

ACMUN 2026

Background Guide

ALL INDIA POLITICAL PARTIES MEET (AIPPM)

AGENDA
**REVIEWING THE CONSTITUTIONAL,
POLITICAL, AND FEDERAL
IMPLICATIONS OF THE
DELIMITATION EXERCISE AND THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE THREE
LANGUAGE POLICY IN INDIA**



Message from the Executive Board

Dear Parliamentarians,

It is our immense pleasure to welcome you to the Lok Sabha of ACMUN.

As your Executive Board, we are delighted to have the opportunity to chair this committee and look forward to three days of engaging debate, rigorous parliamentary procedure, and thoughtful deliberation. The Lok Sabha is a forum where ideas are tested, policies are scrutinized, and every member has the opportunity to shape the course of the discussion. We hope to create an environment that encourages informed discourse, respectful disagreement, and meaningful collaboration.

The agenda before this House—Reviewing the Constitutional, Political, and Federal Implications of the Delimitation Exercise and the Implementation of the Three-Language Policy in India—addresses two of the most significant and contemporary issues influencing India's democratic and federal framework. These subjects require delegates to move beyond rhetoric and engage with constitutional principles, political realities, demographic shifts, linguistic diversity, and the evolving relationship between the Union and the States. We encourage each of you to approach the committee with an open mind, strong research, and a willingness to appreciate perspectives from across India's diverse political landscape.

Whether you are an experienced parliamentarian or participating in your first Lok Sabha simulation, remember that impactful debate stems not only from extensive research but also from attentive listening, strategic negotiation, and effective collaboration. Parliamentary debate is as much about building consensus as it is about defending your ideology. We encourage you to challenge ideas respectfully, uphold the decorum of the House, and make the most of every opportunity to contribute meaningfully.

This study guide is intended to serve as a foundation for your preparation by introducing the key constitutional provisions, historical context, legal developments, and political dimensions surrounding the agenda. It is by no means exhaustive, nor does it encompass the nuances of every political party's position. We strongly encourage you to supplement your preparation with independent research, including constitutional provisions, judicial precedents, reports of relevant commissions, parliamentary debates, government policies, and credible academic sources.

Above all, we hope this committee becomes a space for learning, critical thinking, and engaging discussion. Should you have any questions regarding the agenda or committee procedure, please do not hesitate to reach out to us before the conference. We are always happy to assist.

We wish you the very best in your preparation and look forward to witnessing passionate speeches, compelling arguments, and exemplary parliamentary conduct at ACMUN.

Jai Hind.

Nimisha Maria Nishant
Chairperson

All India Political Parties Meet (AIPPM) - Overview

The All India Political Parties Meet (AIPPM) is a specialised committee that simulates the dynamic landscape of Indian politics and policymaking. Unlike traditional United Nations committees, where delegates represent sovereign states and advocate their respective foreign policies, AIPPM requires delegates to assume the roles of Indian political leaders and represent the ideology, priorities, and political interests of their allotted parties.

The committee is designed to replicate the political environment of India, where governance is shaped through debate, negotiation, coalition-building, and consensus among parties with diverse ideological perspectives. Delegates are expected to analyse national issues not only through constitutional and legal principles but also through the lens of political feasibility, electoral considerations, regional aspirations, and public policy.

A distinguishing feature of AIPPM is its emphasis on political realism. Every delegate represents an actual political figure or party and must remain consistent with their assigned portfolio's ideology, public statements, legislative record, and policy positions. Success in committee is therefore measured not only by the quality of debate but also by the delegate's ability to authentically portray their assigned leader while contributing constructively to the discussion.

Unlike a formal sitting of Parliament, an AIPPM is not bound by the legislative procedures prescribed under the Constitution of India. Instead, it serves as a consultative political forum where parties deliberate upon matters of national importance, negotiate policy alternatives, identify areas of consensus, and propose recommendations for consideration by the Government and Parliament. The committee encourages bipartisan dialogue while recognising that political disagreements are an inherent feature of a vibrant democracy.

Debate within AIPPM is often characterised by spirited exchanges, strategic alliances, negotiations, and ideological contestation. Delegates are encouraged to challenge opposing viewpoints, defend their party's stance with credible evidence, and engage in constructive criticism while maintaining parliamentary decorum and mutual respect. Effective participation requires a combination of constitutional understanding, political awareness, persuasive public speaking, and diplomatic negotiation.

