarian issue. Second, having been directed against the most decadent, the most barbarous form of caste separatism, it rallied the progressives of all castes; among the satyagrahis who braved the lathis of the police were boys and girls of the highest castes, including members of the ruling families of the state. It had the support of all the caste organizations, all the political parties (including local committees of the Congress) and several prominent individuals. It is significant that a Communist leader of the dock workers of Cochin, A.G. Velayudhan, died at the hands of the police while leading a squad of working-class volunteers to the scene of the satyagrah. Here was, therefore, that combination of the struggle for social equality, the struggle against landlordism, the mobilization of all democrats and progressives and the leadership in action of the working class, which is the essence of the struggle for a United Democratic Kerala.

The second struggle that should be specially mentioned is the *glorious struggle of the North Malabar peasantry*. This, as is well-known, was the most determined action which the rural poor of North Malabar resorted to against the landlord hoarders. It unleashed such an unprecedented mass force, the people who participated in it showing a high degree of militancy and resourcefulness that the government had to call the military to crush it. Karivellore, Korome, Pazhassi, Thillengeri, Onchiyam, Munaynkunnu became the symbols of a new phase in the history of our peasant movement, the phase in which the organized peasantry under Communist leadership relied on its own strength to defeat its class enemy.

These struggles were, however, conducted at a time when the Congress still had the halo of the biggest if not the only national organization in the country. Congress had got full power

at the Centre only a few weeks before; it was on the eve of coming to power in Travancore and Cochin. A sizeable section of democrats therefore felt that the Congress should be given time and that the Communists were unnecessarily creating trouble for the Congress and its government. This view was shared by sections of the peasantry and of the working class itself. The genuine desire of sections of the democratic people to give time to the Congress government was fully utilized against the fighting vanguard of the people, the Communist Party.

This attitude, however, was extremely short lived. The people soon began to see that Congressmen in power did not mean people's representatives in power, but corrupt and greedy individuals trying to loot the people through misuse of the state machinery. Corruption in the granting of permits and bus routes, in the assignment of lands, widespread nepotism, creation of new jobs to give employment to Congress stooges—were all added to the burden of increase in the price of rice, successive breakdowns of the rationing system, squeezing of the poor peasant in the name of procurement, unrestricted blackmarket and endless repression. People began to see that the limitless greed and selfishness of Congressmen were leading them to mutual squabbles on the issue of dividing the loot. Groups of Congress sympathizers were disgusted when they saw minister after minister, MLA after MLA, intriguing against one another. Newspaper columns, trains and buses, shops and offices, every place where people had an opportunity to get together and discuss, became places for expressing extreme indignation at what was happening, hatred and contempt for the 'national organization' and its leaders.

This was naturally sought to be utilized by reactionaries of all hues. The Catholic hierarchy in Travancore and Cochin, Hindu reaction, different factions in the Congress, all took advantage of the anti-Congress sentiment in order to pull down their adversaries from seats of power and to secure their own narrow, sectional interests. Organizations like the Hindu Mandlam and the Cochin Party, emerged. Large sections of the people, however, rejected these reactionary parties and their false slogans, and rallied round the Communist Party and other democratic

parties and organizations. It is remarkable that, in the first municipal elections that took place in Cochin after the Congress Ministry took office (the elections of December, 1948), the Communists secured a sizeable percentage of seats. It is also remarkable that the first Communist elected to the Cochin state legislature early in 1949, Gokalakrishna Menon, was underground at that time. And by 1950, when a series of by-elections took place in the Travancore-Cochin state, the Congress had become so discredited that it lost most of the seats.

III

One indication of the process of disillusionment among the people was the growth of a new generation of socialists (in place of the 1942-45 generation the majority of whom had left the Socialist Party to form the KSP and started joint work with the Communists) as well as the origin and development of what later became the KMP Party. When the genuinely democratic rank and file of the Congress began to get disgusted with their own organization, although they had not yet cast off their ideological and political prejudices against the Communist Party, they started seeking out new forms of organization for their activity. The development of these parties was an indication that, instead of the Congress succeeding in isolating the vanguard from the masses of the democratic movement, the Congress was itself getting isolated from the masses.

The factor that proved decisive in the situation however was the leading role played by the Communist Party. It was the Communist Party which, after an initial phase of considering the National Congress a part of the anti-imperialist movement even after the August 15 transfer of power, undertook extensive popularization of the slogan: 'Replace the Congress Government by a People's Democratic Government.' It was again the Communist Party which stood at the head of the fighting people in a series of major and minor struggles, such as the Paliyam Satyagraha, the North Malabar struggle, the September (1948) strike of Travancore students, several struggles of the industrial and agricultural labourers, etc. The Party penetrated into several new areas and built up the democratic movement in

spite of the tremendous difficulties it had to face.

