

A Study into Offences by Extremist Groups

- G.Sreenivas, SP, S.I.B., Hyderabad.

Apart from external threats to freedom, developing countries are facing acute subversions of human freedoms from internal contradictions and turmoil. Societies are sharply divided on issues of ethnicity, religion, region etc. There is an increasing degree of violence. It has assumed international dimensions in the form of terrorism, fundamentalism and so on and so forth. This has given rise to the issue of State violence Vs Group violence.

India today is like an experimental ground for the relentless pursuit of all forms of violence; separatist, secessionist, ethnic, religious and others. There are instances of inhuman attacks on innocent lives in the most inhuman way

This is no exception to Andhra Pradesh where the violence by the extremist groups has increased on an unprecedented scale leading to violence and counter violence. Violence breeds violence and there is no stage of return for any one of the two, whether it is the State or these groups perpetuating violence. It is essential to probe how far this violence is able to protect the Human Rights of the individual or the Society (Group Rights). The State and the extremist groups which basically claim and vow to protect Human Rights are the main causative factors of violating Human Rights. The Extremist groups say that their origin and goal is to capture power and safeguard the Human Rights of the individuals. The question to be pondered is whether they are able to achieve this goal? In the name of protecting Human Rights it has become the major group

violating Human Rights either directly or indirectly. If this is the case how can they claim to be protecting the Human Rights? The Group, which criticises the State, for not being protectors of Human Rights, itself is violating Human Rights. In this backdrop there is a need to study the group violence perpetuated by the extremist groups. Hence a detailed study of violation of Human Rights by these groups in the North Telangana area of Andhra Pradesh was undertaken.

The present study was conducted in North Telangana Region which is supposed to be the hot bed of extremist movement. The study is based on both primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected from 200 respondents across the different sections of the society chosen at the rate of 40 persons from each of the five districts viz., Adilabad, Nizamabad, Warangal, Khammam and Karimnagar.

A detailed questionnaire was administered to the respondents by the interview method. The secondary data was collected from the Police Department, Newspapers and other Published material to present a macro level analysis.

Human Rights mainly concern relationships between individuals and the State. They control and regulate the exercise of State power over individuals, grant freedom to individuals in relation to the State and require States to satisfy the basic human needs of people within their jurisdiction. They are best understood as those rights expressed in International treaties (or instruments) which

have been agreed upon by States; and, which are set to human rights standards. The most famous of these is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948. Since the Second World War human rights theory and practice have evolved every couple of decades, i.e., "generations" of rights.

At first human rights were considered to be claims for non-intervention by governments in the lives of the citizens - to prevent the abuse of State power. These first

generation rights came to be known as 'Civil & Political Rights'. In the 1960's it was argued that claims for positive intervention by governments in order to promote social justice should also be recognized as human rights. This second generation of rights came to be known as economic, social and cultural rights. So, the first two generations of rights are considered to be interdependent; it is not possible to separate them as one depends on the other.

Table - I (Offences committed by extremists during 2003)

District	Peoples War			Jana Sakthi			Prathigatana			Praja Pratigatana			PP/New Democracy			Other Groups		
	M	O	Tot	M	O	Tot	M	O	T	M	O	T	M	O	T	M	O	T
Adilabad	8	60	68	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karimnagar	17	58	75	9	35	44	2	4	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
Warangal	16	89	105	5	16	21	-	7	7	-	15	15	1	-	1	1	18	19
Khammam	3	8	11	-	3	3	-	-	-	1	11	12	-	-	-	-	4	4
Nizamabad	6	26	32	-	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Medak	-	-	-	1	26	27	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1
MBNR	8	49	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nalgonda	14	46	60	-	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	2	2
R.Reddy	1	7	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Srikakulam	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VZM	3	15	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
Vsp®	6	22	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E.G.Dist	2	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Krishna	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guntur	35	101	136	1	5	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prakasam	1	28	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chittoor	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anantapur	6	34	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
Cuddapah	1	19	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kurnool	2	25	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
G.Total	129	597	726	16	97	113	2	11	13	1	28	29	1	5	6	2	35	37

Table - II (Professional background of the respondents)