For this edition of ACMUN, the committee will deliberate upon the agenda:

Reviewing the Constitutional, Political, and Federal Implications of the Delimitation Exercise and the Implementation of the Three-Language Policy in India.

This agenda requires delegates to examine two of the most consequential issues confronting India's democratic and federal framework. Discussions will encompass constitutional provisions, electoral representation, Centre-State relations, linguistic diversity, regional aspirations, public administration, and the broader implications of balancing national integration with India's pluralistic identity. Delegates are expected to evaluate these issues through the ideological lens of their allotted political parties while remaining mindful of constitutional values, democratic principles, and the long-term interests of the Republic of India.

The objective of this committee is not merely to debate existing policies but to foster meaningful dialogue, develop pragmatic policy recommendations, and demonstrate the collaborative spirit essential to democratic governance. Through informed deliberation and constructive engagement, delegates will experience the complexities of India's political system and the challenges involved in building consensus within one of the world's largest democracies.



1. Delimitation policy

MEANING

Delimitation is more than a mere bureaucratic exercise of redrawing lines on a map; it is a foundational pillar of India's democracy, a complex and often contentious process that mirrors the nation's journey through population growth, regional aspirations, and political compromise. At its core, delimitation aims to uphold the principle of "one person, one vote, one value," ensuring that every citizen's voice carries equal weight in the Lok Sabha and state assemblies, regardless of where they live.

The story of delimitation in India is a tale of three distinct acts: a period of regular, post-census readjustment; a prolonged era of political standstill; and the present moment of uneasy calm before a looming, high-stakes reckoning.

HISTORY

Act I: The Uncomplicated Era (1950s-1970s)

In the years following independence, the process was straightforward and in line with constitutional mandates. The Constitution of India, in its wisdom, provided for a Delimitation Act to be enacted after every census to readjust the number of parliamentary and assembly constituencies. The idea was simple: as the population grew and shifted, the electoral map had to be redrawn to maintain proportionality and fairness.

The first delimitation exercise was carried out by the President in 1950-51, followed by the first Delimitation Commission in 1952. Subsequent commissions were established in 1963 and 1973, each meticulously working to re-balance the electoral map based on the 1961 and 1971 censuses, respectively. This was a period of routine, almost predictable, democratic housekeeping. These commissions, headed by retired Supreme Court judges, adjusted seat allocations and redrew constituency boundaries, ensuring that each Member of Parliament or a State Legislature represented a roughly similar number of people. It was a testament to the nation's commitment to equal representation in a rapidly growing and reorganizing country.

Act II: The Great Freeze (1976-2002)

The most dramatic chapter in the history of delimitation began with a growing political anxiety. By the mid-1970s, a stark demographic divergence had emerged. The southern states, particularly Kerala and Tamil Nadu, had made significant progress in population control through effective family planning policies. In contrast, the northern states, with higher birth rates, saw their populations swell.

This demographic imbalance created a constitutional dilemma. According to the principle of population-based seat allocation, the next delimitation exercise would inevitably result in the southern states losing seats in the Lok Sabha, while the northern states would gain them. This was seen by many as a cruel irony: a "punishment" for success. The states that had diligently implemented national family planning goals would see their political voice and representation diminish, while those that hadn't would be rewarded with greater power.

To prevent this looming federal crisis and to encourage states to continue their family planning efforts without fear of political penalty, a monumental decision was made. The 42nd Amendment Act of 1976 was passed, which froze the allocation of Lok Sabha seats to the states and the boundaries of constituencies based on the 1971 census. This was an unprecedented political compromise, a temporary suspension of a key constitutional principle for the sake of national unity and a more balanced political landscape. The freeze was set to last until the year 2000.

Act III: The Uneasy Thaw (2002-Present)

As the year 2000 approached, the same political tensions resurfaced, magnified by nearly three decades of continued demographic divergence. Instead of a full-scale delimitation, a new path was forged. The 84th Amendment Act of 2001 and the 87th Amendment Act of 2003 extended the freeze on the total number of Lok Sabha seats per state until the first census after 2026.

However, a crucial adjustment was made. The Delimitation Act of 2002 was passed, and a new Delimitation Commission was constituted. This commission was tasked with a unique and complex mission: to redraw the boundaries of constituencies *within* each state based on the 2001 census figures, but without altering the total number of seats already allocated to that state based on the 1971 census.