All these activities provoked unprecedented repression involving the imprisonment of over 3,000 Party members and sympathizers, the arrest and beating up of thousands of people and other unspeakable atrocities, committed by the police. Enemies of the Party thought, as they had in 1940 and 1946, that the Party was completely smashed; friends of the Party and even sections of the Party membership thought that the Party had gone too far in leading struggles. It was, however, proved by the subsequent demonstration of popular support for the Party, the tremendous mass response when the leaders of the Party came out of jail in 1951, that, as on earlier occasions, repression had, far from weakening, strengthened the Party.

It does not, of course, follow from this that the Party committed no mistakes in leading these struggles. Mistakes were undoubtedly committed both of a strategical and tactical nature: the Party swung from the original mistake of overestimating the role of the bourgeoisie in colonial revolutions to the new mistake of totally denying that role; in the process of correcting the earlier mistake of underestimating the leading role of the working class, the Party committed the equally serious mistake of denying the role of the peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie, denying the crucial importance of the anti-imperialist nationalist factor, virtually denying the fact that British imperialism still had its grip over India. Mistakes were also committed in the direction of underestimating the role of parliamentary work in further advancing the democratic movement, equating the gradual process of mass disillusionment with the Congress which was taking place with the already completed process of the isolation of the Congress from the people, advancing forms of struggle for which the masses were not yet ready, etc.; Despite these mistakes, however, the Party was going along generally correct lines. Its main political line of fighting the Congress government, its central political slogan of 'replacing the Congress government by a People's Democratic Government' was quite in tune with the aspirations of the people. It was not the party but its main political opponent—the Congress government—that was getting isolated from the people.

This reality became clear beyond dispute when the results of the first general elections in the first quarter of 1952 were announced. The Congress claim of being the unchallenged leader of the people was proved hollow. The Communist Party and various socialist parties on the left, as well as communal and other opposition parties on the right, did put up an effective fight against the Congress. Among these opposition parties, however, it was the Communist Party and not the Socialist Party (then under the joint leadership of Jayaprakash Narayan, Ashok Mehta, Lohia and so on) that emerged as the leading party of opposition. The leader of Communist Party in Parliament became the leader of the entire opposition; the same position prevailed in four state legislatures—West Bengal, Hyderabad, Madras and Travancore-Cochin; in the last two there was even a possibility of the Communist and their allies forming a coalition (non-Congress) government.

The electorate of Kerala played a particularly significant role in this development. Both in Travancore-Cochin and in Malabar, the Congress was reduced to a minority both in terms of the votes polled as well as in the seats secured: it secured 44 out of 108 seats and 11,95,943 out of 33,41,767 votes in Travancore-Cochin; in Malabar, the figures were four out of 30 seats with 3,02,353 out of 11,37,335 votes. Furthermore, it was the united front of leftists (Communist Party, Revolutionary Socialist Party, and Kerala Socialist Party) in Travancore-Cochin and the alliance of the Communist Party, Kisan Mazddor Praja Party and Independents in Malabar that secured the majority of opposition votes and seats.

IV

Among the important factors which led to the defeat of the Congress in the 1952 elections was the national aspiration of the non-Hindi-speaking peoples to have their own states on the basis of the linguistic-cultural principle.

The Congress suffered the biggest reverses in the non-Hindi-speaking regions—the Punjab, Bengal, Andhra, Tamilnad and

Kerala. Each of them had its own variant of the national (linguistic-cultural) problems and movement. The Punjabi national problem, for instance, was mixed up with the problem of Sikh vs Hindu communalism; the nationalism of Andhra and Kerala was directed against the North on the one hand and Tamilnad on the other. Tamil nationalism, in its turn, was to a limited extent directed against Kerala and Andhra but was mainly anti-North (added to which was anti-brahminism).

The Communist Party was the one party which tried to intervene in the developing national situation, to give the emerging national movement a progressive democratic content. The Party's understanding had no doubt been incorrect earlier in the sense of mixing up the national and religious questions (support to the demand for Pakistan). This, however, did not prevent it from championing the demand of the various nationalities in the Indian sub-continent for the formation of their own states and for autonomy of the nationally reorganized states. Furthermore, the Communist Party demarcated itself from the national-chauvinists within each nationality and fought for the solution of borders and other disputes with neighboring nationalities on the basis of justice and democracy.