Respondents	ADB	KNR	WRL	NZB	KMM	Total
Doctors	2	2	2	2	2	10
Teachers	2	2	2	2	2	10
Police	2	2	2	2	2	10
Revenue	2	2	2	2	2	10
Forest	2	2	2	2	2	10
Excise	2	2	2	2	2	10
Other Officials	2	2	2	2	2	10
Politicians	2	2	2	2	2	10
Farmers	8	8	8	8	8	40
Agriculture Labour	4	4	4	4	4	20
Tribals	5	5	5	5	5	25
SC	5	5	5	5	5	25
Surrendered Cadres	2	2	2	2	2	10
TOTAL	40	40	40	40	40	200

Table - III (Socio - economic background of the respondents)

S.No	Respondent Groups	Social Status				Economic Status		
		OC	BC	SC	ST	Rich Class	Middle	Poor
1.	Doctors	6	4	0	0	3	7	0
2.	Teachers	4	5	0	1	0	9	1
3.	Police	4	4	1	1	0	10	0
4.	Revenue	6	3	1	0	0	9	1
5.	Forest	4	3	2	1	0	8	2
6.	Excise	6	3	1	0	0	9	1
7.	Other Officials	3	6	1	0	1	9	0
8.	Politicians	2	4	0	4	0	6	4
9.	Farmers	15	18	3	4	3	21	16
10.	Ag.Labour	3	11	4	2	0	1	19
11.	Tribals (ST)	0	0	0	25	1	4	20
12.	SC	0	0	25	0	0	4	21
13.	Surrendered Cadres	1	7	1	1	1	1	8
Total		54	68	39	39	9	98	93
Percentage		27.0	34.0	19.5	19.5	4.5	49.0	46.5

Both categories of rights may require positive State intervention/ restraint and they entitle individuals to rights. This is where the third generation of human rights came in. They are commonly known as "collective rights" or "group rights".

The UN notion of Human Rights violation is limited to omission or commission of Human Rights on internationally agreed principles of Human Rights either by the State or its agents. This is clear that the UN definition is restricted to the element of State or its agency, which violate Human Rights. It does not take up the issue of groups who equally violate the Human Rights. Hence the State is the basic protector of Human Rights and sees that no one violates the Human Rights and takes stringent action against the person who violates the Human Rights. But here, the group in the form of extremism, violate the basic human rights of the individual drawing the State into embarrassment. Global definition of violation of Human Rights should not be restricted only to the State or its agents but its scope should be extended to the 'groups' who also violate the Human Rights, at times, more than the State. In addition, Human Rights violation is always perceived as physical violence, with out taking into consideration the socio-economic factors, which also lead to the violation of Human Rights. A person deprived of poor medical facility or deprived of food is in principle deprived of Human Rights. Such questions need deep surge into the definition of Human Rights. The entire

causative factors for the violation of Human Rights will have to be listed out and the definition has to be basically adjusted to that effect.

Left Wing Extremism is inspired by the Naxalbarry Movement in West Bengal. Ultras among the Andhra communists proclaimed Mao's thought as real Marxism - Leninism and rejected parliamentary path. The movement started in Srikakulam, spread to Telangana and it is at no point of return though the principles and ideologies have come to be diluted in the course of time. Though, extremist groups emerged to fight the socio-economic inequalities in the society, later they slowly derogated and split into number of groups and sub-groups causing concern to the State and the public. Each group has its own interests and in the melee confuses the public with their ideology and action. As every group is oriented towards carrying fire arms/guns, naturally the people are subjected to fear and insecurity. The public at large is not aware that there exist 29 major and minor groups. The survey points out that majority of the respondents are aware of only five extremists groups viz., CPI (ML) PW (96%), CPI (ML) Jana Shakti (69%), CP (ML) Praja Pratighatana (47%), CPI (ML) Pratighatana (42.5%) and CPI (ML) New Democracy (39%) and knowledge of the respondents about the remaining 24 groups is negligible.

The expectation of the public is less from the extremists. Has the public understood the

nature of extremist movement? How is it going to benefit them, etc? In the course of time, it has become evident that extremists have become a cause of concern, as they do not allow the individuals to enjoy freedom and liberty. The extremists who spoke and spread ideals ran away with huge party money collected from the people either voluntarily or by coercion. The gender harassment in the party, differences among the party cadre, wrong actions pursued by the extremists like blasting of the bus at Chinthagudem on November 18, 2002 and killing 20 persons mistaking that police were travelling in the bus etc are points against extremists. The people in North Telangana have clearly understood the movement and

their support if at all, is only due to fear of gun and the consequent insecurity. The survey reveals that 80% of the respondents denounced the extremist movement and only 6% of the respondents are in favour of the extremist movement, while 14% had no opinion.

