

BLOCK: II
CONTESTATION OVER NATION

- Unit 1 : Indian 'Nationhood': The Idea**
- Unit 2 : Early challenges: Integration of Princely States**
- Unit 3 : Re-organization of the States**
- Unit 4 : Demands for New States**
- Unit 5 : Demands for Self-determination and Insurgency:
J& K and Assam**

UNIT : 1
INDIAN NATIONHOOD: THE IDEA

Structure:

- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Objectives**
- 1.3 Conceptual categorization**
 - 1.3.1 Background of the Study**
 - 1.3.2 Nation, Nationalism and Nationhood**
 - 1.3.3 Factors contributing in nationhood**
 - 1.3.4 Basic features of Nationhood**
- 1.4 Historical background of Indian Nationhood**
 - 1.4.1 Classical notion of Indian Nationhood**
 - 1.4.2 Transnational idea of Indian Nationhood**
 - 1.4.3 A Long Struggle for Indian Nationhood**
- 1.5 Indian Nationhood: Debate and Discourse**
 - 1.5.1 Nationhood in the Post Colonial Period**
- 1.6 Summing Up**
- 1.7 Reference and suggested readings**

1.1 Introduction

Nationhood simply means cultivating common aspirations by a group of people in a defined geo-political setting. The idea of modern nationhood was developed in Europe in the mid of 17th and early 18th Century, but had been promulgated across territoriality in the subsequent period. The sense of belongingness is the basic notion behind the construction of nationhood. The shared culture, ethnicity, language, history, religion etc. usually help in reducing the differences among people. Accordingly, the nationhood is not free from circumstantial influences as the idea of peace, security, power struggle, global politics, and market economy etc. have viable impact on the entire geo-political setting. Hence, despite complexity, the spirit of nationhood helps to be united irrespective of their multiple standing. Unlike others, India too, has constructed the sense of nationhood accentuating

unity in diversity. The colonial as well as post colonial history of India is based on not other than substantiation of Indian nationhood.

The Indian nationhood officially synced with the independence of 1947. Despite plurality, multiplicity; the sense of belongingness, unity in diversity are widely nurtured throughout the system. However, the partition was a bitter experience in shaping or reshaping the Indian society. The internal imbalance sometimes paused as a threat for Indian Nationhood but it has been managing customarily since the very beginning. In recent time, the sense of nationhood has been defined through the prism of *Hindutva* in establishing a *Hindu Rastra*. Basically the concept of nationhood is essential for every nation state system and which is beyond debate and contestation, but India has been facing both horizontal as well as vertical challenges as it needs to examine the entire concept through multiple prisms. Here in this unit, an attempt has been made to understand the Indian nationhood from multiple angles.

1.2 Objectives

The concept of nationhood is essential for one and all. The construction of nationhood has inseparable linkage with the formation of modern nation state system. As we know the Indian nationhood can be studied for multifaceted reasons and here an attempt has been made to understand what exactly nationhood means and its relevance in a society like India. The objectives are categorically highlighted below. After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- i. Understand* the concepts of nation, nationalism and nationhood.
- ii. Explain* the emergence of Indian nationhood.
- iii. Discuss* and scrutinize the present discourse of Indian nationhood.

1.3 Conceptual Categorization

The nationhood is the state of being a nation or a group of people united by common language, culture, politics, economic life, history etc. The common

Space for Learners

interest usually helps to promote the spirit of oneness; also can be defined as commonness. The sense of commonness is essential criteria for nationhood. Furthermore, it contributes in strengthening the spirit of nationalism among the citizenry. It is witnessed that the idea of nation, nationalism and nationhood are linked with one another.

1.3.1. Background of the Study

Every fragile notion is considered as a source of contestation. The conceptual framework of nation, nationalism and nationhood are somewhat fragile and remain contested, debatable but essential for geopolitical study. Most of the time people are in a race for finding purity of social settings, but nowhere possible to get it. Even it is becoming more complex day by day. Therefore, despite plurality, people prefer to find out their common identity, origin etc. Usually human being considers race, language, religion, culture, ethnicity, history, identity etc. as their preconditions for bringing commonness. Even these are essential for consolidation in a larger geopolitical framework. The ancient Greek had witnessed such arrangement of city states i.e. Athens, Sparta and so on. These states have their specific territorial border, their own administrative mechanism, their citizenry etc. The modern nation state is the new fashion of old city states. Perhaps, it is a refined version applicable in a modern situation. At present, it is very difficult to find a homogenous society; the globalization makes inroads for all to go beyond their physical border. Even the global issues are getting multifaceted challenges from all walks of life. No one is secure, self sufficient and therefore it demands for global collaboration. As a basic actor of global politics, the nation states propel to cooperate with each other. The dependency or cooperation is maintained even in individual level. Apparently, the nation states have been providing a common space to be united under a defined political setting. Essentially, there are two different but basic ways to mingle the sentiment of common people i.e. one is inherent and other one is imposed. Whenever, people shared similar identity, history, ethnicity; it becomes easier to bring proximity among the people, but on the contrary the diversity makes difficult to be united. Even the states have to initiate multiple policy and programmes in bringing closeness. Ultimately by the nation state, an imposed attempt has been made in bringing the sense of shared culture. Hence, both the

ways are essential for founding nationalism and wherein the concept of nationhood is the optimal point everyone can realize it.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

There were over 1000 city states in ancient Greece but the main poleis were Athens, Sparta, Corinth, Thebes, Syracuse, Aegine, Rhodes, Argos, Eretria, and Elis. The territory of Greece is mountainous, and as a result, ancient Greece consisted of many smaller regions each with its own dialect, cultural peculiarities, and identity. Regionalism and regional conflicts were prominent features of ancient Greece. The city states indicate on one hand concentration of people in certain locality and fragmented setting of their poleis.

1.3.2 Nation, Nationalism and Nationhood

Nation and nation-states are interchangeably used to mean a group of people inhabiting in a particular geopolitical setting. Basically, nation indicates large number of people united by common descent, history, culture, ethnicity, language and inhibition in a particular territory. Accordingly, the state claims for a specific sovereign territory having population ruled by a government of their own. On one hand, nation is a structural framework exists on the basis of some similar characteristics of inhabitants and other hand state is the creation with some precondition realized in a particular geopolitical setting. Therefore, the nation state is a combined terminology to indicate a group of people having shared history, culture, ethnicity etc. and living in a sovereign territorial setting under the control of a government of their own.

Stop to Consider

Four basic elements of State:

A state has four essential elements :- 1. Population, a group of people
2. Territory, size doesn't matter. But, a fixed territory is essential. 3. Government, to run the administration a competent authority and 4. Sovereignty, which means free from any form of subjugation by others. Another crucial element is recognition by other elements like nation state or any international organization.

Space for Learners

The concept of 'nation' developed in Western Europe during the post reformation struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and was further shaped by the industrial revolution and political revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. During the nineteenth century, the development of the political power of the middle classes within capitalist states also refined the concept of the nation (Harrison and Boyd 2018)

The term nation derives from Latin word '*natio*' literally meaning 'birth'. The French word '*nacion*' also means 'birth' or 'place of origin'. People from a particular locality usually have common language, culture, cuisine, history, way of life and so on. Ultimately their sense of belongingness helps in uniting one and all. Interestingly it becomes as their shared entity and which is essential for both individual as well as collective sphere. Apparently it would be an unprecedented race for establishing their uniqueness and sense of superiority. Hence, it would unleash a different kind of sentiment based on their race, place of birth, origin etc. for the sake of a nation. This extraordinary sentiment or patriotism is simply called nationalism. The world has witnessed diverse nationalisms in different capacities. Basically, the sense of nationalism was strongly grounded in the west, particularly in Europe. Later on it became a common phenomenon of the world politics. There are different kinds of nationalism i.e. extreme nationalism, pan nationalism, narrow nationalism, sub nationalism and so on. Despite multiplicity of nationalism, the ultimate goal is substantiation of sentiment in a unified manner. The unified setting through the sentiment of nationalism is literally called nationhood.

Stop to Consider

Different kinds of Nationalism:

The nature of nationalism is varied from one situation to another. Considering the process of functioning, nationalism can be categorized as follows i.e. Ethnic nationalism, Cultural nationalism, Civic nationalism, Liberal nationalism, Romantic nationalism, Religious nationalism, Post colonial nationalism, Pan-nationalism, Sub-nationalism, Extreme nationalism etc. With the changing circumstances, the sentiment of nationalism has been changing. The Nazi sentiment of Hitler ruled

Germany is unacceptable at present situation of Germany, the sentiment of Indian people under the colonial administration was changed in post colonial period, and the Indian liberal nationalism is going to replace with Hindu nationalism and so on. Furthermore the pan Indian nationalism is facing challenges from different sub regional nationalism. Hence, the idea of nationalism is somewhat relative or situational.

Space for Learners

The existence of nationhood is usually found in nationalism as the spirit or sentiment contributes in shaping or reshaping a nation state. Nationhood simply means the state of being a nation, or a large group of people united by common language, culture or economic life and so on. Guibernau has defined the nation as “a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself. (Guibernau 1996: 47).

According to Margaret Moore, the term nation refers to a group of people who identify themselves as belonging to a particular nation group, who are usually ensconced on a particular historical territory, and who have a sense of affinity to people share that territory. It is not necessary to specify which traits define a group seeking self determination (Moore 1997: 906).

Max Weber defines nation as a community of sentiment based on different factors. According to Weber, modern nations usually need a state to protect their integrity and interest and states usually need a nation if they are to command the allegiance of the individuals.

Benedict Anderson defines nation as an imagined political community. it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. (Anderson 1983: 5-6)

O. Bauer who defined the nation as a community of culture and character based on common historical destiny.

It appears that, demarcated territorial setting is not essential for a nation. Even for the nationhood too, demarcation is not necessary but national

Space for Learners

identity is inevitable. For nationhood, Adrian Hastings has explained as in the West, three elements were especially important in the creation of nationhood. War stimulated a sense of national identity and nationalism. The awareness of a wider linguistic sense of identity, rather than dialect, developed as the consequence of writing and the spread of printing. Finally, a religion was especially important. The idea of a chosen nation comes from the Old Testament, and kings and national priesthoods used religion to shape national identity. (Harrison and Boyd 2018)

In India, the long fight for freedom, history, colonial administration, etc. had promoted the sense of nationalism among the people. The idea of nationhood was also substantiated as people irrespective of their community identity, and other credentials were engaged in the nation building process. Perhaps, there is a constant contestation among the people to realize a true sense of nationhood.

Check Your Progress

1. What is nationhood?
2. What is a nation?
3. How nationalism contributes in constructing nationhood?
4. What are the major elements of modern nation states?

1.3.3 Factors contributing in nationhood

There are multiple factors have been contributing to realize nationhood. Basically it needs some common preconditions for linking one with another. Although modern society is relatively diverse, people are concerned for their race, religion, ethnicity, community etc. Furthermore, people also consider different other factors for finding their commonness. Sometimes, the diversity or uniqueness is again considered as a source of commonness in different situation. Hence, Benedict Anderson had proposed for 'imagined communities', as the global setting is not prudent enough in structuring nationhood. But notable point is that even in an imagined situation, the role of different factors is inevitable.

The origin of birthplace helps to unite people from different background. Usually people have acute relation with their birthplace, the motherland or the fatherland and somewhere it is also called as homeland. The native area not only remains memorable but easier for accessible too. The concept of family as well as kinship has substantial contribution in bringing closeness among the people and which is the foundation of nationhood. These preconditions have historical prominence starting from nomadic period how the entire setting was controlled and regulated by family. However, with the changing circumstances, though the setting has been getting changed, the concept of family and kinship are also changing. Despite their diverse nature, family and kinship brings sense of commonness among the people.

Another crucial factor is shared history and it is easier to find one's origin through the prism of history. In a modern complex situation, most of the people represent multiple identities. Despite multiplicity, their historical linkages provide sense of belongingness. The Indian society is diverse but their shared history of pre colonial, colonial and even post colonial period helps to be united. In accordance with their narrow individual identities, people have had a shared common identity as an Indian. In a similar fashion, different other countries across the globe have multicultural setting, but remained united mostly depending on their shared historical background. As a result a strong nationhood is possible to arrange despite their stratified social setting.

Language is another factor which has been contributing in realizing nationhood. Strong nationhood deserves monolingual state so that people can share, understand one's ideas without complexities. At present most of the societies are linguistically diverse and subsequently becomes a barrier for sharing one's viewpoint with others. In such a situation, a particular language gets privilege over others. Somewhere, the lingua franca becomes essential for their everyday life. Hence, a common language or commonness through language helps in bonding people. A community based on language is essential element for strong nationhood.

In a similar fashion, the concept of ethnicity has been contributing in sustaining nationhood. People of same ethnic background, have their shared way of

Space for Learners

living. But, presence of different ethnic identities increases the probability of clashes or contestation among the people. As a result, the bondage or unity among the people becomes fragile and which is a challenge for building nationhood. A strong nationhood deserves sense of belongingness at any cost. In this regard, we can discuss contribution of culture and religion too. Culture provides a larger space to share one another. It is relatively loose in individual level but have a strong connection in public domain. Basically culture incorporates everything i.e. food habit, music, art of living, dress code and so on. Hence, the sense of commonness is basic notion of culture. Accordingly, the modern notion of plurality or existence of many cultures becomes the source of contestation, but recognition of all helps in bringing closeness. Sometimes, diversity is considered as a different notion of culture in modern society. It is pragmatic to understand culture through the prism of religion, language, ethnicity, modernity etc. In accordance with culture, religion has immense contribution in substantiating nationhood. Basically religion is considered as a private matter but inseparable from the public domain. The major religion of the world are encompassing across the boundaries with huge numbers of admirers. Religion is not just a principle of individual; but it is a way of life for religious persons. The basic norms of religion or the religious scriptures are considered as holy but these are considered as a great source of learning. Ultimately, the activism of every individual is regulated by his or her own religion. Interestingly, religious linkages are usually maintained even transcending national boundaries. Apparently it is considered as a vital precondition for nationhood; but no one can deny its probable challenge towards the entire setting of commonness.

Geographical location is another condition to unite the people. It is a physical bonding in true sense of the term. People inhabiting in a specific geographical location usually shares their everyday life i.e. interaction of their quotidian life, sharing pleasure and pain and so on. Geography usually incorporates physical as well as psychological relations; starting from riverine basin, forestry, farming land to migration, population density etc. are basic concerns of geography. There is an inseparable bondage among the inhabitants of a specific locality. As a result their sense of belongingness becomes quite strong and which is essential for nationhood.

Furthermore, it seems heterogeneous societies are usually loosely bonded but sometimes such type of multicultural setting might be a strong source of nationhood. Actually, it is a collective endeavour to bring the essence of commonness. Thereafter, the common enemy might be a crucial factor for realizing nationhood. Basically, people are concerned for their security, both individual as well as collective. However, state is the security provider for its own citizens. Reversely, it becomes a moral responsibility of every citizen to remain standby with the state in critical situation. Even citizen remain ready to sacrifice everything for the sake of nation. Hence any upheavals or threat for the state is considered as challenge for security. Such types of adverse situations are tackled in a unified manner whether by state or collective efforts of citizen, but notable point is that a common enemy propels the entire system to be alarmed. Such type of sacrifice, sentiment or collective efforts helps in strengthening nationhood. Sometimes the internal disturbances become a challenge for the state and which contributes in weakening the sense of nationhood.

Leadership has significant but indirect linkage with nationhood. From the ancient period to modern society, empirical system to democracy, religion to polity, farmers to bureaucrats; everywhere popular leaders have substantial influence throughout the system. Basically a leader possesses indifferent personality, unusual mission and vision, capability to influence one and all and ultimately common people convincingly or controllably remain submissive to accept the command of the leadership. The spiritual leaders usually control religious activities, the political leaders basically control their citizenry and governance, the farmer leaders speaks issues related with farming. Everywhere, a vital role wielded by leaders and people have unconditional support overtly or covertly. There are some historical figures like Bismark, Hitler, Mossulini, Lincon, Gandhi, Mao, Yaseer Arafat, Sheikh Muzibar etc. and despite their ideological differences, they were considered as undisputed leader of their age. There is an inseparable linkage between leadership and expectation of common people. Hence, people urge to secure their common expectation in a united manner. It helps in finding commonness and which is one of the basics for nation, nationalism and also nationhood.

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

Ideology is considered as a basic ethos of nationhood. Ideology simply means substantiation of idea and has staunch followers too. It is appeared that people believe on certain way of activism whether it is just or unjust, true or not; even they are ready to sacrifice everything for securing their ideological standing. History has been witnessing that Nazism in Germany, Fascism in Italy, liberalism in Western Society, Capitalism in Europe are crucial ideological standing. Furthermore, ideologies like colonialism, socialism, feminism, modernism etc. are also getting importance in different geopolitical setting. It is a common spirit mostly based on idea, thinking, aspiration etc. and helps in bringing commonness. Such type of ideological exercise helps in uniting different section of people of a nation state.