This was a masterful, though temporary, solution to the political gridlock. It addressed the need to re-balance constituencies within states that had seen significant internal population shifts (e.g., from rural to urban areas) while simultaneously avoiding the politically explosive issue of reallocating seats between states. This meant that while the number of voters in a single constituency might be made more equitable, the overall political power balance between the states remained frozen in time, reflecting the demographics of 1971.

The Looming Delimitation (Post-2026)

The current delimitation freeze is set to expire after the first census following 2026. This means the next delimitation exercise will likely be based on the census data of 2031. The stakes could not be higher. The demographic imbalance between the southern and northern states has only widened over the past half-century.

The upcoming delimitation is expected to be one of the most significant and challenging political events in modern India. It will require a delicate balancing act to reconcile the principle of "one person, one vote" with the concerns of federalism and the sacrifices made by states with successful population control programs. The outcome will not only determine the political map of India for decades to come but will also be a profound test of the country's cooperative federalism and its ability to manage deep-seated regional differences for the greater good. The future of delimitation is a story yet to be written, a story that will shape the very foundation of India's democratic journey.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Constitutional Mandate: The Foundational Articles

The story of delimitation's legal framework begins with the very source of all Indian laws: the Constitution itself. The framers of the Constitution, in their foresight, embedded the requirement for delimitation into the foundational text.

- **Article 82 (for the Lok Sabha) and Article 170 (for State Assemblies)** are the two primary constitutional commands. They state, in no uncertain terms, that upon the completion of each census, the allocation of seats to the states and the division of each state into territorial constituencies must be readjusted. This is the bedrock of the entire legal process—a constitutional imperative to ensure that representative democracy remains fair and proportionate to the population. These articles effectively make a new delimitation exercise mandatory after every decennial census.
- **Article 330 and 332 (for Reserved Seats)** are equally crucial. They provide the legal basis for the reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) in the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies, respectively. The law mandates that the number of reserved seats in a state must be in proportion to the SC/ST population within that state. This is a vital part of the delimitation process, ensuring that vulnerable and marginalized communities have a guaranteed political voice. The Delimitation Commission is legally bound to identify and earmark these seats based on population concentration, adding another layer of complexity to its work.

The Parliamentary Acts: The Detailed Blueprints

While the Constitution lays down the principle, Parliament translates it into a detailed legal blueprint through Delimitation Acts. These acts give a concrete form to the constitutional mandates and define the specific procedures and powers of the commission.

- **The Delimitation Acts (1952, 1962, 1972, 2002)** are the specific legal instruments that have governed each exercise. The Delimitation Act, 2002, for instance, provides the most recent legal framework. It details the duties of the commission, the data it must use (in this case, the 2001 census), and the principles it must adhere to, such as keeping constituencies contiguous and respecting administrative boundaries like districts. These acts are the "how-to" guides for the entire process, outlining everything from the commission's composition to its final publication of orders.

The Legal Authority: The Delimitation Commission

The legal framework vests immense power in the Delimitation Commission, a high-powered, independent body created by the Central Government under the Delimitation Act. Its legal authority is what makes the process so robust and final.

- **Its Composition:** Legally, the commission consists of a Chairperson (a retired Supreme Court judge), the Chief Election Commissioner or a nominee, and the State Election Commissioner of the concerned state. This composition is designed to ensure impartiality and non-partisanship, as its members are insulated from political pressures.
- **Its Powers:** The commission's legal powers are what truly sets it apart. Its orders have the **force of law** and, critically, they **cannot be challenged in a court of law**. This legal provision is a shield against endless litigation that could halt the democratic

process indefinitely. While the commission's orders are laid before the Lok Sabha and the State Assemblies, the legal framework explicitly states that no modifications are permitted. This makes the commission's decisions final and non-negotiable, ensuring that the legal process reaches a definitive conclusion.

The Legal Pauses: The Constitutional Amendments

The legal framework of delimitation is not a static monolith; it has been adapted to navigate political and social realities. The most significant legal interventions came in the form of constitutional amendments that "paused" the periodic delimitation process.