Human Rights are violated by these extremist groups day in and day out directly or indirectly causing inconvenience, fear and insecurity to the public and embarrassment to the State. It may be seen that as many as 94% of the respondents felt that the extremist activities violated the Human Rights, only 2.5% of the respondents did not agree with this view while the remaining 3.5% had not expressed any opinion.

Table - IV (Opinion of the respondents on the extremist movement).

S.No	Respondent Groups	Opinion on Extremist Movement		
		Approve	Disapprove	No Opinion
1.	Doctors	0	6	4
2.	Teachers	0	9	1
3.	Police	0	10	0
4.	Revenue	1	9	0
5.	Forest	1	7	2
6.	Excise	0	8	2
7.	Other Officials	0	10	0
8.	Politicians	1	9	0
9.	Farmers	1	36	3
10.	Agricultural Labour	2	16	2
11.	Tribals (ST)	1	22	2
12.	SC	3	15	7
13.	Surrendered Cadres	2	3	5
Total		12	160	28
Percentage		6.0	80.0	14.0

Table - V (Extremist activities considered by the respondents as violation of Human Rights)

Activity	Respondent Groups														Percentage
	Doctors	Teachers	Police	Revenue	Forest	Excise	Other Officials	Politicians	Farmers	Ag. Labour	Tribals (ST)	SC	Surrendered	Total	
Murders	10	10	10	10	8	9	10	10	39	20	25	24	10	195	97.5
Threats	10	8	9	9	9	9	10	10	38	14	25	24	10	185	92.5
Blasting	9	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	38	18	25	22	10	190	95.0
Landmines	8	8	10	8	10	8	10	10	38	18	25	25	10	188	94.0
Anti-voting	9	8	10	7	10	8	10	10	38	17	24	23	9	183	91.5
Bandhs	10	7	9	7	8	9	10	10	37	18	24	23	10	182	91.0
Extortion	9	8	9	8	8	9	8	10	37	18	24	18	10	176	88.0
Forcing shelter	8	7	8	8	8	9	8	10	38	18	25	19	10	176	88.0
Forcing to join	10	9	9	7	9	9	7	10	38	14	25	23	10	180	90.0
Anti-contesting	10	9	9	6	9	8	8	10	37	17	25	21	10	179	89.5
Anti-cultivation	10	7	8	5	7	9	9	10	37	18	24	20	9	173	86.5
Anti-visits	10	9	8	5	8	8	8	10	37	19	25	20	10	177	88.5
Anti- Govt. Employment	9	8	8	5	7	8	8	10	37	18	25	21	10	174	87.0
Anti-public office	10	9	10	5	8	9	9	10	37	17	25	22	9	180	90.0
Obstructing	10	7	9	7	9	9	8	10	38	14	25	21	10	177	88.5
Preventing development	10	8	8	7	8	8	8	10	36	18	24	21	10	176	88.0
Forcing cover	9	7	9	5	8	9	7	10	38	18	25	20	9	174	87.0
Hit lists	9	8	7	6	9	9	7	10	37	17	24	20	9	172	86.0
Destroying crops	9	7	8	5	8	8	7	8	38	14	22	20	10	164	82.0
Looting	10	7	9	5	9	9	8	10	38	18	21	21	10	175	87.5
Human bombs	9	8	8	5	8	8	7	10	39	18	21	20	10	171	85.5
Preventing agricultural labour	8	8	7	4	8	8	7	9	39	17	22	21	9	167	83.5
Preventing tribals	10	7	9	5	8	8	9	10	37	17	24	20	10	174	87.0

Killing of innocents by the extremist groups, like civilians who are in no way against any one, either the State or the extremists, is a heinous act. Why should the informant be killed? Any individual, as per the law has to necessarily provide information with regard to any anti-social activity or element. Thus by giving information, he is legitimately discharging his

duty towards the State. The extremists view that they are eliminating the class enemies is not supported by facts. From 1990 to 2003, statistics shows that 141 SCs, 234 STs, 1604 BCs were killed whereas only 525 OCs were killed. Even in the Ocs, it is the poorer sections that lost their lives in these violent acts.

Table - VI (Caste-wise classification of Murders committed by extremists).