The above discussion clearly depicts that there are lots of factors have been contributing in nationhood. In a plural society, although it is difficult to unite, but there are many preconditions usually help to unite. Perhaps modernity, globalization, cooperation etc. have substantial influence on internal as well as external matter of every nation state. On one hand, the competitive global politics have been sharpening the idea of nationhood and other hand the modern liberal society provides an open space to share with one another. There is a contradiction that positivity as well as negativity is there in achieving nationhood. Moreover, nationhood unleashes negative attitude towards other. We can put an example that how racism is essential for strengthening nationhood and similarly how nationhood had adversary on international peace. Race is a highly debatable issue. People are categorized on their biological setting as white, black, coloured or brown and so forth. The concept is contested among the social scientist as racialization is a major source of discrimination. It goes as saying that the white are superior or the black are least capable and marked by animal nature. With the changing circumstances, it becomes somewhat difficult in finding pure race but which are still prevalent in different countries. Couple of years back, the Jew were engaged in searching people with genetic uniformity and even provided citizenship too. In Germany, Adolf Hitler had applied scientific racism to unite the German against the rest of the World. Hence, despite contestation, the role of race, gene, blood etc. are inevitable for considering commonness and which is essential for strengthening

nationhood. But the extreme nationalism or expectation of nationhood, Hitler had destroyed the worldly system. Hence, the idea of nationhood is a contested term in global politics. In India, the idea of nationhood was grounded during the colonial administration of British. The history of India is the greatest source of Indian nationhood. However, the trajectory of Indian nationhood is really contested and still the process is surreptitiously advancing.

Space for Learners

Check Your Progress

1. What are the major factors contributing for nationhood?
2. How ideology contributes in strengthening nationhood?
3. How territoriality helps in constructing nationhood?

1.3.4 Basic features of Nationhood

The construction of nationhood is essential for sustaining the spirit of belongingness. Although, it is somewhat difficult to get specific stature of nationhood, but one can realize it. The following features would be helpful to understand nationhood:

1. The sense of nationhood is associated with loyalty to the nation. Sometimes, individual interests are depreciated for preserving collective national interest
2. The bonding of nationhood is strengthened through the spirit of nationalism. The one nation formula is significant in understanding nationhood.
3. It is in favour of fixed and permanent territoriality, any challenge may causes obliteration of nationhood.
4. It promotes common interest among the people. In a reverse form, the common interest of people usually considers as national issue and which is essential for constructing the sense of nationhood. Even the issue of national security is crucial to understand nationhood.

Space for Learners

5. No one can escape from the circumstantial influence and with the changing situation, the notion of nationhood is also getting changed.
6. Another important point is the learning of self determination from the spirit of nationhood. It rejects any form of outside interferences.
7. The idea of nationhood is indivisible. Any form of contestation considered as a challenge for nationhood.

These are some pertinent character of nationhood. There is not any fixed structural setting of nationhood, but the spirit or desire of people for it is substantial.

1.4 Historical background of Indian Nationhood

The geopolitical history of India is quite patchy and has been endorsing different narratives with full of contradiction. From the civilizational impact on Indian society to the present architect of Hindutva, the multiplicity of Indian society has been witnessing unusual form of nationhood. It has historical prominence, one can put forward the entire debate in two broader categories i.e. one is classical and other one is modern concept of nationhood. The Hindu religious scriptures usually carry the significance of ancient form of nationhood; basically the civilizational impact and cultural homogeneity had linked the people of Indian subcontinent. Accordingly the idea of 'Hindutva' is rooted in Indus valley civilization. The modern notion was developed with the emergence of modern nation state system and which was fulfilled with the transfer of power from colonial administration to the Indian people and thereafter. Eventually, at present, the ancient notions are tried to retrieve in modern situation.

1.4.1 Classical notion of Indian Nationhood

Traditionally the Indian culture believes in *Vasudhaiva kutumbakam*, the world is considered as one family. The verse is appeared in chapter 6 of Maha Upanishada VI. 71-73 advocates for a shared worldly system. In a similar way, the Rig Veda I.164.46 states '*Ekam sat vipra bahauda vadanti*' or what is one, the sages give many names. There may be different

processes, but all are enthusiastic for finding the ultimate truth, that is the supernatural power, *Mokshya*. Despite stratification, Hinduism persuades for an inclusive society, people are for a common goal that is finding the absolute truth. Furthermore, the Hindu scriptures had given the broadest idea of humanity, brotherhood and universal cooperation and so on. However, the trend was disrupted in the course of history, but the spirit of belongingness has remained intact intangibly. It is alleged that under the rule of outsiders, there were sharp divisions among the Hindus. Hence, in recent time, there is a demand for uniting the Hindu under a common umbrella, to strengthen the spirit of *Hindutva*. Apparently, the ancient history of Indian society promotes universalism and which is relevant to understand the global politics of recent time. The believers of universalism are focusing on global cooperation for solving different transnational issues of recent time. Hence, it is considered as a noteworthy approach to understand the concept of universalism. The spirit of universalism is the driving force for constructing an imagined boundary of Hindu culture, one step ahead for a Hindu nationhood. However, a section of people are engaged in reframing the holistic view of imagined Hindu nationhood. Hence, there is a contradiction on the basis of functioning between ancient as well as modern Indian nationhood.

Space for Learners

1.4.2 Transnational idea of Indian Nationhood

The idea of nationhood is essential for constructing a nation whether it is demarcated or not. Sometimes, people go beyond a demarcated boundary, constructing an imagined nationhood. On one hand, the nation states are engaged in sharpening their demarcated border, but other hand mutual cooperation is inevitable in global politics. Subsequently, a shared global culture is getting prominence throughout the system. Unlike others, there was a linkage of cultural history among the people of Indian subcontinent. The demographic setting and cultural linkages from Kandahar to the East Asian countries, provides a broader scope for understanding the historical affinity among the people. Diversity was prevailed everywhere and which is a pertinent force for sustaining nationhood. Hence, no one can deny the

Space for Learners

civilizational impact in India and its beyond. Despite similarities or multiple linkages, the concept of modern nation states is in favour of snapping all sorts of shared relations. It controls movement of people, trade and commerce, rights and privileges etc. and regulated by the state specifically within the border. The construction of a wide nationhood comprising the neighbours of India is somewhat imaginary and nowhere possible to establish it.

1.4.3 A Long Struggle for Indian Nationhood

The legacy of Indian culture is rooted in the Indus valley civilization, but were being faced multiple disruptions from time to time. Although, the concept of nationhood has developed only a century back or two, but the essence of universalism had a long historical prominence in Indian society. Besides, one can find linkages between ancient universalism with the state of imagined nationhood, but which is relatively narrower in terms of functioning. Furthermore, nationalism is one of the basics of nationhood, whether it is in India or beyond. The Indian nationalism got momentum with the emergence of new leadership to replace the British administrative set up in India. As a result, the entire setting was reshaped to mobilize towards a finite direction and subsequently India got independence after a long struggle for power. It was the ultimate goal for every Indian and also considered as the founding stone for Indian nationhood. The divisive, exploitative role of British administration was completely rejected by the people of India and subsequently British failed to retain power by any means. One day they were propelled to hand over power, authority declaring independence of India.

The Sepoy mutiny was considered as the first initiative to reject the British administration by a section of Indian military force. However, the resentment of the common people had grown surreptitiously and had been continued till the mid of 20th century. Due to the segregation among the people as well as military, it was easier for colonial administration to control without any major hindrances. On the contrary, it requires couple of decades for Indian to get independence. The fighting was for self rule, self respect and this was

inevitable for every individual irrespective of their backgrounds. Basically the concept was developed by the western educated persons to struggle for freedom, liberty, and justice and so on. Even the platform like Indian National Congress had substantial contribution in the long struggle for freedom. On one hand Indian people were being united for independence, but other hand British passionately had applied divisive politics in every sphere of society. Even the nation was bifurcated on the basis of religion. Besides, there were three different groups of administrative set up to weakening the unity of Indians.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

British rule in India:

A group of British merchant came to India for strengthening trade and commerce with Indian subcontinent under the banner of British East India Company and gradually they got an opportunity to rule the country. The decline of Mughal empire and stratified social setting in India provided freehand to run the administration without any complicacy. Till 1858, there was a rule of British East India Company, but Sepoy mutiny had changed the administrative mechanism as the British crown was propelled to rule it directly. The entire geopolitics are set in two categories i.e. one is directly ruled by the Crown also called as British India and other regions were administered by some regional rulers are called princely states. However, the princely states had to provide taxes to the British government. Ultimately, there was an administrative segregation policy of British to divide the people of India. At the time of partition, the entire geographical region was divided into three groups i.e. a major portion of British India is categorized as A, the princely states are as B and for Pakistan is kept under group C. The British were very systematic in the geopolitical matter but their strategy of divisive politics had been continued till the date of independence. As a result, they had sponsored a fragmented nationhood for the people of India as well as Pakistan. The history of partition on the basis of religion is sponsoring in sharpening Hindu nationhood of recent time.

Space for Learners

The western educated conscious group was the pioneer of independence struggle. It doesn't mean that all the western educated persons were patriot; many of them were ardent supporters of British administration. Under the august leadership of a section of western educated patriots, the common people had joined the struggle demanding their self respect, dignity, freedom and so on. Hence, people irrespective of their background had fought for the independence of India. Their aspiration for freedom was the driving force to unite one and all. Even they had constructed an imagined nationhood free from the dominance of others.

Secondly, the unity among the people was one of the major approaches to fight against British. As we know, the Britishers had an intension to divide and rule, and subsequently the common people had failed to construct a unified force. They know the weaknesses of Indian people as religion, caste, class, language, ethnicity etc. are considered as sensitive matter in every nook and corner of Indian society. Hence, they had sharpened the divisive identities for the construction of enemy group among the Indians. The Hindu Muslim fight was very common, but fighting among different sects of a particular religion was more critical at that time. The Upper caste had an involvement for atrocities against the lower caste, even the Muslims were too engaged in fighting different capacities.

In such a divisive society, it was quite difficult to bring under a common umbrella. Undoubtedly the western educated conscious group had glaring contribution to mobilize the common people against the British. Even they were successful to construct them as an enemy of Indian people. The support and active participation of common people had founded the sense of belongingness. The spirit was essential for constructing nationalism and which is the basic precondition for Indian nationhood. With the independence, undoubtedly the Indian nationhood was grounded formally. The Indian National Congress was a pioneer institution for India's freedom movement. It was a common platform of people propagating different ideologies, believes and faith. Even the leadership was in favour of establishing a liberal democratic setting for a heterogeneous society like India, but there was an alternative but paralleled viable force for establishing a Hindu *rastra*, claiming for a Hindu nationhood. The Indian nationhood somewhere punctured with

the presence of narrower sense of nationhood. Furthermore, it had faced substantial challenges throughout the process of integration of India. Apparently it becomes a never ending phenomenon as the concept of Indian nationhood has been facing multiple challenges in different capacities.

Space for Learners

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the classical notion of Indian nationhood.
2. What are the major factors contributing for Indian nationhood?

Self Asking Questions

1. 'Nationalism is inevitable to realize a nationhood'. Do you agree?
(80 words)

.....
.....
.....

1.5 Indian Nationhood: Debate and Discourse

1.5.1 Nationhood in the Post Colonial Period

The Indian nationhood can be realized from the debate and discourse on Indian nationalism, a quite sensitive matter in the politics of recent time. Basically, Indian nationalism has been shaping time and again by the changing political dispensations. It is considered as a pertinent matter for nation building process. However, at present Nationalism has become an everyday business for a section, chanting *Bharat Mata ki Jai* becomes crucial for assertion of nationalism. During the national movement for freedom, there were different processes to revitalize the spirit for nationalism. Apparently, patriotic song, slogan, poem and other write-ups provided wider space to strengthen the sense of nationalism; even the trend continues in the post independent period. Later on, observation of national days, song, films, historical monuments, commemorating the national movement had inspired a lot. These are hybridized with the induction of Hindutva, a new orientation of Indian

Space for Learners

nationalism. Hence, there are different nature of nationalists; i.e. soft nationalist and hardcore nationalist, liberal nationalist and despotic nationalist, moderate and rigid nationalist etc. and all are claiming for nation first, the territorial integrity, sovereignty is indispensable. During freedom struggle, there were three different schools of nationalism in India i.e. one school was run by Indian National Congress, the moderate approach, another one was the Hindu nationalist, and the third one was led by the communist disciples. Despite their ideological differences, people were enthusiastic for freedom and subsequently India got her independence in the year 1947. The scenario of post independent period is also changing in an unprecedented way.

Changing trend of Indian Nationhood:

In the post Independent period, India has been witnessing change in nationalism, the liberal pan Indian nationalism is replacing with hard core Hindu nationalism. The spirit of nationalism was basically cultivated during the independence movement; a section of freedom fighter had mobilized the common people against the British with a sentiment of self rule. The sense of belongingness was grounded at the time of independence and continued for couple of decades even after independence. Despite Hindu Muslim divide, an inclusive agenda was initiated for the sake of development as well as integrity of India. It was necessary for the nation building process. But, the advocates of Hindu nationalism have been campaigning for a Hindu *Rashtra* with a different fervor. It is alleged that the Hindu nationalist had no contribution in India's independence movement, indirectly supported the British administration. Basically, they opposed the process of handed over power and also declared the independence as bogus one. Other hand, the liberal setting was constructed by the Congress leadership, advocated for an inclusive society, rights and privileges for the minority groups, recognition of depressed classes etc. were rejected by the Hindu nationalist group. Even their political outfit Jana Sangh had to validate their ideological standing in the context of India. There was a constant struggle for constructing a Hindu nationhood by Hindu Mahasabha, Rastriya Sayangsevak Sangh, Vishwa Hindu Parishad, Jana Sangh and finally the BJP, Shiv Sena and other pro Hindu groups. Their aspiration for a Hindu nationhood is politically grounding in recent time. Even they are demanding cultural, social, political, historical and even constitutional change for establishing a Hindu *Rashtra*.

The Indian nationhood has been facing challenges from different sub national or regional forces within the state. The diversity usually provides enough space to sharpen one's identity in accordance with their aspiration. The nation has witnessed different challenges in different capacities i.e. linguistic based reorganization of states, sharpening separate identity based on culture, ethnicity, history etc. are very common among different communities in India. Hence, the pan Indian nationalism is challenged by sub or regional sentiment. However, the Indian constitution tries to unite one and all so that an inclusive society is possible to form. So, there might be different types of nationhood but everywhere the Indian nationhood remains prominent to substantiate the idea of India as a nation.

Stop to Consider

Hindu Nationalism:

There were hundreds of institutions have been working for establishing a Hindu *Rashtra* rejecting the existence of other religions in India. The tallest figure of RSS, Golwakar in his book *We or Our Nationhood Defined* where Muslims were portrayed as a perpetually hostile and alien element within the Indian body politic and society, who must either accept total subordination to Hindus or cease being Muslims. (Chandra and others 2007: 266). The Hindu nationalists were engaged in portraying the Muslims as their foe. Even the rule of Muslim emperor was rejected by the fanatic group of Hindu nationalist. The ideologue of RSS i.e. Savarkar, Golwalkar, Shyama Prasad Mukherjee etc. had substantial contribution in the formation of Hindu nationhood.

1.6 Summing Up

The concept of nationhood is essential for strengthening unity among the people. It is somewhat easier to realize in a homogenous society, but country like India, despite plurality, the spirit of nationhood is adequately sustained over the years. Even the notion of universalism was emphatically demanded by the followers of Hindutva to establish an inclusive society. However, the

Space for Learners

perception of Hindu nationalist for establishing a Hindu nationhood is not only a threat for minorities but it will shatter the entire democratic setting of India. The values of Indian constitution will face substantial challenges in the days to come. Never the less, the unity in diversity is the driving force of Indian nationalism has been contributing for the construction of a unique nationhood in the world.

1.7 Reference and Suggested Readings

1. Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*
2. Chandra, Bipan, M. Mukherjee & A. Mukherjee (2007) *India Since Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi
3. Desai, A. R. (2010) *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan Privt. Ltd. Mumbai
4. Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*, Blackwell
5. Harrison K. and Boyd T. (2018) *The nation in understanding political ideas and movements* <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526137951.00006> viewed on manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526137951/9781526137951.00006.xml (10August, 2021)
6. Hastings, A. *The construction of nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge university Press 1997)
7. Jafferlot, Christophe (2007) *Hindu Nationalism: A Reader*, Permanent Black, Ranikhet
8. Smith, A. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations* (Blackwell 1986)

UNIT: 2
EARLY CHALLENGES: INTEGRATION OF PRINCELY STATES

Space for Learners

Structure:

- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 Objectives**
- 2.3 Historical Background of India**
 - 2.3.1 Pre-British Period of India**
 - 2.3.2 British Period of India**
 - 2.3.3 Partition of India: India and Pakistan**
- 2.4 Emergence of India: Early Challenges**
 - 2.4.1 To Shape India as a Nation**
 - 2.4.2 Communal Tension in the aftermath of Partition**
 - 2.4.3 Survival of democracy**
 - 2.4.4 Integration of Princely States**
 - 2.4.5 Precarious Socio-Economic Infrastructure**
 - 2.4.6 Partition, Displacement and Rehabilitation**
- 2.5 Summing Up**
- 2.6 Reference and suggested readings**

2.1 Introduction

After the long struggle for freedom, India attained her independence in the year 1947. With the end of British rule in erstwhile India, the new nation deluged with multiple challenges in different capacities. Basically the emergence of two nations had conglomerated divisive politics among the common people. The geopolitical bifurcation had devastating impact across the territoriality. The history, map, memory, linkages, kith and kinship etc. were severely dislodged and it had been required couple of decades to reorganize the new political settings i.e. India and Pakistan. Hence, to understand the trajectory of Indian politics, it is essential to accentuate the contribution of British colonizer, the national movement, impact of communal bigotry, the situation of world politics and contribution of India in the World

Space for Learners

War II etc. As we know the national movement of India was a shared venture for disowning the British administration but the post independence politics shattered the entire setting and subsequently India faced multiple challenges for the formation of Indian nationhood.