- **The 42nd Amendment Act, 1976:** This landmark amendment legally froze the allocation of Lok Sabha seats to the states and the boundaries of constituencies based on the 1971 census. The legal justification was to promote national family planning efforts without politically penalizing the states that were successful in controlling their population growth. This was a monumental legal decision that temporarily suspended a core constitutional principle for the sake of political stability.
- **The 84th and 87th Amendment Acts, 2001 and 2003:** As the 1976 freeze was set to expire, these two amendments extended the legal pause until the first census after 2026. However, they introduced a clever legal workaround. The 87th Amendment specifically provided for the delimitation of constituencies **within** each state to be carried out based on the 2001 census, but without altering the total number of seats allotted to each state. This allowed for an internal rebalancing of constituencies to ensure population parity within a state while keeping the overall power balance among states legally frozen.

POLITICS SURROUNDING DELIMITATION

Delimitation in India is far from being a dry, technical exercise of drawing lines on a map. Instead, it is a high-stakes political battleground, a game of power and representation where the stakes are the very nature of Indian federalism. At the heart of this conflict lies a profound and complex demographic divide between the states of the north and the south, a tension that has been carefully managed through political compromise for decades, but now looms as a defining challenge for the nation's future.

The history of delimitation is, in many ways, the story of this political struggle. It pits a core democratic principle—that every citizen's vote should have equal value—against the delicate balance of federal power. The resulting compromises have shaped the political landscape of the world's largest democracy and the coming exercise is poised to do so again, with even greater consequences.

The Political Divide: North vs. South

The central political conflict surrounding delimitation is rooted in divergent demographic trajectories. In the decades following independence, the southern states, including Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka, and Andhra Pradesh, invested heavily in education, healthcare, and family planning initiatives. Their efforts were a resounding success, leading to a significant

and sustained decline in their fertility rates. They became pioneers of good governance, proving that it was possible to stabilize population growth.

Meanwhile, the northern states, particularly Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan, experienced continued and rapid population growth. This created a profound political dilemma. According to the constitutional principle of population-based representation, the next delimitation exercise would inevitably reward the states with higher population growth, granting them a larger share of Lok Sabha seats. This would come at the expense of the southern states, who would see their political voice in Parliament diminish.

Politically, this was seen as a "punishment for success." Southern leaders argued that their states were being penalized for their responsible and effective governance, while states that had failed to implement family planning were being rewarded with greater political power. This created a deep sense of injustice and a fear that their interests and unique regional identities would be marginalized in a Parliament increasingly dominated by northern states.

The Political Truce: Compromise and Postponement

Faced with this looming political crisis, India's political leadership chose to prioritize federal stability over a strict interpretation of the law. This led to a series of significant political compromises.

- **The 1976 Freeze:** The first major political truce was the **42nd Amendment Act of 1976**. This act legally froze the allocation of Lok Sabha seats based on the 1971 census. The political rationale was clear: to avoid a federal breakdown and to give states with higher population growth more time to implement family planning programs without the fear of losing political representation. This was a bold and, for its time, necessary political decision that put a "pause button" on a core democratic process for the sake of national unity.
- **The 2002-2003 Delimitation:** As the freeze was set to expire, the same political tensions resurfaced. The compromise reached was a masterful political maneuver. The **84th and 87th Amendments** extended the freeze on inter-state seat allocation until after the first census following 2026. However, they allowed the Delimitation Commission to re-draw constituency boundaries *within* each state based on the 2001 census. This was a clever political solution that appeased both sides. It addressed the need for fairer representation within states that had seen significant internal population shifts (e.g., urbanization) while avoiding the politically explosive issue of reallocating seats between them. It kicked the can down the road, buying more time for a more fundamental solution to be found.

The Looming Political Battle of 2026

Today, the political stakes are higher than ever. The demographic gap has only widened in the decades since the 2001 census. Projections suggest a dramatic shift in political power. According to some estimates, if delimitation were to be carried out based on current population figures, states like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar could gain dozens of seats, while southern states like Tamil Nadu and Kerala could lose seats, or at the very least see their share of the total number of seats drop significantly.

The political arguments are now more vocal and passionate than ever before.

- **The South's Case: A Question of Justice and Marginalization.** Southern leaders and parties argue that a strict population-based delimitation would be deeply unjust. They fear that a Parliament dominated by representatives from the North will lead to their concerns being sidelined in national policy debates. They point to their significant economic contributions to the national exchequer and their strong human development indicators, arguing that their political influence should not be diminished despite their responsible population control. Their core argument is that in a federal system, states are not merely demographic units but distinct political entities with their own aspirations and identities that deserve to be protected.
- **The North's Case: The Democratic Principle.** On the other side, leaders from the populous northern states argue that a true democracy must reflect the will of the majority. They assert that their constituents deserve proportional representation and that an electoral map based on a half-century-old census is a violation of the "one person, one vote" principle. They contend that their growing populations face greater needs for infrastructure, education, and healthcare, and that a larger political voice is essential to secure the necessary resources.