YEAR	SC	ST	BC	OC	TOTAL
1990	26	6	133	31	196
1991	14	26	163	65	268
1992	8	21	155	50	234
1993	5	14	119	33	171
1994	9	6	82	30	127
1995	17	19	56	29	121
1996	6	6	146	44	202
1997	13	23	175	46	257
1998	12	26	129	51	218
1999	3	6	114	33	156
2000	9	19	78	20	126
2001	6	26	121	31	184
2002	6	14	58	23	101
2003	7	22	75	39	143
Total	141	234	1604	525	2504

Apart from this, the extremists followed inhuman methods of destruction. From 1987 to 2003, in 142 landmine incidents, 216 policemen and 86 civilians were killed. No civil society can afford to tolerate such acts

of inhuman practices. These practices are just followed to put the individuals and the society in constant fear. Issuing threats to people like death warrants or listing them in "Hit list" causes fear, insecurity and agony to the

individual. The survey pointed out that 86.5% of the respondents mentioned extracting money and occupying the agricultural lands of the farmers and the landlords as Human Rights violation. For example, naxalites looted stocks from a medical shop, provision stores, cloth store and from houses and carried away 75 bags of paddy etc. on October 14th 2002 from Vemavaram village in Machavaram Mandal of Guntur district (Times of India dt.15.10.2002). In the survey 87.5% of the respondents accepted it to be human rights violation. Extremists blasted/torched a number of Telephone exchanges, government buildings, RTC Buses, Trains, Railway Stations, government vehicles. In 2003 alone they damaged 622 items of property worth about Rs.14,98,10,350. The damage caused to the public property indirectly affects the rights of the individuals preventing them to use them. A pregnant woman in a bus could not reach the hospital due to the torching of the bus, and died due to lack of medical facility! The records in MRO Offices are burnt leading to non-availability of land records. Depriving of a telephone leads to inconvenience to the public. 96.5% of the respondents categorically raised their voice against this. Every one has the right to take his/her own decision, but there are incidents where the naxalites forcibly took away youngsters to join in the movement, depriving them the right

to think and act. For example, a 16 year old girl Bhumavva of Englaspur village of Khanapur Mandal in Adilabad district was taken away by the extremists in September 2002 (The Hindu dt. 16.09.2002)

The other methods of the extremists like forcing the politicians to resign from their positions, not to contest, not to vote, boycott elections etc are violation of the basic human rights of the individual. Any individual in the civil society has right to vote, to contest in the elections, and to hold public office. The frequent bandh calls given by the groups restrict the movement of the public, there by violating their freedom of movement, which is basic right guaranteed in the Indian Constitution.

The survey clearly shows that to mitigate/ curb the extremist problem, use of force is not a solution. The belief of the public is that by use of force no results can come forth. The extremist movement was not born today and it has a history of three decades. Violence breeds violence and it is counter productive to development or to solve a problem. If extremism is looked at, as law and order problem, it will continue without any solution. The past reveals that treating it as law and order issue lead to unprecedented violence with no point of return, either, for the State or for the extremists.

Table - VII (Measures suggested by respondents to curb extremism).

S No	Respondent Groups	Development Activities	Awareness programmes	Use of force Govt.	Talks with reforms	Structural/ Functional
1	Doctors	9	9	6	8	7
2	Teachers	7	10	1	10	6
3	Police	8	8	6	8	7
4	Revenue	9	7	4	7	3
5	Forest	9	8	3	8	5
6	Excise	10	9	6	7	8
7	Other Officials	7	9	2	8	5
8	Politicians	9	8	2	6	6
9	Farmers	35	37	7	30	22
10	Agr. Labour	18	14	2	16	8
11	Tribals (ST)	22	22	3	23	14
12	SC	19	21	3	16	14
13	Surrendered	10	9	0	8	7
Total		172	171	45	155	112
Percentage		86.0	85.5	22.5	77.5	56.0

Only 22.5% of respondents supported the use of force. Even this 22.5% supported use of force along with packages of other programmes like developmental activities, awareness programmes etc. 77.5% respondents in the multiple survey

favoured talks with the Government and felt that only holding talks with extremists will not suffice unless developmental activities and awareness programmes are carried out on a war footing.



The test of every religious, political, or educational system, is the man which it forms. If a system injures the intelligence it is bad. If it injures the character it is vicious. If it injures the conscience it is criminal.

Henri Frederic Amiel