Despite historic prominence, the independence of India was remained awkward for the common people that it had happened at the cost of partition on communal line. Exponents argued that, either it was a situational demand or British strategy to divide the nation and apparently history inculcates different debate and discussions; but the common people had to suffer a lot throughout the process. The history witnesses communal clashes, massive displacement, unabated migration, inhuman torture, massacres in the post partition period and at the same time the nation needs to reset its basic institutional grounding. The situation was quite precarious at that time in terms of societal integration, political transformation, and economic revivalism and pertinently reorganization of states was a terrible challenge for the new leadership of modern India.

The partition propels to reorganize the entire geopolitical setting of modern nations i.e. India and Pakistan. Even in the new geopolitical setting of India, it needs to rearrange different administrative units as aspiration and demands of different stakeholders were diverse and subsequently different strategies were applied to unite and integrate its territoriality. It was an unprecedented challenge for the new leadership to unite India as a nation.

2.2 Objectives

The transition from British dominion to an independent India had to face lots of troubles i.e. long battle for freedom, upshot of partition, communal clashes, integration of princely states and restructuring one and all and so on. It was quite difficult to structure under a unified setting as diversity prevails everywhere. At the time of partition, people were remained skeptical about the future, basically people from both the nation were enthusiastic for the freedom but concurrently become the victim of divisive politics. The ploy of divisive politics remained prevalent in every sphere of society. Here, an attempt has been made to understand the precarious situation faced by the people as well as Indian leadership in the post partition period. The

chapter is ideally prepared considering the following objectives. After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- *understand* the entire geo-political setting of India at the time of independence.
- *comprehend* the political initiatives to integrate one and all under the larger political framework of independent India.
- *examine* the impact on Indian polity in the post independent period.

2.3 Historical Background of India

The political setting of India has been witnessing manifold changes and challenges throughout the history. It is essential to go beyond the political framework to understand the trajectory of India as a nation. The administrative history of India is quite interesting but debatable issue as exponents are either glorifying or demonizing in accordance with their limited knowledge or capacity. Writing or rewriting history is an unending phenomenon but it needs a holistic approach to understand or retrieve the past chronicles whether it is for India or somewhere else. On and around 5000 years back, the Indus Valley Civilization had contributed towards the advancement of socio-eco-political setting of India. There was a rich administrative setting encompassing the region of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro. The history also witnessed that many dynasties had ruled different parts of India in different capacities. The ancient period comprises the administration of Haryanka Dynasty (Middle of 6th Century-413 BCE), Sishunaga Dynasty (413 BCE-345 BCE), Nanda Dynasty (345 BCE-322 BCE), Mauryan Dynasty (322 BCE-185 BCE), Shaka (150 BCE-400 CE) and so on. With the invasion of the Mahmeddan clans, a new chapter was started in India. They were again replaced by the European colonizers. It appears that, India's history is speckled with the ruins of empires. Kingdoms have periodically risen here, expanded and fallen, reshaping with them the region's culture and identity. Hence, the administrative history of India has been changing over the years and usually the age old system has been replacing with modern democratic setting.

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

2.3.1 Pre-British Period of India

The history of pre-British India was dominated by the Mughal Empire ruled almost the entire subcontinent of India controlling four million square kilometers of land and a population of about 160 million. The foundation stone of Mughal Empire was laid by Zaheeruddin Mohammad and also known as Babur in the year 1526. Initially Babur had to face a battle with Ibrahim Lodhi, the Sultan of Delhi from Lodhi dynasty. With that very incident, the mighty Babur had expanded its territory invading different kingdom one after another. The Mughal Empire sustained till the end of Aurangzeb, the last prominent ruler, during whose reign the empire also achieved its maximum geopolitical extent. At the beginning of Mughal Empire, there were many kingdoms in India i.e. Delhi Sultanate, Rajputana, Sur Empire, Timurid Empire, Deccan Sultanate, Chero Dynasty, and Bengal Sultanate. Most of the kingdoms were becoming insignificant in the presence of mighty Mughal, but with the end of Mughal Empire, once again many kingdoms claimed their existences. Allegedly, the British had enormous contribution in stimulating the princely states in India.

There are different schools which have been explaining the decline of Mughal Empire in India. The major reasons for declination of Mughal Empire were depravities in high places, excessive luxury, and increasingly narrow views that left the rulers unprepared for any kind of external challenges. The Marxist school led by Irfan Habib tries to explain the excessive exploitation of the peasantry by the rich, which stripped away the will and the means to support the regime. Karen Leonard has focused on the failure of the regime to work with Hindu Bankers, whose financial support was increasingly needed; the bankers then helped the Maratha and British. From the religious point of view, some exponents argued that Hindu powers revolted against the rule of a Muslim dynasty. Although, different exponents have been explaining differently, but it would be pertinent enough to explore applying the conspiracy theory of different stakeholders and particularly from the British Colonizer's end.

Check Your Progress

1. Give a pen picture of pre independence period of India.
2. Highlight the reason of diversity in India.

Space for Learners

2.3.2 British Period of India

The British rule in India can be divided into two phases i.e. Company Rule till the end of 1857 and the Crown Rule from 1858 to 1947. Replacing the traditional process, the British had applied new approaches in conquering the nations. Very surreptitiously, without major bloodshed, the British colonies had been grounded across the globe. In India, after getting the Royal Charter (Shahi Farman) issued by Mughal emperor Farukhsiyar in 1717, the East India Company got power of attorney to export and import of goods in Bengal. Besides it also got permission to pass goods through the ports. After getting the business license, gradually established its business foundation in India. The company was empowered to establish forts and keep security forces. By the Regulating Act of 1773, the East India Company had opened a new chapter as the parliament of Great Britain recognized the company's rule in India.

The early history of British expansion in India was characterized by the co-existence of two approaches towards the existing princely states.

1. The first was a policy of annexation, where the British sought to forcibly absorb the Indian princely states into the provinces which constituted their empire in India.
2. The second was a policy of indirect rule, where the British assumed suzerainty and paramountcy over princely states, but conceded to them sovereignty and varying degrees of internal self-government.

British India consisted of British Indian Provinces and the Princely States. Undeniably, there were some administrative pockets ruled by European i.e. Portuguese, Dutch, French etc. The British India was directly under the control of British Government and by the Indian Independence Act of 1947 the lapse of paramountcy was declared by the British Crown and apparently India became independent. However, the Act didn't cover the 565 princely

Space for Learners

states of India. The British administration has provided opportunities or ensured liberty to merge either with India or Pakistan and others are allowed to remain free as independent states. These princely states were under the direct rule of Princes but everywhere they were directly or indirectly controlled by the British crown. Initially, the British administration had expanded its territory using different strategies i.e. direct fight with different rulers, diplomacy, persuasion and even some mischievous policies i.e. Doctrine of lapse, Subsidiary alliance system were applied from time to time.

Stop to Consider

Doctrine of Lapse:

It was a policy of East India Company to expand its territoriality in India. The policy was the initiation by the Court of Directors of East India Company in the year 1834. Later on, the imperialist policy vigorously applied by Lord Dalhousie in the late 1840's and remained applicable until 1859. The policy carries that if a ruler died without his biological heir, the entire territory would be annexed by the Company. No Kings were permitted to adopt male child as their successor and through that very policy Satara, Nagpur, Jhansi, Jaitpur, Jaswan, Ballabgarh etc. were annexed with the British territory. It was one of the greatest conspiracies or injustice to the people of India as without spending a penny, different territories were annexed one after another.

Subsidiary Alliance System:

The British East India company expanded its territory introducing different strategies in India. Lord Wellesley had changed the administrative setting introducing the Subsidiary Alliance System and different areas were compelled to depend on the British Military. The internal system was allowed to administer by the existing rulers but their security system was regulated by the British. Apparently, the rulers were remained dependent on the British and even the internal uprisings were also controlled by the British. Ultimately, the administration was being weakening day by day and very tactfully propelled to merge

with the British administration. The Subsidiary Alliance system basically carries the following principles:

- Acknowledge the British East India Company as paramount of power.
- Permanently station a British Army within the territory.
- Pay subsidy maintaining the British Army.
- Post a British Resident in his court
- Not negotiate with any other rulers without prior consent from the Governor General
- Not employ any European in their service without getting approval from the British

Besides, if the ruler fails to make payment as per the alliance, then the state would be confiscated by British East India Company.

Space for Learners

Check Your Progress

1. What is doctrine of lapse?
2. What is Subsidiary Alliance System?
3. Discuss the British policies to expand its territory.

2.3.3 Partition of India: India and Pakistan

The end of national freedom movement was resultant with the formation of two nation based on religion. From the very beginning, the religious angle was applied by the British in a well thought out process. The Hindu-Muslim identities were sharpened in different capacities and the British were scary about the unified stand of the common people. Perhaps, the emergence of Indian National Congress, the common platform for Indian nationalism was the biggest challenge for British administration and subsequently it promulgates an anti Congress movement instigated by the British. A section of elite Muslim had become supporter of British rule to aspiring protection from the domination of Hindu as well as French, Portuguese or Dutch colonies.

Space for Learners

Gradually this very elite section of Muslims nurtured the concept of two nations. Even they founded the All India Muslim League in the year 1906 to raise the issues of Muslims. Furthermore, by the Indian Council Act 1909, the Muslims were given separate electorates ensuring minimum reservation through reserved category. In a similar fashion, by the Indian Council Act 1919, the Sikhs, European and Anglo Indian were also given separate electorates. Gradually, the Hindus were felt paranoid and strengthen own organizational setting for safeguarding Hindus in India. In the meantime, a section of Hindus were united under the banner of Akhil Bharatiya Hindu Mahasabha (1916) founded by Madan Mohan Malaviya as well as Rastriya Sawangsevak Sangh (1925) by a Hindu nationalist Keshav Baliram Hedgeawr. Another fraction, the communist ideology got momentum with the establishment of Communist Party of India in the year 1925. The fragility helps the British to configure divide and rule policy in an elegant manner.

The partition of India was not an accidental phenomenon and one's need to revisit the chronological development of two nation theory. With the formation of different organizations on religious line, the divisive politics rooted deeply in the society. The decades of 1920's and 1930's, some communal incidents were occurred in different parts of India. In the provincial election 1937, although Congress had outnumbered Muslim League, the League performed better in Muslim dominated area and sought Congress League Coalition government and which was denounced by the Congress leadership. The Muslim leadership felt insecure as they would always be in second position in larger democratic framework and subsequently demanded for a Muslim dominion parting away from India. Even in the year 1940, the Muslim league had moved a resolution demanding 'independent state' for Muslims comprising the North-West belt as well as Eastern part of India. At this point, the British strategy was simple as they will provide dominion status in exchange of support and cooperation for World War II. Even a delegation led by Sir Stafford Cripps came to India in March, 1942 with a view to convince the Indian leadership to keep India loyal to the British war policy in exchange of elections and self rule. The leaders of Muslim League were offered with a separate Union in the following days. Nevertheless, the proposals of Cripps Mission were rejected by the Indian National Congress

as well as All India Muslim League. The British strategy was simple and clear as on one hand it had been trying to usurp support towards British war policy and other hand deflecting the demand for independence. Taking into consideration such strategy, the Bombay Session of All India Congress Committee held on 8th August, 1942, had launched the great August Movement or Quit India Movement to end the British rule in India. Apart from Congress, different other stakeholders i.e. Viceroy's Council, All India Muslim League, Hindu Mahasabha, the princely States, the Indian Imperial Police, the British Indian Army and Indian Civil Service cadres had extended support towards the British administration.

The next Provincial election was held in January, 1946 and once again the Congress swept the united province and Muslim League remained limited in Muslim concentrated area. The leaders of Muslim League had claimed that even the common people were in favour of partition. Keeping it in mind, the British once again send a group of leaders, the Cabinet Mission in order to discuss transfer of power from the British government to the Indian leadership. The Cabinet Mission had proposed a three tier administrative setting with a federal union at the top, provincial groupings at the intermediate level and provinces with maximum autonomy at the bottom. The proposals of Cabinet Mission were rejected by the Congress as well as Muslim League, but the demand of partition was conglomerating in every nook and corner of India. Even the Muslim League had taken a resolution to observe 16th August, 1946 as 'Direct Action Day.' However, the legislators of Indian National Congress, Muslim League and Sikh Community came to an agreement with Lord Mountbatten and which has come to known as 3 June plan or Mountbatten Plan in freedom history. On that very day, Lord Mountbatten formally announced in the radio regarding the partition of India. Thereafter, on 5th of July, 1947 Indian Independence Act was passed by the British Parliament and the King of Britain approved the Bill of partition on 18th July, 1947. Subsequently, on 14th August, 1947 the nation was divided into India and Pakistan purely based on religious line.

Space for Learners

Mountbatten Plan or 3 June Plan:

The plan named after Lord Mountbatten, the last viceroy of India (February 1947 to August 1947) and also the first Governor General of independent India. Essentially, the legislators of Indian National Congress, All India Muslim league and Sikh community came to an agreement with Lord Mountbatten. The plan provided an overview how to rearrange the geopolitics of India after partition. The plan includes the following important provisions:

1. Principle of the partition of British India is accepted by the British Government. The British India is divided into two dominions and will be known as – Dominion of India and Dominion of Pakistan with effect from 15th August, 1947.
2. The province of Bengal and Assam and the Province of Punjab are constituted under Government of India Act 1935 and ceased to exist. The provinces were constituted as East and West Punjab in the West and East and West Bengal in the East. The fate of Assam and Sylhet would be decided as per referendum. Subsequently, after partition both the provinces i.e. Bengal and Punjab shared by India and Pakistan.
3. Both the dominions were entrusted with full autonomy to administer their own law. The leaders were allowed to prepare their own constitution. Until the making of the new constitution, they can apply different provisions of the Government of India Act 1935 to govern the states.
4. The plan also terminated the British suzerainty over the princely states and these states could decide to join either India or Pakistan.

The Mountbatten plan incorporates different other issues i.e. sharing of Military, administrative personnel's, different titles, provision of governor general and so on. This is the final plan from the British end in India.

There are different narratives regarding the partition and communal angle is considered most pertinent in this regard. On one hand, the presence of All India Muslim League and other hand Hindu Mahasabha as well as RSS had deluged the entire system terribly. The demand had become more stringent in 1940's and partition was the only choice for every stakeholder. Even the leadership of Congress also propelled to accept the situational demand of partition. Only a few leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan had opposed the concept of partition. Another narrative comes up with the battle of power politics between Jinnah and Nehru accentuated the partition of India. Some others believe that the British leadership was overwhelmed with the divisiveness of Indian society and subsequently to end the communal clashes and atrocities; it was the only way need to be applied. Apodictically, the divide and rule policy of British was the dominant narrative had contribution in partition. Notable point is that partition resultant with massive migration, displacement and huge loss of lives and property from either side of the nations. Even it had abysmal impact on socio-economic sector in the post partitioned period.

Check Your Progress

1. What are the major factors contributed in national movement of India?
2. What are the reasons behind partition of India?
3. How the divisive politics cautiously applied by the British administration?
4. Discuss the role of Indian National Congress in bringing independence of India.

2.4 Emergence of India: Early Challenges

We all know that at the wee hours of 15th August, 1947 India got her independence from the British raj at the cost of partition. The entire nation was in grief for unwanted partition. There was no alternate option other than partition to restrict multiple partitions as diversity prevails in every nook

Space for Learners

and corner of India. Reaching the feat, India faced unprecedented challenges from different capacities. Even the leaders were skeptical about the longevity of free India but gradually everything had come towards normalcy. Undoubtedly it required couple of years to bring stability however India had become an example for other nations. Basically, the partition on communal line had abysmal impact upon the society, polity and even economy and so on and subsequently a massive migration, displacement, loss of life and property, and social tension among the communities had been witnessed. Secondly, after partition it was quite essential to demarcate the boundary with Pakistan. Thirdly, it was important to solve the internal geopolitical issues as different princely states and other dominions had a tendency to separate from India. Fourthly, although the leadership had chosen democratic form of government but common people were immature enough to apply in their day to day life. Another crucial issue was arisen with the demand for reorganization of states on linguistic basis. Finally, the nation faced challenges from the international affairs as the entire world was reeling under political quandary as Capitalist as well as Socialist block were the two power group emerged after the World War II. Hence, in the aftermath of independence, the leadership had faced huge challenges throughout the nation building process.

2.4.1 To Shape India as a Nation

India attained her independence at the cost of partition. In the post partition period, it was a stringent challenge for the leadership to shape the entire territoriality as a nation. The society in India is heterogeneous and it was quite difficult to bring under the same umbrella in a partition induced diffracted society. Although Pakistan was created for Muslims, but a huge number of Muslims were not interested to leave India. In addition to religion, the entire Indian society is a mosaic of different language, caste, creed, cousin, culture, identity, ethnicity, history and so on. At the very beginning, the leaders were skeptical about the possibility of unity in such a heterogeneous socio-political setting. Gradually, diversity becomes a source of strength in the larger democratic framework.

India is a land over 1652 languages are spoken, all the major religions are available here, the society is divided into multiple layers on the basis of caste i.e. Brahmin, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudra, different tribes i.e. hill and plain, different ethnic identities and so on. On the eve of partition, the separate electorates had sharpened religious identities and particularly Hindu, Muslim and Sikhs were provided to represent in the bargaining of power politics. The entire community was in a race to secure their parochial identity. A section of people indulged in secessionist movement, insurgency activities for demanding their autonomy, ethnicity and so on. Furthermore, the representation in the Working Committee of Indian National Congress on the basis of linguistic boundaries carries the seeds of bifurcation in the post partition period. Historical diversity was quite prominent as India never ruled by a single unified commander. The Hindu people had their own glorious history, the Muslims had also their own past, the Sikh, Rajput, Jat etc. have their own glorious past and therefore historical diversity got momentum even after partition.