The Potential Political Outcomes

The next delimitation exercise is poised to be a defining moment for Indian democracy. The political class faces a difficult choice:

- **A New Grand Bargain:** One potential political solution is to expand the total number of seats in the Lok Sabha. By increasing the size of the house, it would be possible to give more seats to the populous northern states without forcing the southern states to lose any. This would preserve the political status quo while still moving towards more equitable representation based on population.
- **A Deeper Federal Divide:** If a political consensus cannot be reached and delimitation proceeds based on a strict population formula, it could deepen the north-south political divide, potentially straining the fabric of cooperative federalism. It could lead to increased regionalism and a sense of alienation among the southern states, who might feel politically and fiscally marginalized.

Since your background guide follows a structured format (**Meaning → History → Legal Framework → Politics**), the **Three-Language Policy** section should mirror the same style so that the AIPPM background guide remains consistent.

THREE-LANGUAGE POLICY

MEANING

The Three-Language Policy is one of India's most debated educational and linguistic frameworks. It was introduced to promote national integration while preserving India's rich linguistic diversity. The policy seeks to ensure that students learn three languages during their school education, balancing the interests of regional languages, Hindi, and English.

The principle behind the policy is simple yet politically complex: every Indian should have access to their mother tongue or regional language, develop a common means of communication with fellow citizens, and acquire English for higher education and global opportunities. However, because language in India is closely tied to identity, culture, and regional politics, the implementation of the policy has varied significantly across states.

The debate surrounding the Three-Language Policy is no longer merely about education. It has evolved into a constitutional, political, and federal issue involving questions of state autonomy, cultural preservation, linguistic equality, and the balance of power between the Union and the States.

HISTORY

The Early Years (1947–1967)

When India became independent in 1947, one of the Constituent Assembly's greatest challenges was deciding the nation's official language. Hindi was adopted as the Official Language of the Union under Article 343 of the Constitution, while English was permitted to continue for official purposes for an initial period of fifteen years.

However, the proposal to replace English entirely with Hindi met fierce resistance, especially from southern states such as Tamil Nadu, where many feared linguistic domination by Hindi-speaking states. The anti-Hindi agitations of the 1960s became one of the largest language movements in independent India.

To reduce tensions and encourage multilingualism instead of linguistic replacement, the Union Government proposed the Three-Language Formula.

The Kothari Commission (1964–66)

The Kothari Commission on Education formally recommended the Three-Language Formula as part of a national education policy.

The recommendation was:

- Students in Hindi-speaking states should learn:
 - Hindi

- English
- One modern Indian language (preferably a South Indian language)
- Students in non-Hindi-speaking states should learn:
 - Regional language or mother tongue
 - Hindi
 - English

The objective was not merely educational but political—to foster national unity while respecting linguistic diversity.

National Policy on Education (1968)

India's first National Policy on Education officially adopted the Three-Language Formula.

The policy aimed to:

- Promote national integration.
- Preserve regional languages.
- Encourage multilingualism.
- Prevent linguistic dominance.
- Improve communication between different regions of India.

Despite national adoption, education remained largely a State subject, resulting in uneven implementation across the country.

The Era of Partial Implementation

While many northern states implemented versions of the policy, several southern states adopted modified versions.

Tamil Nadu became the most notable exception.

Since 1968, Tamil Nadu has consistently followed a **Two-Language Policy** consisting of:

- Tamil
- English

The state has refused to make Hindi compulsory, arguing that such a requirement violates linguistic equality and federal autonomy.

National Education Policy 2020

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 retained the Three-Language Formula but emphasized flexibility.

The policy states that:

- No language will be imposed on any state.
- Students should preferably study their mother tongue or regional language at the foundational level.
- States retain flexibility regarding implementation.

Despite these assurances, the NEP revived political debates, particularly in southern India, where several governments argued that the policy could indirectly promote Hindi.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Constitutional Provisions

Unlike popular belief, the Constitution does **not** mandate a Three-Language Formula.

Instead, it establishes a broader framework governing official languages and linguistic rights.