This added to the militant mass struggles led by the Party made it a big political force in Kerala and Andhra. The relative weakness of the Party in the Punjab, Tamilnad, Orissa and elsewhere enabled other political parties and groups (like the Akalis in the Punjab, the Dravida Kazhakam in Tamilnad and Ganatantra Parishad in Orissa) to utilize the growing political discontent as well as the national factor both against the Congress as well as against the left opposition. Even in the Hindi regions where the Communist Party was relatively weak, parties of right opposition and communalism utilized to their own advantage not only the growing discontent of the masses against the Congress regime but the national sentiment of Hindi replacing English.

It was natural under these circumstances that the post-election period should witness a new political upsurge demanding the formation of linguistic states, or rather for the implementation

of the policy adopted by the Congress as long ago as in 1921. Andhra, Maharashtra, Karnataka reinforced the movement for the formation of their respective states. The democratic movements in 'Part B' (former princely) states put up their own demand for full equality with 'Part A' states. They in their turn were joined by their brethren of 'Part C' states. The complete reorganization of existing (Part A, B and C) states with necessary border adjustments to form linguistic states thus came on the agenda.

The Congress leadership was totally opposed to this. Forgetting all their earlier commitments, they began to praise the virtues of multilingual states, since they were allegedly 'broad and cosmopolitan' as opposed to linguistic states which were 'narrow and parochical'. We have already seen how they manoeuvred in the immediate post-Independence years (through the Dhar Commission and the J. V. P. Report). They framed the 'Republican' Constitution in which the biggest princes were transformed into Raj Pramukhs; the 'Democratic' constitution according to which the administration in all the non-Hindi states was to be carried on in one of two languages (English or Hindi) neither of which was understood by the people. This callousness to the needs and desires of the people—particularly the people of non-Hindi states—was continued in the post-election years.

The people, however were not prepared to bow to the will of the ruling Congress party. The demand for states reorganization became insistent. It assumed the biggest proportion in the shortest time in Andhra whose national movement was three to four decades old. All sections of the people in Andhra joined the movement. It was against this background that an old respected Gandhite, Potti Srinamulu, went on hunger-strike to enforce the demand for the formation of Andhra state. when the government refused to concede the demand and consequently Potti Srinamulu died, there was a veritable revolt in Andhra.

The situation got so out of control that the government was forced to (i) form an Andhra state minus Hyderabad as the

first step, and to (ii) set up a States Reorganization Commission entrusted with the task of examining the whole question.

These developments on the all-India plane enormously strengthened the movement for the formation of an Aikya (United) Kerala state. Many of those who had considered the demand for such a state to be unrealizable saw that they had been wrong. A new, more broad-based and better-organized Aikya Kerala movement took birth. A well-argued case was presented before the States Reorganization Commission.

It was not as if there were no voices of dissent. They did exist and had the support of powerful vested interests. There were, for instance, feudal circles in and around the ruling family of Travancore, who knew that the formation of Kerala state would lead to the inclusion of South Travancore in the Madras state; they could not reconcile themselves to a separation of that region (in which they were directly interested) from the new state; they, therefore, preferred the continuance of the bilingual state. Again, there were sections of professionals and government employees who were apprehensive of lesser employment opportunities since the new state would be smaller in size. Political considerations were also not wanting : was there not a danger of the new state being under Communist influence since the Party was strong both in Malabar and in Travancore-Cochin ?

These objections, however, were overcome not only by the democratic aspirations of the mass of the working people, but also by the class interests of the growing bourgeoisie. The politicians, professionals and the capitalist entrepreneurs of the Malabar region had the oppressive feeling that their rivals in Tamilnad were thwarting all attempts at the development of Malabar. Their counterparts in the Travancore-Cochin region saw in the new province a wider field for their activities, more favourable opportunities for the advancement of their interests: both joined the movement for Aikya Kerala.

Moved as they were by these considerations, they stood for as big a state as they could get: 'rejecting the false principle of

linguistic state,' they demanded the Tamil-speaking taluks of south Travancore, the Kannada (or Tulu) speaking taluks of South Kanara and the mixed-linguistic Gudalur taluk in the Nilgiri district—all on the 'historical' claim that 'ancient Kerala extended from Gokarnam to Kanya Kumari'! But in the event of this not being realized, they were willing to settle for a smaller Kerala state rather than have Malabar continue to be part of Madras.

Actually, however, there was no possibility of their claim being accepted. The States Reorganization Commission rejected all their claims except for a part of Kasargod taluk—a part with Kannada (Tulu) majority—on the ground that the taluk as a whole is not Kannada majority and that a taluk should not be cut up. Barring this and barring the plantation belt of Devicolum and Peerumade (with a majority of Tamil labourers who however had their homes in the Madras state), the new state recommended by the Commission was in fact a linguistic state of the Malayalees.

The implementation of this recommendation, the formation of the new Kerala state on November 1, 1956 was thus the realization of the long cherished desire of progressive Malayalees.