Hence, in a diverse society like India, it was quite difficult to accommodate one and all. Considering the issue of safety and security, it was essential for a newly born country like India. Even it controls from further splitting in the post independence period.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider:

Demarcation of Territoriality :

After partition, it was essential to demarcate the geopolitical boundaries and Cyril Redcliff was assigned to demarcate the border within five weeks. It was quite difficult to demarcate for the team and subsequently remained disputed for couple of decades. The issues of enclave, disputed borderland etc. are remained unresolved even today. The abrupt decision for demarcation propels the people to migrate from one nation to another. Such type of unabated migration has created the problem of refugee and till date many people have been suffering in getting citizenship.

Space for Learners

2.4.2 Communal Tension in the aftermath of Partition

Due to partition, there was a massive migration of people from either side of new nations and had been continued for couple of years. It was one of the largest unplanned, abrupt exoduses of people in the history of migration. The rail, road and water ways were remained overcrowded for couple of months and even people had to move hundreds of kilometers on foot to achieve their destination. People faced innumerable hardship, inhuman atrocities, extortions, killing, looting and so on. The cities like Kolkata, Patna, Amritsar, Rawalpindi and Lahore had witnessed highest number of communal incidents. Apparently, partition witnessed huge loss of life and property.

The decision of partition was not just an administrative formalities but it was a matter of life and death of lakhs of people. As many as one million died and 15 million were displaced, the Hindu and Sikh fled from Pakistan to India and the Muslims fled to Pakistan from India. It had been continued for couple of decades and people faced innumerable hardship in settling down in new nation. People and particularly women, children and elderly people were being suffered a lot. The situation was too cruel to survive a life. The neighbours, friends, colleagues had became enemy with the declaration of partition. Interestingly, the peaceful coexistence and unified struggle against the British had become a history with immediate effect after partition.

The entire nation was considered as communal hotbed after partition. On the very day of independence, Mahatma Gandhi was in Kolkata and sat for hunger strike against the communal outrages after partition. In Kolkata and Patna, the Muslims were insecure whereas in Nowakhali, the Hindus were insecure. Actually the great leader with tallest personality, Gandhi was popular among the Hindu and Muslims. Secondly, he strongly opposed the concept of partition on religious angle. However, being partition was certain and to stop any form of bloodshed, Gandhi insisted the leaders to maintain peace and safety and security of others at any cost.

Stop to Consider

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel:

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel (1875-1950) popularly known as Iron Man of India, the first Deputy Prime Minister and also the Minister of Home Affairs, Government of India had immense contribution in the nation building process. He emerged as a major leader of the freedom movement after the Kheda Satyagraha (1918) and the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928).

At the time of independence, the problem of integration of princely states was a major challenge for India as national integrity and unity was essential to overcome the precarious situation emerged after partition. The Britishers had allowed joining the princely states either with India or Pakistan or they can remain independent shaping their own political setup. Under such circumstances, Sardar Patel was the commanding figure diplomatically merged as many as 565 princely states with Indian domain. Hence, the architect of existing geopolitical map of India was none other than Sardar Patel.

Space for Learners

2.4.3 Survival of Democracy

With independence, India came out from the British colonial subjugation. India had adopted liberal democratic republican form of government. In the post World War II period, most of the newly independent countries had adopted liberal democracy, wherein the power is vested in the hands of common people. The western countries are considered as pioneer of modern democracy and have been practicing without interruption as people have been nurturing democratic values in different capacities. The British administration in India had initiated limited democracy through conducting provincial elections. Despite colony, the Britishers tried to introduce the Indian society with democratic aspiration, values, temper and so on. Basically democracy needs modern education, scientific temper, infrastructural development, organizational setting and so on, but the society of India remained sluggish in the entire process.

Space for Learners

India had introduced representative democracy after partition. As a result, it was essential to conduct election, preparation of electoral rolls, formation of independent body for managing elections, rules and regulations and so on. Democracy usually vested powers in the hands of common people and in India most of the people were illiterate, economically disadvantageous, culturally retarded and subsequently the constitution framer were skeptical, about the adequacy or competence of democracy in India. At least the common people should have minimum idea to judge what is wrong or right. Democracy provides scope to choose the best from many. Even they should have idea about the complex procedure of election. For a successful democracy, the voters should be conscious; their active participation would help in check and balancing the government and so on. It's essential to be free from prejudice, nepotism or inclination so that people can chose perfect representative to run the government. But, India after the partition was too immature to expect a fully democratic society. Furthermore, the constitution provided equality, rights, privileges, freedom, justice, minority rights and so on and which is essential for democracy but it would be challenging to sustain democracy in a plural, heterogeneous, unequal society like India. Hence, it was a distance dream in the aftermath of partition.

2.4.4 Integration of Princely States

The integration of princely states was a crucial issue raised in different situation as many of them had indirect support towards the national movement. By the late 1930s, the Congress made it clear their intension of integrating the states into the Indian Union. In the Haripura Session of Indian National Congress (1938) emphasized its stand for the same political, social and economic freedom in the states as in the rest of India and considers the states as integral part of India which can't be separated. The demand for *Purna Swaraj* or complete independence was accentuating for the whole India.

With the Indian Independence Act 1947, the British reign in India had come to an end. Earlier, the British tactfully grounded here and without interruption ruled for 200 years. They applied different methods in annexation as well as expansion of territories. Initially the East India Company ruled India but

after the great Indian Rebellion of 1857, also known as Sepoy Mutiny, the British crown took over the charges to rule directly from the British parliament. The British had two categories of administrative units. One is British India, the British paramountcy was there and other one is princely states and which were ruled directly by Indian Raja-Maharajas but indirectly controlled by the British. At the time of independence cum partition, there were as many as 565 princely states. On the eve of independence, they were provided three options i.e. merging either with India or Pakistan or they can remain free as independent state. It appears that most of them decided to merge with India, a few merged with Pakistan and only five states wished to remain free as independent states. The integration strategies applied by the Indian leadership can be categorized into two i.e. persuasion and repression. It is also known as carrot and stick policy. Through this, one who wished to join the Indian state was ensured full protection including privy purses and others were tactfully compelled to merge with India. Notable point is that apart from Bhopal, Hyderabad, Jodhpur, Junagadh and Travancore, most of the Kings of princely states signed the instrument of accession with India, only three had signed with Pakistan; but the entire process was remained complicated in a newly democratic setting.

The main architect of India's integration policy was none other than Sardar Vallab Bhai Patel, the Iron Man of India; but it is essential to recognize other two personalities Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India and V. P. Menon, the secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of States under Sardar Patel. Here they had applied different strategies to usurp the support from the smaller states. They applied persuasion as well as suppression to merge the territories with India. It started even before independence and within short span of time most of the princely states merged with the Indian Union. But, the states like Junagarh, nearest to Pakistan, although the Muslim ruler intended to join Pakistan, but the people strongly opposed his standing and subsequently joined with India. The matter of Jammu and Kashmir was somewhat different as Hindu ruler ruled over the Muslims and they sought to remain as an independent state, but whenever Pakistan tried to capture the Kashmir region, ultimately the Maharaja Hari Shing had negotiated with India and signed the Instrument of Accession.

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Princely States:

The erstwhile India was remained under the rule of different kingdoms. Prior to the British colonial administration, a substantial portion of Indian territory was ruled by the Mughal emperors. The history of different kingdoms was remained patchy, most of them either extinct or remained weakened in the course of time. It appears that the British colony replaced the conventional monarchical system but many parts had remained untouched even at the end of colonial administration. On the eve of independence, as many as 565 princely states were there. It was a great challenge to arrange or annexed these princely states within the larger framework of India. Sardar Vallab Bhai Patel was the stalwart figure to address the issue and most of the princely states were become integral part of India. Being the first Minister of Home Affairs, Government of India, Mr. Patel had integrated different territories applying multiple strategies i.e. persuasion, diplomacy, plebiscite or military force. Besides, there were two types of agreement i.e. instrument of accession and standstill agreement.

Basically, by the Wavell plan of 1945, the princely states were to be independent after Independence of India. Even the Cabinet Mission Plan also asserted the independence of princely states. But the Mountbatten Plan of June 1947 declared that the princely states would have to join either India or Pakistan according to their geographical location.

Check Your Progress

1. What are the major challenges India faced in the aftermath of partition?
2. Discuss the trajectory of India as a nation.
3. What do you mean by refugee? How the problem was addressed in the post partition period.
4. Was partition a challenge for nation building process? Give your arguments.
5. Discuss the process of integration of princely states in India.

Stop to Consider

Privy Purses:

The concept is a payment process to the royal families for their agreement to merge with India. By the 26th amendment to the Constitution of India, 1971 withdrew recognition of the princes as rulers, took away their remaining privileges, and abolished the remuneration granted to them by Privy Purses.

In the aftermath of independence, the new India faced abysmal challenges from different angles. The Hindu-Muslim communal clashes had destroyed the societal bondage among the people. Furthermore the partition had sharpened the differences as Hindustan is for Hindus and Pakistan for Muslims. The Muslim concentrated areas i.e. Baluchistan, Sindh, Western Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and East Bengal were bifurcated from India for the creation of Pakistan. There was a massive migration as Hindu people from Muslim dominated area prefer to go to Hindu concentrated areas and vice versa.

Stop to Consider

Annexation of Kashmir and Hyderabad:

At the time of partition, Jammu Kashmir was ruled by Maharaja Hari Singh and signed a standstill agreement with Pakistan and also proposed one with India. But it announced that Kashmir intended to remain independent. In the meantime, Pakistan Army tried to occupy Kashmir and to resist the invaders, Maharaja Hari Singh wrote to India asking military assistance. As per procedure, Maharaja propelled to sign Instrument of Accession with India. Finally Indian troops secured Kashmir, Srinagar and the entire valley. Despite Muslim majority, the Kashmir valley became integral part of India. However, a portion of Kashmir still remained under the occupation of Pakistan. Hyderabad was a Hindu dominated state ruled by Nizam, a Muslim ruler under subsidiary alliance system of British. In November 1947, Sir Mir Osman

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

Ali Khan did a standstill agreement with Dominion of India intending to remain free after partition. Fearing the establishment of Communist state and rise of militant *Razakar*, the Indian government invaded the princely state in September, 1948 under 'Operation Polo', a military action from Indian side. Finally, the Nizam compelled to sign the instrument of accession. He also enjoyed the facility of privy purse but later on it was ended with 26th Amendment of Indian Constitution.

2.4.5 Precarious Socio-Economic Infrastructure

Although India attained her complete liberty with the independence but apart from political liberty as guaranteed by the constitution, all others were remained a distance dream as society, economy, culture etc. were not in a proper shape to resilient after the long struggle for independence. People were being struggled for basic amenities. There was nothing in terms of modernity i.e. technology, drainage, irrigation, industries and so on. The British colonizers were just for exploiting the resources and particularly raw materials from India. Secondly, most of the people had direct or indirect contribution in national freedom struggle and ultimately the cumulative production in those days had decreased abysmally. Thirdly, the partition induced communal clash had devastating impact in the socio-eco-cultural setting. Nothing remained under control; the instable society had gruesome impact in the economic sector. Fourthly, huge migration induced displacement destroyed the foundation of society. One hand migrated people were considered as refugee and at the same time their contribution remained nil for couple of decades. Furthermore, migrated people had faced citizenship crisis in the following years. Finally, the social heterogeneity destroyed the cultural bondage in the post partition period.

2.4.6 Partition, Displacement and Rehabilitation

It was a great challenge for independent India that as many as 15 million people were uprooted due to partition. Undeniably, the migration was a situational demand as religious identity had been sharpened everywhere and subsequently an irresistible turmoil faced by the common people. It was quite painful for them to leave their homeland permanently but had no

alternate option was there. Although people exchanged their properties, but which was quite impossible for all and even people did not get proper sale value in such a horrible situation. Furthermore, it was not easier for them to settle down in their new location and subsequently a new issue emerged in terms of refugee. The nation needs to consider the problem of refugee on humanitarian ground and they were ensured food, shelter, medicine and other basic amenities. Considering the emotional mayhem of losing one's homeland, the government had initiated different schemes and even citizenship was entrusted to them in the course of time. There was an agreement between India and Pakistan on resolving the citizenship crisis with mutual understanding. By the Indian Citizenship Act 1955, a huge number of refugees were given citizenship in India. In this context, it would be important to mention here that a huge number of Indian Muslims migrated to Pakistan at the time of partition also returned after getting normalcy here. The introduction of Citizenship Amendment Act 2019 is acutely related with people towards the non Muslims of neighbouring countries including the refugee of partition. It becomes a debatable issue in the present context of Indian politics.

Space for Learners

SAQ:

Q. 'Plurality is the strength of Indian society' discuss with arguments?

(80 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.5 Summing Up

India attained her independence in the year 1947. As a new nation, India had faced multiple challenges in different capacities. Democracy was adopted but India was remained tender in age to sustain democracy. With the partition,

Space for Learners

the entire geopolitical setting of India witnessed a massive fragmentation and which has become normal in the subsequent period. Here,

1. The socio-political situation of India was remained volatile for couple of years in the aftermath of independence movement. The immediate affect was partition, emergence of two nations on the basis of religion. Eventually a huge mobilization of people was there throughout India. The communal bloodshed really destroyed the historical bondage among the people. Even the memory of independence was erased by the communal clashes and even both the countries became mutual enemy within short span of time. The rule of Britishers sometimes questioned that partition is accidental or British creation. Notable point is that resetting of nation is quite difficult at that time.
2. After Independence, India had witnessed a precarious situation in terms of economy for devastating impact of World War II. Basically India was a prominent supplier of military as well as food grains for the British. One hand the people were being engaged in perennial fighting for independence and at the same time unavoidable impact of World War II, the situation was worsened abysmally. Furthermore, people had to face different health hazard due to their poor infrastructural facilities.
3. The partition on the basis of religion was not a proper solution for India as thousands of Muslim remained within the geopolitical space of India. Initially most of the people exchange their property as Hindu from Pakistan definitely preferred India and Muslims also preferred Pakistan. However, it was quite difficult to exchange their land and other properties. It did not happen that all the people were in favour of partition as the standing of liberals, moderate and people with inclusive mindset rejected such proposals. Pertinent point is that a major chunk of political leaders including the constitution framer literally provided space for all religion. On one hand the modern liberal personalities were in favour of inclusive society and other hand it was a situational demand that the Muslims in India outnumbered even the then Pakistan. Undoubtedly

considering the security issue, advantages or disadvantages, a huge number of people migrated but later returned in course of time.

4. The partition of India impelled a massive migration of people. Despite poor transportation system, people migrated from one location to another and it was the highest displacement in the world history. The transnational movement created the issue of citizenship as people were remained confused for couple of years. Hence people had suffered from contested identity and subsequently faced unequal treatment for year after another.
5. The administrative setting was severely affected due to partition. The personnel preferred safe destination and got better opportunities in new administrative setting. But entire system was destabilized for partition induced migration.
6. In the aftermath of partition, the demand for reorganization of states on the basis of language was a massive challenge for the newly independent nation. Gradually the demand had become stronger and within the decade the nation had to gone through reorganization of states.
7. Finally, it had required couple of years to realize India as a nation. There were some unavoidable issues i.e. separatist tendencies, dissatisfaction over internal boundaries, provision of privy purses and so on. The issues unfolded multiple challenges in the unity and integrity of India.

So, after reading this unit you have learnt that emergence of India as a nation requires manifold transformation. The diversity usually constricted in smooth functioning but at the same time it is the strength of Indian nationhood. The constitutional values provide enough space to maintain peaceful coexistence. However, the challenges emerged in the aftermath of partition had been replaced with new challenges in the course of time.

2.6 Reference and Suggested Readings

1. Brass, Paul R. (1990) : The Politics of India Since Independence, Cambridge, New Delhi
2. Chandra, Bipan, Mridula Mukherjee and Aditya Mukherjee (2008): India Since Independence, Penguin Books, New Delhi
3. Dhiman, S. C. (2014): Princely States, the Muslim League and the Partition of India, Neha Publishers, New Delhi
4. Menon, V. P. (2014): Integration of the Indian States, Orient Black Swan, New Delhi
5. Nag, Sajal, Tejimala Gurung and Abhijit Choudhury (2009): Making of the Indian Union Merger of Princely States and Excluded Areas, Akangsha Publishing, New Delhi
6. Politics in India Since Independence, NCERT Text Book
7. Singh, Jaswant (2009): Jinnah: India, Partition, Independence, Rupa Publication, New Delhi

UNIT: 3

RE-ORGANISATION OF THE STATES

Unit Structure :

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Objectives

3.3 Re-organisation of the States in India on Linguistic Basis

3.3.1 The Role of the National Leadership

3.3.2 The Action Plan

3.3.3 The Creation of Andhra Pradesh

3.3.4 States Re-organisation Commission

3.3.5 Linguistic Re-organisation of Sensitive Regions: An Overview

3.4 The Consequences of Re-organisation

3.5 The Issue of Minority Languages of India

3.5.1 Constitutional Safeguards for Linguistic Minority Communities

3.6 Summing Up

3.7 References and Suggested Readings

3.1 Introduction

Reorganisation of the states in India was a strategic move made by the Government of independent India in order to bring order and give a definite structure to the administration of the country. Since ancient times, India has been a country filled with diversity. This diversity is reflected in India's multiple cultures, languages, religions, customs and ethnic groupings. However, there has always been a sense of unity that has been able to manage this diversity. Hence the Indian civilization was able to survive such long historical journey. The boundaries of India's provinces also have never been drawn on any of these grounds.