Article 343

Declares Hindi in the Devanagari script as the Official Language of the Union while allowing continued use of English through parliamentary legislation.

Articles 344–351

These provisions collectively deal with:

- Development of Hindi.
- Continued use of English.
- Appointment of Official Language Commissions.
- Promotion of linguistic harmony.
- Protection of linguistic minorities.

Article 351 directs the Union Government to promote the spread of Hindi while ensuring it draws vocabulary from other Indian languages.

Articles 29 and 30

Protect the cultural and educational rights of minorities.

These provisions ensure linguistic minorities can preserve and promote their own language and establish educational institutions accordingly.

Article 350A

Directs every state to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother tongue at the primary stage for children belonging to linguistic minority groups.

Although not enforceable like Fundamental Rights, it serves as an important constitutional directive.

Seventh Schedule

Education originally fell under the State List.

After the **42nd Constitutional Amendment (1976)**, education was moved to the Concurrent List.

This means:

- Parliament can legislate on education.
- States can also legislate.
- In case of conflict, Union law generally prevails unless protected by Presidential assent.

This constitutional arrangement lies at the heart of disputes surrounding language policy.

National Education Policies

The Three-Language Formula has appeared in:

- National Policy on Education (1968)
- National Policy on Education (1986)
- Programme of Action (1992)
- National Education Policy (2020)

Importantly, these are policy documents rather than constitutional mandates. Their implementation depends largely on state governments.

Official Languages Act, 1963

The Official Languages Act ensured the continued use of English for official purposes beyond 1965.

This legislation significantly reduced fears of complete Hindi replacement and remains a cornerstone of India's language policy.



POLITICS SURROUNDING THE THREE-LANGUAGE POLICY

The Three-Language Policy has remained one of India's most politically sensitive issues because language is deeply connected to identity, culture, and regional autonomy.

Unlike many education policies, debates surrounding this policy often reflect broader questions about federalism, constitutional balance, and Centre-State relations.

The Hindi Imposition Debate

The most persistent criticism comes from several non-Hindi-speaking states, particularly Tamil Nadu.

These states argue that making Hindi compulsory—either directly or indirectly—places an unfair burden on students who already learn their regional language and English.

They contend that students in Hindi-speaking states effectively study only one additional language (English), whereas students in southern states may be expected to learn two additional languages.

This asymmetry has fuelled accusations that the policy disproportionately benefits Hindi-speaking regions.

The Centre's Position

Successive Union Governments have generally maintained that the Three-Language Formula promotes:

- National integration.
- Cultural exchange.
- Greater employment opportunities.
- Increased mobility across India.
- Multilingual competence.

Recent governments have clarified that the policy does not mandate compulsory Hindi and that states have flexibility in selecting languages.

Nevertheless, political disagreements persist over how the policy is implemented in practice.

Federal Concerns

The debate raises significant questions about Indian federalism.

Critics argue that:

- Language policy should respect India's linguistic diversity.
- States are better positioned to determine educational priorities.
- Centralized language policies risk undermining cooperative federalism.

Supporters contend that:

- A common linguistic framework strengthens national unity.
- Knowledge of multiple Indian languages encourages inter-state communication.
- Multilingual education enhances cultural understanding.

The challenge lies in balancing national cohesion with regional autonomy.

Contemporary Political Developments

The implementation of the National Education Policy (2020) has renewed debates over the Three-Language Formula.

Several southern states, including Tamil Nadu, have expressed concerns that the policy could lead to the gradual expansion of Hindi despite official assurances of flexibility.

Meanwhile, many northern states continue to support multilingual education under the existing framework.

As a result, the Three-Language Policy remains a recurring issue in Centre-State relations, educational reforms, and electoral politics.

QUESTIONS A DELEGATE SHOULD CONSIDER (AIPPM)

- Should the Three-Language Formula remain a national educational policy, or should states have complete discretion over language education?
- Does the current framework adequately respect India's federal structure?
- Can national integration be promoted without creating perceptions of linguistic dominance?
- Should the Union Government have a greater role in language policy after education was moved to the Concurrent List?
- How can linguistic minorities be better protected while ensuring educational flexibility?
- Is the existing Three-Language Formula still suitable for a multilingual and globalized India, or does it require reform?
- Should India adopt a more flexible multilingual model that accommodates regional preferences while maintaining national cohesion?