Till independence, almost all of India's provinces were multi-religious, multicultural and multi-lingual. This proved advantageous to our national

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

leaders when they started mobilizing the masses in the interest of the freedom struggle against British rule.

However, language as a tool of drawing boundaries became prominent in the early 20th century. One of the activities undertaken by the British in India was the spread of modern education in the country. Only through the medium of mother tongue can education be spread among the masses. Also language is very closely related to culture and customs. It is the only source through which the masses could successfully become part of the political and administrative systems.

The leaders of the Indian National Congress were the first to realise that important role language could play in mobilizing the masses well as structuring them. Congress reorganised its regional branches on the basis of linguistic grounds. This in turn gave birth to the idea of the organisation of Indian states on linguistic basis once India attained independence.

3.2 Objectives

This unit is an attempt to understand the phenomenon of reorganisation and creation of states in independent India on the basis of linguistic identities. After going to this unit you will be able to :-

- *Understand* the necessity of reorganization of Indian states
- *Discuss* the purpose behind choosing language as the basis of reorganisation
- *Describe* official steps taken towards reorganisation
- *Understand* the idea behind reorganisation of major states
- *Discuss* the consequences of reorganisation
- *Evaluate* the constitutional provisions and safeguards with regards to minority linguistic communities in India

3.3 Reorganisation of States in India on Linguistic Basis

The reorganization of Indian states was a strategic step that was anticipated by many experts. Firstly, Indian nationalism promoted during the freedom

struggles had found expression in terms of linguistic grounds. This was because all national leaders are regional leaders first and foremost and it is most convenient to mobilise masses in their mother tongue.

Second, India's decision to construct a federal structure of government required both a central government as well as provincial governments. Hence, it became necessary to re-define the boundaries of the Indian states. As it had already been done on linguistic basis during the freedom struggle, reorganising the states on linguistic terms seemed to be the simplest of available solutions.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Some important points:

- In simplest terms, reorganisation of states on linguistic basis means carving out the boundaries of a state on the basis of the concentration of the majority speaking population of that particular region.
- In the early 1920s, the Indian National Congress had reorganised its regional branches on the basis of language.
- Leaders like Gandhiji believed that reorganisation of the Indian states on a linguistic basis will strengthen the unity of the nation.

Thirdly, drawing up provinces in India on the basis of language was the dream of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhiji believed that the regional languages could develop to their fullest terms only if the provinces were to be reorganised on linguistic basis. The Indian National Congress successfully experimented with this during the freedom movement. Hence it was more or less assumed that independent India would be drawn on the lines of linguistic boundaries for a seamless administrative setup to be established.

3.3.1 The Role of National Leadership

As mentioned earlier, creation of states and territories in India on the basis of language was a strategy that gained momentum during the British rule in India. A glowing example of this was the creation of Orissa as a state in

Space for Learners

India on the 1st of April, 1936 on the basis of language. The creation of Orissa was the result of a prolonged linguistic movement that started in the year 1895 under the successful leadership of Madhusudan Das, Gajapati Krushna Chandra Dev etc.

However, the national leadership, who envisioned such a redistribution during the freedom struggle days, had second thoughts about linguistic redistribution of states after India attained independence. Some of the reasons behind this were—

1. An important consequence of independence of India from British rule was the Partition of India into two sovereign nations of India and Pakistan. This partition resulted in serious administrative, political, social and economic problems in the country.
2. As an emerging state, India faced issues related to security, economy, law and order.
3. The issue of Kashmir and the fight between India and Pakistan over Kashmir that continues to persist till date.
4. Unwillingness of the national leadership to further damage the unity of India by bringing about divisive issues like borders and boundaries.

Under such circumstances, leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru felt that there were issues far more important than reorganisation of the states. First and foremost, the national leadership aimed at strengthening the stability and security of the country. They also attempted to avoid issues that might hamper the fragile unity over which India stood. That included issues like region, regionalism and language.

Despite such efforts, the issue of linguistic reorganisation of states was raised in the Constituent Assembly immediately after independence. There were several reasons behind this—

- Firstly, independent India was composed of an amalgamation of 571 princely states that were merged together as 27 states. However, such a merging was conducted on a temporary basis.

- Secondly, many communities and their regional leadership were unhappy with this temporary merging of states and started demanding for their own states based on linguistic grounds.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Some important points:

- On the 1st of April, 1936, the state of Orissa was created. It was the first Indian state created on linguistic grounds.
- After India's independence, the national leadership was initially hesitant to move forward with the linguistic reorganisation of states.
- Administration, development, security, economy, law and order and unity were issues that were given priority to by the government over reorganisation.
- After independence, 571 princely states of India were merged temporarily to form 27 states.

Check Your Progress

1. What is the role of language in our lives?
2. When was the state of Orissa created?
3. What were the issues faced by India immediately after independence?
4. Why did Mahatma Gandhi support reorganisation on the basis of language?

3.3.2 The Action Plan

The Linguistic Provinces Commission or The Dar Commission

On the 17th of June 1948, the Constituent Assembly of India appointed the Linguistic Provinces Commission in order to look into the possibility of constructing Indian States on the basis of language. This

The Commission was headed by Justice S. K. Darand hence, it was popularly known as the Dar Commission.

Space for Learners

The Dar Commission enquired upon the desirability and feasibility of reorganising the states on a linguistic basis and reported that under the current circumstances, it was an unadvisable step. It might further lead to conflicting situations in the country. According to the Dar Commission, this step, if taken by the government, might prove harmful to the administrative set up as well as the unity of the nation.

Once it was made public, there was a huge uproar against the report submitted by the Dar Commission to the Constituent Assembly. Particularly, in the southern regions of the country.

S A Q:

Q. Do you think the national leadership pre and post independence played a positive role in the reorganisation of Indian states? Discuss in detail. (20+60 words)

.....
.....
.....

The JVP Committee:

The appointment of the JVP Committee was an attempt to pacify the vocalists of the arising linguistic movements all over the nation. This Committee was constituted by the Indian National Congress, the then ruling party in December 1948. It was composed of three very prominent members—

- Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (the then Prime Minister of India)
- Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel (the then Deputy Prime Minister of India and Minister of Home Affairs)
- Pattabhi Sitaramayya (the then President of Indian National Congress)

Like the Dar Commission, the JVP Committee too, was against the reorganisation of states for the time being. According to the JVP Committee Report, the issues of unity, national security and economic development

were rather pertaining. These issues required immediate administrative attention rather than reorganisation of states.

At the same time, the JVP Committee also pointed out that with regards to regions where formation of states on the basis of language was an insistent and overwhelming need, the creation of new states would be put under consideration. This would, of course, require the consent of all the linguistic groups based on that particular region.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Some important points:

- The Constituent Assembly appointed the Dar Commission in 1948 to look into the possibility of reorganisation of Indian states immediately after India's independence.
- The Dar Commission in its report stated that reorganisation, at that moment, might hamper the administration as well as Unity of the country.
- People all over India, especially South India, opposed to and protested against the Dar Commission report.
- The Congress Appointed the JVP Committee in December 1948 to study whether reorganisation on a linguistic basis was still a possibility.
- Although the JVP Committee felt that there were issues India was facing that were far more important than reorganisation, yet it could have done on need-based criteria.

Check Your Progress:

1. When was the Dar Commission appointed?
2. Did the Dar Commission suggest for reorganisation of Indian states?
3. Who were the members of the JVP Committee?
4. What, according to the JVP Committee, were the issues more important than reorganisation that India was facing post independence?

Space for Learners

3.3.3 The Creation of Andhra Pradesh

The creation of Andhra Pradesh was an epic moment in the history of reorganisation of Indian states. For a long time, the Tamil and Telugu speaking population of that region were a part of Tamil Nadu. Since the beginning of the 20th Century, the Telugu speaking population concentrated around the Andhra area had been demanding a separate state for them – “Andhra Pradesh”.

The JVP Committee had recognised the need and validity of creation of Andhra Pradesh but was in no hurry to take concrete steps towards the same. This gave birth to a number of protests and movements all over the Telugu speaking region of Tamil Nadu. One such incident was the fast unto death by popular social activist and freedom fighter Patti Sriramalu. Sriramalu started his fast on the 19th of October, 1952 and tragically expired on the 58th day of his fasting. This created a huge uproar in Andhra followed by protests, riots, hartals and even mass violence. Soon after, the situation went out of control.

The Government decided to resolve this issue by agreeing to create a separate state of Andhra Pradesh carved out of Tamil Nadu. The Tamil speaking leaders of this region were also agreeable to this decision. However, a problem arose with the issue of Madras city. Both Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh wanted Madras as a part of it. Logically, Madras belonged to Tamil Nadu on both linguistic as well as geographical terms. As such, the leaders of Andhra in the later days, gave up this demand.

On the 1st of October, 1953, Andhra Pradesh was born as a Telugu speaking state. Tamil Nadu has since been recognised as a state predominated by a Tamil speaking population.

SAQ:

Q. Discuss the role played by various committees appointed by the Government of India to look into the reorganisation of India on linguistic basis after independence. (40+40 words)

.....
.....
.....

Stop to Consider

Some important points:

- The state of Tamil Nadu, before reorganisation, had two major linguistic groups – the Tamils and the Telugus.
- The Telugu speaking population resided in the region of Andhra and had been demanding for a separate state since the beginning of the 20th Century.
- After a long series of protests, in October 1953, Andhra Pradesh became the first Indian state to be created on a linguistic basis post the independence of India.

Space for Learners

Check Your Progress

1. When was the state of Andhra Pradesh created?
2. Who was Patti Sriramalu?
3. Which was the city that both Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh demanded for?

SAQ:

Q. Discuss the circumstances that led to the creation of Andhra Pradesh as a state in 1953. (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

3.3.4 The States Reorganisation Commission

Today, if we reflect upon the issue of reorganisation of states in independent India on a linguistic basis, we will observe that two elements played a very significant role in accelerating the process. These are –

Space for Learners

1. The first and foremost element was the creation of the Telugu speaking state of Andhra Pradesh after a successful mass movement. This directly encouraged other linguistic groups belonging to different regions of India to raise or further strengthen their own demands for separate states.
2. The second element was the nature of the then most powerful person in India, Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru was a rather benevolent and liberal leader. Although he supported reorganisation of states, Nehru was of the opinion that India needed to mature and develop as a nation first before such a step was undertaken. But at the same time, Nehru did not strongly object to the demands raised by the people. Infact, he started believing that a linguistic and strategic separation might, in the later years, strengthen the unity in diversity of India.

In order to look into the issue in detail and to provide a necessary action plan, Nehru appointed the States Reorganisation Commission (SRC) in August, 1953 – coinciding with the formation of Andhra Pradesh. The SRC consisted of three important members:

1. Justice Fazl Ali
2. K. M. Panaikar
3. Hridaynath Kunzru

For about two years, the SRC was committed to the task of finding the best possible way to reorganise the states of India. During those two years, India faced some extremely volatile situations with protests, agitations and mass violence occurring all over the country. Linguistic, communal and cultural emotions were accelerated to a point that people started clashing against one another with the simplest of excuses. The unity of India as a nation was at stake.

Amidst such a situation, the SRC submitted its report in October, 1955. Following were its major recommendations –

- It recommended the re-drawing of the boundaries of Indian states on the basis of Language.

- It was against the splitting up of two states – Punjab and Maharashtra.
- It suggested to reorganise the states into 16 states and 3 Union Territories.

Most of the recommendations of the SRC were accepted by the Indian Parliament. Some modifications were made though. In November 1956, the States Reorganisation Act was passed in the Parliament. The following were the major decisions implemented by the government of India through the Act –

1. The Act provided for the reorganisation of Indian states into 14 states and 6 Union Territories.
2. The Telengana area of Hyderabad was to be included in Andhra Pradesh.
3. The Madras district of Madras Presidency and Travancore-Cochin were amalgamated to give birth to Kerela.
4. The Kannada speaking areas of Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad and Coorg were to be included in the Mysore state.
5. The Marathi speaking areas of Kutch, Saurashtra and Hyderabad were to be included in Bombay.

States created by the SRC Act, 1956

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Assam
3. Bihar
4. Bombay
5. Jammu and Kashmir
6. Kerela
7. Madhya Pradesh
8. Madras
9. Mysore
10. Orissa
11. Punjab

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

12. Rajasthan
13. Uttar Pradesh
14. West Bengal

Union Territories created by the SRC Act, 1956

1. Andaman and Nicobar Islands
2. Delhi
3. Himachal Pradesh
4. Laccadive
5. Minicoy and Amindivi Islands
6. Manipur and Tripura

Stop to Consider

- Jawaharlal Nehru appointed the States Reorganisation Commission in August, 1953 to provide a necessary action plan for the reorganisation of the Indian states in a scientific manner.
- In 1955, the SRC recommended the redrawing of Indian states on the basis of language into 16 states and 3 union territories.
- The Indian Parliament passed the SRC Act in November, 1956.
- According to the Act, Indian states were reorganised into 14 states and 6 union territories.

Check Your Progress

1. Who were the members of the States Reorganisation Commission?
2. When did the SRC submit its report?
3. When did the Parliament of India pass the States Reorganisation Act?
4. What were the major recommendations of the States Reorganisation Act?

SAQ:

Q. According to you what were the circumstances that led to the establishment of the SRC? (60 words)

.....
.....
.....

Space for Learners

3.3.5 Linguistic Reorganisation of Sensitive Regions: An Overview

Formation of Maharashtra:

As mentioned earlier, the SRC Report was against the reorganisation of Maharashtra. Hence, the SRC Act had made no provisions with regards to Maharashtra. This was met with huge protests in the entire region of greater Maharashtra. The regional leaders, in this regard had support from all sections of society – students, workers, farmers, businessmen, artists. Even before the SRC Act was passed in the Parliament, protests started in Maharashtra against its implementation. In January, 1956 there was a huge riot in Maharashtra that ultimately led to a police firing killing 80 protesters.

This incident brought the government under tremendous pressure and a decision was taken to divide the province of Bombay into two separate states based on linguistic grounds –

1. Maharashtra comprising of the Marathi speaking population
2. Gujarat comprising of the Gujarati speaking population.

It was also decided that Bombay city would be established as a Union Territory. This move was again, strongly protested against. As a result, in July 1956 the Government decided to form a greater and bilingual Bombay. People belonging to both Maharashtra and Gujarat were against this decision. Even regional leaders of Indian National Congress protested against this. Neither the Marathis nor the Gujaratis were ready to give up Bombay to the other state. As a protest against this new decision, protests and violence spread all over Maharashtra and Gujarat again. In Ahmedabad alone, 16 people were killed in police firing.

Space for Learners

Under such circumstances, the Government decided to refrain from making any immediate decisions. For almost five years, protests and agitations continued to occur in the region. In May 1960, under the influence of INC President Indira Gandhi and President of India Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, did the government arrive at a solution regarding the reorganisation of Bombay. The state of Bombay was finally divided into Maharashtra and Gujarat. The city of Bombay was included in Maharashtra as its capital and Ahmedabad was declared as the capital city of Gujarat.

Stop to Consider

- The SRC Report was against the reorganisation of Maharashtra.
- Following huge protests and riots, in 1956 the government decided to divide the province of Bombay into two states – Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- Bombay was reorganised in 1960 into two states with Bombay as the capital of Maharashtra and Ahmedabad as the capital of Gujarat.

Formation of Nagaland:

Nagaland, belonging to the North-Eastern region of India became the 16th state of independent India on the 1st of December, 1963. The area of Nagaland, situated mostly on the Naga Hills was technically never an administrative part of Ancient or Medieval India. The British rulers, to a certain extent were able to consolidate Nagaland into its administrative fold but a number of exemptions were made. However, since the beginning to the 20th Century, the Nagas had been demanding self-rule and autonomy within Assam. In order to pacify their demands, even the Government of India Act, 1935 had declared Naga areas as Excluded areas.

At the onset of the independence of India, the Nagas led by the Naga National Council (NNC) were agreeable to be a part of independent India and wanted to be constitutionally included in an autonomous Assam. But after 1946, they had a change of mind and decided to assert their right of be a sovereign state separate from India.

Nagaland remained a part of Assam after independence and gradually a huge mass movement emerged under the leadership of the NNC for a sovereign Nagaland that led to a series of violent incidents. As a solution to this, the government of India created a separate Union Territory comprising the Naga Hills in 1957 naming it Naga Hills Tuensang Area (NHTA). The tribes within the region were not satisfied with the creation of NHTA and cases of violence and agitations started to increase.

In July 1960, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru arrived at an agreement with the Naga leaders to recognise the formation of a full-fledged state of Nagaland within the Union of India.

Stop to Consider

- On 1st December 1963, Nagaland became the 16th state of India.
- Since the beginning of the 20th Century, the Nagas had been demanding self-rule and autonomy within Assam.
- After independence, the Nagas under the leadership of the NNC started demanding for a sovereign Nagaland separate from India.
- The Government of India tried to resolve the Naga demands by at first granting them the status of a Union Territory and then that of a state.

State of Punjab:

The reorganisation of Punjab was a peculiar incident in the history of reorganisation of Indian state. After independence, 8 princely states of North India were united to form the PEPSU – Patiala and East Punjab States Union. This region of India comprised of 3 major linguistic groups –

1. Punjabi
2. Hindi and
3. Pahadi

In 1956, the states of PEPSU were merged as one state – Punjab. The SRC report was completely against further reorganisation of Punjab as it proved to be more of a communal issue than a linguistic one.

Since the birth of PEPSU, leaders and general population of the region had been demanding a reorganisation. This was especially so in the Punjabi

Space for Learners

speaking areas of the state. Two powerful political parties were heavily involved with this movement – the Akali Dal and the Jan Sangh. Their demand, to carve out a Punjabi Suba or Punjabi speaking state out of PEPSU.

The major issue with this demand was the mixing up of communal feelings with the issue of language. Akali Dal is a Sikh communalist political party who wanted Punjab to be established as a Sikh state. In their demand for Punjab, they took the support of Punjabi language with the explanation that Punjabi was their mother tongue as well as the language of the Sikh, thus mixing religion with language.

Their opposition party in PEPSU, the Jan Sangh identified itself as a Hindu communalist party. Jan Sangh was vehement in its protest against the formation of Punjab and denied to accept Punjabi as the mother tongue of the Hindu population of the region.

The Government of India primarily viewed the issues of Punjab as communal rather than linguistic. For Nehru as well as other national leaders, the demand for a separate Punjab was in reality the demand for a state to be established on the basis of religion under the veil of a linguistic basis. On this very ground, The SRC refused the formation of Punjab as a state.

However, between the period of 1956 and 1966, movements and protests continued in the region over reorganisation with no imminent solution. In 1966, the then Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi agreed to the division of Punjab. As a result of this-

- Punjab was created as a Punjabi-speaking state.
- Haryana was created as a Hindi-speaking state.
- The district of Kangra and a portion of the district of Hoshiyarpur, that were pre-dominated by Pahadi-speaking people were merged with the state of Himachal Pradesh.
- The newly built city of Chandigarh was declared a Union Territory as well as the joint capital of both Punjab and Haryana. A set-up that continues to exist till date.

Stop to Consider

- Formed after India’s independence, the state of PEPSU consisted of people belonging to three major linguistic groups – Punjabi, Hindi and Pahadi.
- Two powerful political parties of the region were involved in the movement for the reorganisation of Punjab – the Akali Dal and the Jan Sangh.
- The central leadership felt that this demand was in fact a communal demand under the veil of a linguistic one.
- After a long period of struggle, in 1966 the Government of India agreed upon the division of Punjab.
- Punjab was born as a Punjabi speaking and Haryana was born as a Hindi speaking state with the Pahadi speaking regions getting merged with Himachal Pradesh.

Space for Learners

S A Q:

Q. Under what circumstances were the states of Maharashtra and Gujarat created? (40+40 words)

.....
.....
.....

Q. How was the issue of reorganisation of Punjab resolved? (60 words)

.....
.....
.....

Check Your Progress

1. Was the SRC in favour of creation of Maharashtra and Punjab?
2. Into which states was the Province of Bombay reorganised?
3. When was the State of Nagaland created?

Space for Learners

4. What is the full form of NNC?
5. What is the full form of PEPSU?
6. What were the three major linguistic groups of the PEPSU?
7. Is the Akali Dal a communal political party?
8. Discuss the major implementations made through the States Reorganisation Act, 1956?

3.4 The Consequences of Reorganisation

Although the SRC Act, provided for the creation of 14 states only, the process of reorganisation of states that continued for a long time gave birth to a total of 28 states in the Union of India till present time.

While Maharashtra and Gujarat became the 14th and 15th states, Nagaland was established as the 16th state of the country. Punjab became two states of Punjab and Haryana taking the toll up to 17. In 1969, Meghalaya carved out of Assam became the 18th state of India. In 1971, the Union Territories of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura were granted the status of States thus increasing the count to 21. In 1975, Sikkim and in 1987 Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh and Goa were reorganised as states. Three new states Chattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand were carved out of Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh in November 2000. That last state to be reorganised in India is Telengana which was created in 2014 by carving out Andhra Pradesh. Delhi, the capital of India, emerged as a Union Territory.

At present the Union of India is composed of 28 states and 8 Union Territories.

It cannot be said that states reorganisation has been able to solve all the issues relating to linguistic conflicts in the country. Disputes over inter-state boundaries, economic issues and linguistic minorities still continues to persist in India. However, reorganisation was able to deal with one major factor affecting the unity of the nation – that was managing the dispute over language amongst various linguistic majorities in different parts of India and drawing up boundaries between states with a universally agreed upon and rational element.

3.5 The Issue of Minority Languages of India

Space for Learners

India is multi-diverse and one of the most interesting facets of this diversity is, of, course, language. According to the 2001 Census Report of India the number of mother tongues spoken by the people of India totals up to 19,569. Of those, 121 languages are spoken by more than 10,000 people. As of now, 22 of those languages are officially recognised in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution.

Keeping this in mind, it was impossible to carve out any state in India that would have been a Unilingual state. Every territory would have one or two majority linguistic groups with a number of minority linguistic communities. Hence, it was very important for the Government of India to look into the cause of the minorities in each and every state. In this regard, the Government emphasised on undertaking certain important steps –

- Promoting their integration with the majority linguistic group in the state. This way, minorities will be protected against unfair treatment.
- Creating an environment where the language and culture of the minority communities would continue to exist and develop.
- Ensuring that no separatist tendencies would further develop in the concerned states by checking the activities of both majority as well as minority communities.

During the process of reorganisation, utmost care was taken to achieve the consent of the minority communities of all concerned regions regarding their integration into a state on linguistic basis. This was done in order to prevent further dissent from the minority linguistic groups and with the hope that it would also instigate the feeling of state loyalty in them. At the same time, a number of provisions were included in the Constitution of India, in order to safeguard the interests of the linguistic minorities residing all over the country.

Stop to Consider

- The process of reorganisation of states in India continued for all long duration giving birth to 28 states and 8 union territories in the country.

Space for Learners

- Telengana was the last Indian state to be carved out of Andhra Pradesh in 2014. Meanwhile in 2020, Jammu and Kashmir lost its status of a state and was reconstituted as a union territory owing to internal disturbances.
- Although India hosts thousands of linguistic groups, 22 of those languages are officially recognised in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.
- During the process of reorganisation, the Indian government took utmost care to protect the interests of the minorities and provided several constitutional safeguards for them.

SA Q:

Q. How did the Government of India deal with the minority linguistic communities during the process of reorganisation of states. (40 words)

.....
.....
.....

Check Your Progress

1. When was the state of Mizoram born?
2. From which state was Uttarakhand carved out of?
3. Which was the last state to be born in India?
4. How many Union Territories does India have presently?
5. How many official languages are recognised by the Indian Constitution?
6. Is there any unilingual state in India?

3.5.1 Constitutional Safeguards for Linguistic Minority Communities

Let us discuss the constitutional safeguards for linguistic communities in India.

Article 30

Under Article 30 of the Indian Constitution, the linguistic as well as religious minorities of India have been provided with certain Fundamental Rights such as—

- They shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.
- While granting aid to educational institutions, the state shall not make discriminations against any educational institution based on the fact that it is under the administration of a linguistic or religious minority.

Article 347

Article 347 of the Indian Constitution discusses about a special provision relating to language spoken by a section of the population of a state. It states that any minority community residing within a state may demand to the President of India that the language spoken by them be officially recognised throughout the state or within any specific part of the state. If after sufficient consideration, the President is satisfied with such a demand, he or she might direct the concerned state to fulfill the same.

Article 350B

The Seventh Constitutional Amendment Act, 1956 had inserted a new Article 350B in Part XVII of the Indian Constitution. It was based on a recommendation made by the SRC to establish a special office for linguistic minorities in India.

Article 350B provides for the appointment a special officer for linguistic minorities. He or she was designated as the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. He or she shall be appointed by the President of India and would investigate upon all matters relating to the safeguards provided for the linguistic minorities in India. He or she shall submit regular and periodic reports to the President on such matters. All reports shall be laid by the President in front of the Parliament and also sent to the state governments concerned. Along with these provisions, the Government of India also constituted the National Commission for Religious and Linguistic Minorities on the 29th of October, 2004 to look into different issues with regards to various minority communities in India.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

- Articles 30, 347 and 350B of the Indian Constitutions specifically deals with the rights of minority linguistic communities in the country.
- The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has been designated with the task of enquiring into issues related minority communities in India.
- On 29th October 2004, the National Commission for Religious and Linguistic Minorities was created by the Government of India.

S A Q:

Q. Discuss in detail the safeguards provided for the minority linguistic communities in the Constitution of India. (60 words)

.....
.....
.....

3.6 Summing Up

Reorganisation of states was a strategic step taken by the Government of India to bring some structure into the formation of states and territories in the country. During the initial years of independence, the Government was hesitant to take such a serious step fearing that the unity and cohesion of the country might be jeopardised by it. But, linguistic communities all over the country started demanding for a reorganisation of the states based on the dominant linguistic groups in a particular region. These demands took the form of different movements and protests in no time. To the Government, of all factors, language seemed to be the one that would be the least threat to the future of the country. To look into this issue, several committees and commissions were appointed during the first two decades of independence.

The SRC appointed in 1953 proved to provide the most helpful recommendations with regards to reorganisation of states. Based on the recommendations of the SRC, the State Reorganisations Act was passed

in the Indian Parliament in 1956. This was a historic movement in the history of India. States were carved out and created on the basis of this Act. This was a prolonged process that raised the number of Indian states up to 28.

The Government of India also took utmost effort to realise the rights of minority linguistic communities of every part of the country. Several safeguards were provided for though the Indian Constitution and establishment of Commissions and Ministries specific to their needs.

Reorganisation of Indian states on a linguistic basis was a dream of several of our forefathers including Gandhiji. However, this dream was realised in the country only after decades of struggles, protests, agitations and movements. The Indian Government, again, had to take some alternative routes while dealing with some controversial regions like Madras, Bombay and Andhra. The end result of reorganisation might not be in the interest of all linguistic communities in the country, but it was able to draw out concrete regions and boundaries. That to, with the element of language, which in India did not lead to further contestation or hamper the unity and the process of development in the country.

3.7 References and Suggested Readings

1. Brass, Paul. R. *The politics of India since Independence*. Cambridge University Press. 2001
2. Chandra, Bipan. *Ideology and Politics in Modern India*. Har Anand Publications. 2009
3. Chandra, Bipan, Mridula Mukherjee and Aditya Mukherjee. *India Since Independence*. Penguin Books. 2008
4. Chatterjee, Partha. *State and Politics in India*. Oxford University Press. 1998
5. Hasan, Zoya. *Politics and the State in India*. Sage Publications. 2007
6. Kaviraj, Sudipta. *Politics in India*. Oxford University Press. 2001
7. Kohli, Atul. *The Success of India's Democracy*. Cambridge University Press. 2001
8. Kothari, Rajni. *Politics in India*. Orient Longman. 2005

UNIT : 4
DEMAND FOR NEW STATES

Unit Structure:

- 4.1 Introduction**
- 4.2 Objectives**
- 4.3 Reasons for Demand for New States**
- 4.4 Emergence of states as a response to demand for new states**
- 4.5 Summing Up**
- 4.6 References and Suggested Readings**

4.1 Introduction

This Block so far has dealt with various issues relating to contestation over Nation. In the first, second and third units of this block we have discussed the concept of nationhood in India, the early challenges of nationhood and reorganization of the states in India respectively. From these units we have learnt that the Indian nationhood officially synced with the independence of 1947.

The political setting of India has been witnessing manifold changes and challenges throughout the history. India, as a nation is full of diversities. We all know that people of different religions, different cultures, languages and races live together in India for ages. Later, with the passage of time demand for smaller states has been on the rise. A voice for separate statehood has been emerging from different regions, political groups and cultural identities (T. Sreenivas, 2018)

Realizing the heterogeneity existing in the society, the founding fathers have advocated a federal kind of political system to protect different regional identities in this multi-cultural society. However, they have refrained from calling India a federation and instead mentioned that, “India shall be a union of states”. However as mentioned earlier demand for smaller states has become very prominent subject in contemporary Indian politics.

In the previous units we have already learnt the background of Indian nationhood as well as reorganization of states of India in the post

independence period. In this Unit we shall discuss demand for new states in India in different regions and in different times.

Space for Learners

4.2 Objectives:

India being a heterogeneous country having different languages, cultures and races, religions, there are a number of fissiparous forces that try to attack its integrity. Moreover, it is a vast country which makes it difficult for administration too. Therefore, the country has witnessed demand for new states from time to time. Reading of this unit will help you to:-

- *examine* the reasons for the demand for new states
- *describe* and List out the different states emerged out of such demand

4.3. Reasons for Demand for New States:

We all know that over the years, there has been demand for separate state from different regions and political groups. There are a number of reasons for the emergence of new states in India. During colonial period India was divided into more than 600 princely states. During the period of 1947-50 the princely states were organized under some provinces. Realizing the existence of heterogeneities of Indian society, the founding fathers made the provision in Article 3 of Indian Constitution that the Parliament can form a new state by separating a territory from any state by merging two or more states or parts of states.

Later, demand for new states started coming from various regions. Growth of regionalism on various grounds has also led to the demand for new states in some regions. Linguistic, ethnic, cultural as well as imbalanced development is the major reasons for the demand for new states in India. Now, let us discuss these reasons—

a) Linguistic Differences: We have already learnt that India is a heterogeneous country. According to the Census of India 2001, India has 122 major languages and 1599 other languages. Presently 22 languages

Space for Learners

are officially registered languages of India. We all know that language is a uniting force among people with lots of diversities. After independence demands started coming from different regions for reorganizing states on linguistic basis. Demand for state on the basis of language gained momentum in the early 1950 with the demand for a new state for Telegu speaking people. Likewise, there was demand for separate state for Marathi speaking population. Passing of State Reorganisation Act, 1956 was a measure towards solving these issues.

b) Regional Imbalances: Lack of economic development, lack of industrialization and lack of job opportunities may be cited as one of the reasons for demand for separate state. Demand for new states also emerged out of the perception of centre-periphery relationship (Kumar, 2000). Some states feel that they are lagging behind in many respects which are not properly addressed by the central government. It is observed that there is an acute sense of relative deprivation in the underdeveloped regions of many states. Emergence of states like Chattisgarh, Uttarakhand and Jharkhand has proved that lack of development has transcended the linguistic cohesion which had seemed to be such a strong cementing force in the initial years of post colonial development (Pradeep Kumar, 2000).

c) Growth of regionalism and regional political parties: Regionalism usually stands for a particular state of consciousness of a group of people united by ties of kinship, religion, race or language, who seek self identification in terms of a particularistic territory as their own sphere of activity. Regionalism is the other name of particular and exclusivist political movements.

Regional political parties mainly work in a particular geographical area of the country and mostly they participate in elections only within that area. However, some regional parties also participate in neighbouring states, with constituencies with similar culture similar to the first state. Different state parties are established at different periods because of different reasons. For example Asom Gana Parishad was formed in Assam to address the problems of the Assamese people, mainly to protect Assamese identity and nationalism. Some even have origins prior to India's independence. Here

we can cite the example of National Conference of Jammu and Kashmir. Besides, there are many regional political parties operating in different states of India like —Haryana Vikas Party, Manipur People’s Party, Sikkim Democratic Front, Mizo National Front etc.

d) Ethnicity: As we know India is home to more than two thousand ethnic groups. Demand for ethnic identity may also be cited as a demand for new state. For example, creation of State of Nagaland in 1963. Ethnicity is also the basis of emergence of different states in the North east like Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura in 1972 and later Mizoram and Arunachal in 1987.

e) Insurgency: is mainly concerned with the occupation of a territory or enjoying political power. For doing so, they generally need the support of the population living in that specific territory. But on the other hand, terrorism does not require such kind of support from the general masses. They do not even require the sympathy of the people.

4.4 Emergence of States as a Response to Demand for New States:

In the above section, we have learnt that in a number of reasons are responsible for the emergence of new states in the post independent period in India. It has been observed that in the first round states were reorganized on the basis of language and the last state created on this basis was Punjab after a bifurcation of bilingual Punjab in November 1996. After that some new states were created on ethnic basis while some other were elevated from centrally administered to full fledged states (ibid). Moreover, urge for development has also given rise to the demand for new states in some areas.

Now let us have a look at the demand and creation of new states in India after independence:

CREATION OF ANDHRA PRADESH:

Andhra Pradesh has been the first state whose demand for separate statehood has been granted by Government of India in the post independence period. The Telegu dominated Andhra Pradesh was part of Tamil Nadu after independence. However, since the beginning of the 20th Century, the

Space for Learners

Telugu speaking population around the Andhra had been demanding a separate state for them. After independence committees like Dar Committee and JVP committees were formed to examine reorganization of the states on the basis of language. But fearing that it could threaten the integrity of the country, the proposal for separate Andhra Pradesh was not granted. The people became dissatisfied and resented to this. Here we must mention the name of social activist and freedom fighter Patti Sriramalu who started his fast on the 19th of October, 1952 demanding a separate state for Telegu-speaking people. On the 58th day of his fasting he expired. This created a huge uproar in Andhra followed by protests, riots, hartals and even mass violence and the situation went out of control.

In such a situation, the Government of India agreed to the demand of the Telegu speaking people and decided to curve out of Tamil Nadu a separate state of Andhra Pradesh. On the 1st of October, 1953, Andhra Pradesh was born out of Tamil Nadu as a Telugu speaking state.

CREATION OF MAHARASHTRA:

Maharashtra belonged to Bombay Presidency during the British Rule. After independence it came under Bombay State. The Bombay State was bi-lingual consisted of Gujarati speaking Saurashtra and Kutch and Marathi speaking Marathwada and Nagpur District. People who want a Maratha speaking state organized themselves under Samuktya Maharashtra Samiti in February 1956 in Pune. It demanded creation of a separate state of Maharashtra with Mumbai as its capital. There were mass protests and demonstrations. More than a hundred of people died during such protests and demonstrations. Ultimately, Government of India agreed to create a new state for the Marathi speaking population and on 1st May 1960, Maharashtra was curved out of Bombay state.

CREATION OF PUNJAB:

We all know that in the time of independence the princely states were reorganized as states of India. The reorganization of Punjab was a peculiar as eight princely states of North India were united to form the PEPSU – Patiala and East Punjab States Union. This region of India comprised of three major linguistic groups –Punjabi, Hindi and Pahadi. In 1956, through

State Reorganisation Act the states of PEPSU were merged as one state – Punjab. The SRC report was completely against further division of Punjab apprehending it to become more of a communal issue than a linguistic one.

It needs to mention here that since the creation of PEPSU, people of the region were demanding more reorganization of the state. Such demand was more prominent in the Punjabi speaking areas of the state. Two powerful political parties the Akali Dal and the Jan Sangh were also involved with this demand. However the major issue with this demand was the mixing up of communal feelings with the issue of language. Akali Dal is a Sikh communalist political party wanted Punjab to be established as a Sikh state. In their demand for Punjab, they took the support of Punjabi language with the explanation that Punjabi was their mother tongue as well as the language of the Sikh. On the other hand the opposition party in PEPSU, the Jan Sangh as a Hindu communalist party. Jan opposed the formation of Punjab and denied to accept Punjabi as the mother tongue of the Hindu population of the region.

Hence, the Government of India primarily viewed the issues of Punjab as communal rather than linguistic and thought that it would go against the Secular idea of Indian democracy. On this very ground, The SRC refused the formation of Punjab as a state. But finally, in 1966, the then Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi agreed to the formation of Punjab. On November 1, 1966 the present Punjab state came into being by separating the pre-dominantly Hindi speaking areas under a new state called Haryana.

CREATION OF NORTH-EASTERN STATES:

Nagaland :

Nagaland, belonging to the North-Eastern region of India became the 16th state of independent India on the 1st of December, 1963. Here you must remember that the area of Nagaland, situated mostly on the Naga Hills was technically never an administrative part of Ancient or Medieval India. The British rulers, to a certain extent were able to consolidate Nagaland into its administrative fold but a number of exemptions were made. However, since the beginning to the 20th Century, the Nagas had been demanding self-rule

Space for Learners

and autonomy within Assam. In order to pacify their demands, even the Government of India Act, 1935 had declared Naga areas as Excluded areas.

Before independence of India, the Nagas led by the Naga National Council (NNC) were agreed to be a part of independent India and wanted to be constitutionally included in an autonomous Assam. But after 1946, they demanded sovereign status and wanted to separate from India. However, Nagaland remained a part of Assam after independence and gradually a huge mass movement emerged under the leadership of the NNC for a sovereign Nagaland that led to a series of violent incidents. As a solution to this, the government of India created a separate Union Territory comprising the Naga Hills in 1957 naming it Naga Hills Tuensang Area (NHTA). The tribes within the region were not satisfied with the creation of NHTA and cases of violence and agitations started to increase. In July 1960, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru arrived at an agreement with the Naga leaders to recognize the formation of a full-fledged state of Nagaland within the Union of India. On December 1, 1963 Nagaland became a full fledged state under Indian Union.

Meghalaya:

The people of Garo, Khasi and Jaintia demand for an autonomous state for the preservation of their cultural identity. For the purpose they organize the All Party Hill Leaders Conference (APHLC) and carry out necessary agitation. The Government of India meets their demand partially and organizes the state of Assam on federal basis. However, the people were not satisfied and continued to pressurize the government to concede their demand. Ultimately, in 1971 the Parliament passed the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, creates the autonomous hill state of Meghalaya which conferred full statehood on the autonomous state of Meghalaya. Meghalaya attained statehood on 21 January 1972, with a Legislative Assembly of its own.

Mizoram:

The Mizos also demand secession from the Indian union for preserving the identity of the Mizo people with regard to their social system and custom.

The Mizos form an organization known as Mizo National Front in 1962 to put forward their demand. But the Indian government adopts the policy of repression against the rebellious Mizos. As a result a section of the Mizo leaders abandon their demands for secession and in 1971 the President of Mizo National Front submits a memorandum to the Indian government demanding a separate state within the Indian union. But a section of Mizos under the leadership of Laldenga continues to demand for secession from Indian Union. The Indian government did not agree to it and started military operations in the region. As a result, violence continued there for a long time. After a series of signing agreement and memorandums between Government of India and Mizo National Front finally in February 1987 Mizoram was granted separate statehood under Indian Union

CREATION OF UTTARAKHAND:

The people of the Hill regions of Uttar Pradesh have put forth a strong demand for the creation of a separate state of Uttarakhand. They felt the need because of the lack of development of the region for a long time. UP state assembly has also recommended its formation. However, the Congress government at the centre opposed this idea. In 1996 Prime Minister Deve Gowda has announced that the government has decided to make a separate state of Uttarakhand from the hills of the Uttar Pradesh. Ultimately the NDA government decides to carve out the state of Uttaranchal on 9 November, 2000.

CREATION OF JHARKHAND:

The tribal people living in some parts of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal have demanded a separate state for cultural and economic development. When their repeated requests are not heeded by the government of India in 1988, they organized massive rallies and also economic blockade in Jharkhand areas. In 1989, they came up with a clear demand for an independent state comprising of contiguous tribal areas of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal. Rajiv Gandhi government sets up a committee to examine the demand. The committee submits its report in 1990. It is of the view that Jharkhand General Council should be created but does not accept the idea of separate state of Jharkhand. In September 1992, the Jharkhand leaders organizes 15 days economic blockade to pressurize the government to accept their demand for a full fledged state.

Space for Learners

But it is not successful. Ultimately Jharkhand as an autonomous state comes into being on 14th November, 2000.

CREATION OF TELENGANA:

Telangana is the last state of India to be granted statehood in the year 2014. The demand for Telangana started in the 1960s soon after the formation of Andhra Pradesh for the Telegu speaking population. Telangana movement is one of the longest movements for separate statehood which lasted for more than five decades. Discontentment arises among the people as they felt inequality, backwardness, under development in the region. Unequal distribution of resources resulted in unbalanced development in terms of education, irrigation, industries and employment.

The Srikrishna Committee in 2011 submitted its report on Telangana issue and stated that demand for separate Telangana has some merit and is not entirely unjustified. However, it also stated that separation is the second best option. On 17 February, a non-cooperation movement was started which lasted for 16 days. Mass rallies and agitations continued. Finally on June 2, 2014 Telangana became the 28th State of Union of India with Hyderabad as the capital.

Check Your Progress:

1. Name the first state which got separate statehood in the post independent period.
2. Which is the last state to get separate statehood in independent India?
3. Discuss the reasons for the emergence of new states in India after independence.
4. According to Article 5 of Indian Constitution the Parliament can form a new state by separating a territory from any state by merging two or more states or parts of states. (Write True or False).

SAQ:

Q. List out the major reasons for the demand for new states in India after independence. (60 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

Space for Learners

4.5 Summing Up

After going through this unit, you are now in a position to analyze the reasons for the demand of new states in India. You have learnt that the political setting of India has been witnessing manifold changes and challenges throughout the history. Moreover, India is a heterogeneous country. Realizing the diversities of the country, the founding fathers made the provision in Article 3 of Indian Constitution that the Parliament can form a new state by separating a territory from any state by merging two or more states or parts of states. In size also India is a huge country. Therefore, demand for new states started coming from various regions. Growth of regionalism on various grounds has also led to the demand for new states in some regions. Linguistic, ethnic, cultural as well as imbalanced development is the major reasons for the demand for new states in India. We have also learnt from the unit about the states of India which came into existence after putting forth demand for statehood for a long time in the post independent period. These states were, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Nagaland, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, Nagaland, Mizoram, Meghalaya and Telengana. Presently India has 28 states. However, the country is still witnessing demands for more states in different regions.

4.6 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Brass, Paul R. (1990) : The Politics of India Since Independence, Cambridge, New Delhi

Space for Learners

2. Chandra, Bipan, M. Mukherjee & A. Mukherjee (2007) *India Since Independence*, Penguin Books, New Delhi
3. Hasan, Zoya. *Politics and the State in India*. Sage Publications. 2007
4. Kothari, Rajni. *Politics in India*. Orient Longman. 2005
5. Kumar Pradeep. Demand for New States : Cultural Identity Loses ground to urge for development, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Aug26 –Sept 2, 2000
6. Sreenivas T. “The Demand for New States in Indian Federalism – A Case Study of Telangana State”, *International Journal of Social Science Research*. Vol. &, Issue 4, 2018.

UNIT: 5

DEMANDS FOR SELF DETERMINATION AND INSURGENCY: JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND ASSAM.

Unit Structure :

- 5.1 Introduction.
- 5.2 Objectives.
- 5.3 Meaning of Self Determination and Insurgency
- 5.4 The Right of Self-Determination
- 5.5 Self- Determination as a Human Right
- 5.6 Self-Determination and Indigenous People
- 5.7 Jammu and Kashmir and Self-Determination
- 5.8 Meaning of Insurgency
- 5.9 Insurgency and Assam
- 5.10 Summing Up
- 5.11 References and Suggested Readings

5.1 Introduction.

The ideas of self-determination and insurgency is something which every nation-state has been facing ever since the formation of the very idea called the political State. India has also been witness to many such events since independence. The unification of India was itself based on many technicalities which required political intervention and manoeuvring.

5.2 Objectives.

The concepts of Self-Determination and Insurgency is something very important at the socio-political level and hence a discussion on it helps a student to understand the concepts better. India has seen several political violent as well as non-violent movements in relation to self-determination and insurgency. In fact the very structure of the state has been challenged at times by issues relating to self-determination and insurgency. After going through this unit, you will be able to –

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

- *Trace* the idea of Self-determination and Insurgency
- *Analyse* and deconstruct the concepts of self-determination and insurgency
- *Evaluate* the impact of Self-determination and Insurgency
- *Discuss* the consequences of Self-determination and insurgency on the State.

5.3 Meaning of Self-Determination and Insurgency

Self-determination, the process by which a group of people, usually possessing a certain degree of national consciousness, form their own state and choose their own government. As a political principle, the idea of self-determination evolved at first as a by-product of the doctrine of nationalism, to which early expression was given by the French and American revolutions. In World War I the Allies accepted self-determination as a peace aim. In his Fourteen Points—the essential terms for peace—U.S. President Woodrow Wilson listed self-determination as an important objective for the postwar world; the result was the fragmentation of the old Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires and Russia’s former Baltic territories into a number of new states. The emergence of the self-determination of nations dates to the periods of bourgeois revolution. In the 19th century bourgeoisie proclaimed the “principle of nationality” in Europe but it was not recognized even in European international law and some of European multinational empires against the principle of self-determination. The influence of the Soviet Union on international community, the democratic and national liberation movement against the fascism during the Second World War included the principle of self-determination in the UN Charter.

Self-determination developed in three differing but not necessarily exclusive contexts: morality, politics and law. Within moral theories, the idea of self-determination is derived from a specific understanding of the human nature that can be traced through the history of liberal thinking at least since the Enlightenment: the person as capable of rational reasoning and the idea of the autonomy of the person. This autonomy of the person, as in the Kantian

philosophy, is often regarded as the source for the human dignity and gives the person its inherent value. The natural rights of all humans are then deduced from this absolute value of the person. Sure, this conception of natural rights has been challenged and today even liberal theories of human rights are not necessarily based on the assumption of human dignity. But the general perception of the person as autonomous and capable of rational choices remains the bases of the liberal idea of the right of self-determination. Taking the liberal concept of self-determination further, it leads to the idea that the only legitimate government is that which has been authorized by the people themselves in their capacity as autonomous agents. This exercise of the constitutive power of the people is a manifestation of their political self-determination in the internal sense. Thus, the liberal concept of self-determination is linked to the idea of popular sovereignty and participation. These ideas have influenced political theories and are reflected in the debate on self-determination as the exercise of the constituent power of the people, popular sovereignty and democratic theories.

The development of self-determination in international law is based on moral considerations on justice and political considerations resulting from political struggles. In recent years the scope of the right of self-determination has expanded due to changing state practice, the acknowledgement of group rights and the claims of indigenous peoples. It has even been argued that the right of self-determination forms part of jus cogens. Historically, the right of self-determination emerged in international law during World War I in two competing ideological forms, reflecting the differing worldviews of the East and the West. In Western Europe the concept of self-determination derived from the Enlightenment ideas of popular sovereignty and representative government. In Central and Eastern Europe the concept of self-determination was primarily based on the phenomena of nationalism. As a result, the Western European concept was less linked to ethnic and cultural factors than the Central and Eastern European one. Both concepts were represented by two important figures of that time: Lenin and Wilson. The first and more radical form of self-determination was defined by Lenin, who understood self-determination as a precondition for peace in the world and his intention was to apply it to all non-European peoples under colonial

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

rule. The second form of self-determination was articulated by Woodrow Wilson. His intention was to apply the principle of self-determination unconditionally to European peoples but not necessarily to peoples under colonial rule. For some decades the Wilsonian restrictive approach to self-determination was the prevailing one and it was only after World War II that the radical approach first promoted by Lenin became the popular understanding of self-determination. By this time the split between the two ideological approaches to self-determination were represented by the Soviet Union on the one side and the European powers on the other side: whereas the Soviet Union challenged the colonial order, the European powers wanted to maintain their colonies. The articulation of self-determination that was subsequently included in the Charter of the United Nations constitutes a compromise between the two competing ideological conceptions. The Charter, which states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is the development of friendly relations among nations based on the respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination, remains vague on the actual content of self-determination. In order to accommodate both ideological conceptions of self-determination, the language of the Charter is somehow ambiguous and, although self-administration of non self-governing territories is encouraged, no expressive right to independence is articulated. Instead, it is left to the administering power to decide in accordance with the specific circumstances the manner in which to govern the occupied territories. But although self-determination was enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, it was for a long time regarded as a mere political principle rather than a legal right.

5.4 The Right of Self-Determination

In international law, self-determination was in the context of De-colonisation when Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Peoples as General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted by the United Nations in 1960.¹⁶ The Declaration states that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that by virtue of that right they shall freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. Yet the content of the right remained vague and ambiguous as

it on the one side provided for a right of self-determination, but on the other hand limited that right in emphasising the principle of territorial integrity of states. The right was subsequently included into the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, which was adopted as General Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV) in 1970¹⁸, which provides for a clarification of the obligations of states under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. According to the Declaration on Principles of International Law, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples of the Charter of the United Nations embraces the right of all peoples to freely determine, without external interference, their political status and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. It also imposes a duty on every state to respect this right. The right of self-determination has to be interpreted in accordance with the other principles of international law set out in the Declaration on Principles of International Law. Among these principles are the principle of the general interest of the international community to preserve international peace and security, the principle of territorial integrity of states and the principle of maintenance of colonial boundaries. The principle of territorial integrity creates a limitation on the right of self-determination, as it does not allow any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States. This limitation does not apply in all situations though, as the Declaration refers only to those states “[...] conducting themselves in compliance with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples [...] and thus possessed of a government representing the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction as to race, creed or colour.” The principle of *uti possidetis juris* creates limitations on the right of self-determination where independence from a colonial power or secession is sought. It preserves and validates the colonial boundaries of a state. This principle thus applies in disputes about colonial boundaries and therefore only forms a restricted limitation on the right of self-determination. In summary, international law provides for a right of secession in the context of de-colonisation. Outside this context, unless a group has no other option than to secede in order to protect themselves from gross human rights violations, self-determination must be exercised within the boundaries of the existing state.

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

5.5 Self-Determination as a Human Right

Although the idea of human rights has a long philosophical tradition, it was the human rights movement, which started as a reaction to the atrocities of the World War II that initiated their inclusion into positive international law. As a result, the former League of Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thus, when discussing human rights, it must be born in mind that the human rights now forming part of international law evolved from a particular historical, political and ideological framework. Self-determination has been expressively acknowledged as a human right when it was included into the two international human rights covenants, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which came into force in 1976 and constitute legally binding human rights treaties based on the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. The right of self-determination is stated in common Article 1 of the ICCPR and the ICESCR. Common Article 1(3) of the ICCPR and the ICESCR then specifies the right in stating that the realization and respecting of it shall be in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Yet, the content of the right of self-determination is not determined and leaves space for interpretation. As human rights have to be balanced with the particular and changing requirements of society, following general legal rules have been elaborated: first, human rights must be interpreted in the context of current standards; second, any limitations on the exercise of human rights are to protect either other rights or to protect the general interest of society; third, any limitations must be considered narrowly and in the context of specific circumstances; and finally, the victim of a human rights violation must bring the claim.

SAQ

Q. Do you think Self-determination for a community is important?
(50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

5.6 Self-Determination and Indigenous Peoples

Space for Learners

The historical evolution and development of the concept of human rights is derived from the liberal idea of the individual as being entitled to rights and freedoms against the state. Thus, international human rights law has mainly paid attention to the protection of individuals. Although the international community condemned the discrimination of religious minorities, no real protectoral system existed until recently and the emphasis was rather on tolerance than on rights. However, the international community became aware that an individual-centred system alone was not sufficient for protecting the rights of individuals as members of a group or of the group as such. Consequently, group rights have been recognized in international human rights law. These developments lead to the recognition of indigenous peoples as distinctive communities with collective rights. The representatives of indigenous peoples themselves insist on their right of self-determination as their core right. One reason for indigenous peoples to claim a right of self-determination is that such an entitlement would officially state the dignity of their status as a people. But until now no binding international legal instrument expressively establishes such a right and even where the general right of self-determination is included, its scope remains vague and unclear. Yet, there is an increasing acknowledgement of the claims of indigenous peoples by the United Nations and many states, but there is neither consensus on the definition of “peoples” nor of “indigenous.” The suggestion of a less monolithic meaning of people takes into account the fact that most human groups live in pluralistic societies. The focus should be on the participation of the different groups and thus “A less majoritarian, more differentiated, participatory and communitarian meaning of ‘people’ carries opportunities [...]. A mature concept of peoples respects and incorporates diversity and takes strength from it.” The main reason for the reluctance by which states applied the term “peoples” in the context of indigenous rights has been the fear that this would lead to a full recognition of their right of self-determination, including a right to secession. This is also reflected in the two Conventions on indigenous rights adopted by the International Labour Organisation: the first Convention from 1957 uses the term populations and the second from 1989, although using the term peoples, makes clear in Article 1(3) that this

Space for Learners

usage must not be construed as having any implications in regard to its usual meaning under international law – namely the right of colonised people to attain independence. With the elaboration of the United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples by the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP), the right of their status. As peoples and their consequential entitlement to the right of self-determination becomes acknowledged at the international level. It is now widely accepted that indigenous populations belong to the category of peoples who are entitled to the right of self-determination. Yet, the fundamental questions of interpretation and the content of the right of self-determination under international (human rights) law remain. Does the right of self-determination mean the right of a people to be free from external interference and foreign domination (external self-determination)? Or does the right imply the right of a people to assert its will against its own government (internal self-determination)?¹

Check Your Progress:

- 1 Try to look for examples of communities demanding self-determination?
- 2 What is External and Internal Self-determination?
- 3 Is Self-determination harmful for a State?

5.7 Jammu and Kashmir and Self-Determination

On the eve of Independence, there were two categories of territories in India: (1) those under the direct control of the British administration, and (2) princely states, approximately 565, governed indirectly by rulers through subsidiary alliance treaties with the colonial administration. In the latter case, the Maharajas and Nizams retained their de jure positions, but powers over defense, communications, and external affairs remained with the colonial administrators. These territories were given an option to join either of the two dominions (India or Pakistan) or remain independent. Most of the territories joined one of the two dominions on the basis of religion or

geographical proximity. Kashmir, however, faced a conundrum: the ruler Hari Singh was a Hindu while his subjects were primarily Muslims, who were held under an oppressive regime. 15 In fact, records would show that Kashmir's struggle for freedom from occupation preceded the Indian accession. Hari Singh's procrastination in acceding to either of the territories by the deadline implied that Kashmir was "technically independent." It was not until an oncoming invasion from the northwestern tribes that Hari Singh decided to finally accede to India in exchange for military assistance. This act was contested by Pakistan as an illegal, nonbinding action, eventually leading to war between the two countries. The Security Council Resolution 47 of 1948, adopted after representation from both the governments, noted that the continuance of the conflict posed a threat to "international peace and security" and that both the countries were in favor of holding a plebiscite within the territory. Towards this, Pakistan was under an obligation to withdraw its own troops from the contested region and withdraw any form of material aid towards the invaders; on the other side, India was under an obligation to reduce the military presence to a number just enough to maintain law and order. The plebiscite, additionally, was to take place under conditions respectful of the choices of the minorities.²⁰ Kashmir was partitioned along a cease-fire line that eventually came to be known as the Line of Control (the "LOC"). For political reasons, the question of holding a plebiscite lost traction by the 1950s. Jammu and Kashmir presented a unique problem: the territory saw three parallel administrations involving Azad Kashmir and the remote northern areas led by a Pakistan-appointed authority (on the Pakistan side) and the Indian Administered Kashmir. This rendered a plebiscite physically and administratively difficult and neither side was agreeable to holding a plebiscite solely in the Kashmir valley and the "uncertain areas around Muzaffarabad." In 1971, India, yet again, entered into war with Pakistan over Bangladesh's (earlier East Pakistan) calls for self-determination that resulted in a large influx of refugees from the neighboring State, who were escaping the Pakistani army-led massacre. India did manage to recapture some of the territory in the Kashmir region during this war, which was finally settled with the signing of the 1972 Simla Agreement. The Simla Agreement provided that any dispute between the

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

countries would be solved only through “bilateral” or other means agreed upon. Hence, in the Kashmir dispute, India contends, and the UN Secretary General also agrees, that the Simla Agreement has turned the dispute into an “internal matter”, by putting an end to the plebiscite question. Nevertheless, the same agreement also mentions that neither country could change the status of the contested territory unilaterally. Kashmir appears to meet all requirements that determine a “people.” The Security Council Resolution of 1948 that favored a plebiscite could be said to rest upon this premise. In the first scenario of a nation state preceding the existence of a parent State, the Kashmir issue could be looked at through a decolonization or occupation lens. In Horowitz’s views, once a colonized population has exercised its “rights” of self-determination, it expires—the population cannot claim a second chance at determining an alternative form of political governance. However, in the case of Kashmir, one could argue that the princely state could not have effectively exercised this right while under military coercion arising from the indirect colonial administration, and so such right has not been exhausted. Negotiations and resolutions have only treated Kashmiris as the object rather than the subject of law. This is the position several commentators have taken while arguing that Kashmir merely passed on from one colonizer to another.

Stop to Consider

Kashmir as an International Issue:

The Indian State has been very apt in handling the Kashmir at various international platforms such as the United Nations as very often Pakistan would take refuge under the UN to drag India at the international platform to discuss the Kashmir issue, which India has repeatedly stated that it is an internal matter of India, and that Pakistan should stop cross border terrorism before taking up such issues at the international level.

5.8 Meaning of Insurgency

The term Insurgency is historically restricted to rebellious acts that did not reach the proportions of an organized revolution. It has subsequently been

applied to any such armed uprising, typically guerrilla in character, against the recognized government of a state or country.

In traditional international law, insurgency was not recognized as belligerency, and insurgents lacked the protection customarily extended to belligerents. Herbert W. Briggs in *The Law of Nations* (1952) described the traditional point of view as follows:

The existence of civil war or insurrection is a fact. Traditionally, the fact of armed rebellion has not been regarded as involving rights and obligations under international law. ...Recognition of the belligerency of the insurgents by the parent State or of the contestants by foreign States changes the legal situation under international law. Prior to such recognition, foreign States have a legal right to aid the parent State put down a revolt, but are under a legal obligation not to aid insurgents against the established government.

The status of the faction opposing a government was usually determined by what Charles Cheney Hyde described as “the nature and extent of the insurrectionary achievement.” If the government was able to suppress the hostile faction rapidly, the event was described as a “rebellion.” In such cases recognition of the insurgents by a third party was regarded as “premature recognition,” a form of illegal intervention. If the insurgents became a serious challenge to the government and achieved formal recognition as “belligerents,” then the struggle between the two factions became in international law the equivalent of war. Support given to the insurgents by a third party amounted to that foreign government’s participation in the war. After World War II the emergence of a number of Communist states and of new nations in Asia and Africa changed the established international legal doctrine on insurgency. Communist states claimed the right to support insurgents engaged in “just wars of national liberation.” The new nations resulting from decolonization in Asia and Africa after World War II supported in most cases insurgents who invoked the principle of “national self-determination.” The United States and other Western countries in turn rejected such intervention as “indirect aggression” or “subversion.” International legal consensus regarding insurgency thus broke down as the result of regional and ideological pressures.

Space for Learners

Space for Learners

At the same time, humanitarian considerations prompted the international community to extend protection to persons involved in any “armed conflict” regardless of its formal legal status. This was done through the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, one of four agreements drafted in August 1949. Members of “organized resistance movements” are protected if in conducting their operations they have acted in military fashion, whereas insurgents lacking formal belligerent status were not protected under traditional international law.

In the Cold War era, insurgency was treated as synonymous with a system of politico-military techniques that aimed at fomenting revolution, overthrowing a government, or resisting foreign invasion. Those who rejected the use of violence as an instrument of social and political change used the term insurgency synonymously with revolutionary war, resistance war, war of national liberation, people’s war, protracted war, partisan war, or guerrilla war, without special concern for either the objectives or the methods of the insurgents. Insurgency referred no longer only to acts of violence on a limited scale but to operations that extended to a whole country and lasted for a considerable period of time. The insurgents attempted to win popular support for the rebel cause, while the threatened government sought to counter the efforts of the rebels. In such contests military operations were closely connected with political, economic, social, and psychological means, more so than either in conventional warfare or in insurgencies of an earlier period.

Modern insurgency tries to create conditions that will destroy the existing government and make an alternative revolutionary government acceptable to the population. While armed violence always plays a major role in such operations, usually initiated by a small activist minority, acts of terrorism are only the most obvious means used by the rebels. Rumours to discredit the government and its supporters, exacerbation of existing social conflicts and creation of new ones between racial, ethnic, religious, and other groups, political intrigue and manipulation to induce clashes between class or regional interests, economic disruption and dislocation, and any other means likely

to destroy the existing social order and to deprive the government of its power base, all play a role in fomenting insurgency.

In pursuit of its goals, the activist minority that forms the hard core of the attempt to overthrow the government will try to recruit a limited number of people for direct participation in their movement and to mobilize a large part of the total population as supporters and occasional helpers. The leaders of the insurgency will also make intensive use of propaganda to secure international sympathy and support. The attacked government is expected to lose the will to resist long before it has exhausted the material resources that allow it to remain in power.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Insurgency and the North-East:

Insurgency and the North-Eastern region of India have been synonymous in the socio-political lexicon of the Indian State. Insurgency in North-East India has been one of the oldest in the South Asian region as the Naga and the NSCN issue is considered to be the oldest in the region. Almost every State of North-East India is afflicted with the issues of insurgency.

This strategic emphasis on popular support, from which flow important tactical principles, distinguishes insurgency from another technique for the overthrow of an established government, the coup d'état. In an insurgency an activist minority counts on outlasting the government in a protracted struggle with the support of the population. The insurgents use terror tactics primarily and other guerrilla operations such as sabotage, ambushes, and raids. Their resources do not permit an immediate attempt to seize the government's centre of power, the institutions by which the country is controlled. The opposite technique is used in a coup d'état. There, the aim of the conspirators will usually be to seize swiftly the strategically crucial levers of government, paralyze the incumbents, and take over. Thus, coups d'état take place mainly in the capital and require the support of elite

Space for Learners

units of the armed forces. Popular support is of secondary importance and frequently a coup replaces one government that lacks mass appeal by another with similar characteristics. Coups are therefore usually manifestations of power struggles among various segments of the elite and do not achieve major social changes.

Unlike conspirators plotting coups against the vital centre of a government, insurgents operate initially at the periphery of the governmental system, in the hope that they will destroy slowly the government's will to resist. Insurgencies rarely engulf the whole country in armed clashes. Their leaders seek out targets of opportunity when and where they can inflict maximum damage on their enemy at lowest cost to themselves. Insurgencies and coups have therefore in common the relatively limited use of violence but differ in their goals: unlike typical coups, insurgencies aim at making major structural changes in society.

Insurgency and revolutions are at times used synonymously but there are, however, important differences between insurgencies and revolutions with regard to the total climate of opinion prevailing in the respective society. In an insurgency an activist minority tries to mobilize the population in support of its goals. In a genuine revolution the population at large has already been mobilized spontaneously by its discontent with the old order and is ready to respond to the appeal of revolutionary leaders. Consequently, genuine revolutions spread faster and generate social waves of greater amplitude than insurgencies. They are also likely to achieve broader social transformations because they respond to more widely shared popular demands than insurgencies which represent at first a minority point of view.

When the climate of opinion is ripe for a revolutionary explosion but equally strongly held contrary views are also present in the respective society, the clash of interests results in a civil war. Like a revolution, a civil war engages broad popular participation and, therefore, raises considerably the level of violence used by both sides. By contrast, in a typical insurgency the rebel minority challenges the forces defending the government amidst a population initially involved only to a limited extent on either side. Without a broad popular base, supporting what is perceived as a "just cause" insurgency cannot attain the broad scope that revolution or civil war can attain, but it can continue to operate for extended periods of time, especially if it receives

assistance from foreign powers to supplement a relative scarcity of domestic resources.

Although no insurgency can attain significant proportions without a measure of domestic popular support, the importance of external aid has been documented repeatedly. Without such aid insurgencies tend to fail, whereas an assured flow of foreign supplies and especially a sanctuary beyond national borders for training, regrouping and recuperation allows insurgents who have only limited popular support to continue their activities for a long time, thus imposing enormous strain and ruinous costs on the country. This makes support of insurgencies a powerful weapon for countries that want to exert pressure on other countries. As the covert support given by a foreign government to an insurgency is very difficult to prove, the temptation to use it as an instrument of foreign policy is great and externally supported insurgency, an indirect form of aggression, has become a major problem in international relations.

Space for Learners

Self Asking Questions

1. Do you think Insurgency creates insecurities among the people in a State? (50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

5.9 Insurgency and Assam

Assam has faced the major brunt of Insurgency since a very long period of time. There are multitude of insurgent groups in the State of Assam, but for our convenience we would be focusing on the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA). Assam, an ethnic and cultural mosaic, carrying in its embrace Ahoms, Bodos, Koch Rajbonshis, Santhalas, Mishings, Dimasas, Kukis, Hmars, Zemis (Nagas), Karbis and innumerable other smaller tribes with a significant presence of Bengalis, Biharis, Oriyas, Nepalis, is truly a mini

Space for Learners

India. And yet the tragedy is that Assam is burning, bleeding and reeling under the impact of an unprecedented scale of violence. Violation of human rights whether abductions, ransom, extortion by the ultras and other miscreants or the alleged atrocities unleashed by the state machinery continue unabated, making life difficult for the peace-loving Assamese. Unprecedented levels of violence and emergence of several insurgent groups and militant outfits now disturb a once tranquil land of hills, valleys and rivers with an abundance of natural resources. This includes the ULFA mainly in the Brahmaputra Valley, NDFB and BLT in Bodo dominated areas, MULTA in areas inhabited by immigrant Muslims and BLTF in Bengali speaking areas, Birsas Commando Force and All Santhal Cobra Force in the Santhal dominated areas within a short span of time. ULFA, which became synonymous with insurgency in Assam, took shape in April 1979 at the deserted *Rang Ghar* premises in Sivasagar where a handful of youth assembled and pledged to liberate Assam from the rule of Delhi. There were six members at the beginning, Arabinda Rajkhowa, Paresh Baruah, Gopal Baruah, Pradip Gogoi, Bhadreswar Buragohain and Bhimkanta Buragohain.

No one cared to take that event seriously at that moment, but in course of time the ULFA became so prominent that for a brief period in early 90s it was running a parallel administration in some pockets. The agony in Assam stems not only from the failure in bringing about proper integration of the North-eastern region as a whole with the mainstream, but also from certain historical and political factors, specially those of the post-independence period. First, it was demography that contributed the most in the generation of tensions and stress. Then the hijacking of the intractable issues by the extremist forces further complicated the Assam scenario.

It has influenced the educational, social and economic aspiration of countless Assamese which gave rise to powerful assimilationist and nativist sentiments and backlash separatist agitation, to massive conflict over languages, education and employment policy. These migrants in order to protect their landholdings made false declarations that their mother-tongue was Assamese which was reflected in an erroneous representation in 1951 census figures. They then started demanding a share in the power of the state and representation in the state assembly. But, the ethnic Assamese were

disinclined to share with the neo-Assamese, and so started the movement against ‘the foreigners’.

The sense of alienation prevailing in the minds of younger generation, the feeling of negligence by Centre, rampant corruption in public life and geographical location of the region have contributed to factors that led to insurgency. In spite of its abundant natural resources, economic imbalance, feeling of utter negligence by the Centre, frustration among educated youths and sense of insecurity in their own land have been identified as some of the causes of insurgency in the state –

- Economic causes: The oil wells in Assam produce five million tons of crude oil, but the first refinery to process this crude oil was set up in Barauni in Bihar. The state in spite of producing more than 400 million kilograms of tea with a turnover of Rs. 20 billion⁴⁶, the headquarters of all the tea companies are located outside the state,
- Political cause: The political culture of alienation by distant Delhi has resulted in inept handling of even the genuine demands and aspirations of the people of Assam. Failure of the Centre to handle the illegal migration from Bangladesh also resulted in the growth of ULFA
- ULFA was in a sense outcome of the Assam Movement and the movement provided the platform for formation of secessionist ideals. There were important people who created the atmosphere and articulated the ideals to fight the injustice and unequal treatment meted out to the Assamese society at large and this could only be countered via aggressive actions showing the Indian government the presence of strong Assamese nationalism and pride which would struggle for preserving the rights of the people.

The ULFA first came into the limelight when it joined hands with the AASU and All-Assam Gana Sangram Parishad (AAGSP) combine in enforcing the boycott of polls of 1983 till the names of the illegally settled ‘foreigners’ were struck off from the electoral rolls. In the initial years the ULFA was not very active and it lent support to the famous Assam Agitation. It had close connections with the AASU as at the beginning it supported the cause of Assamese nationalism.

Space for Learners

It was mainly after 1985 that ULFA started its militant activities such as bank robberies, killing of people. It dispensed a reign of terror when it started political elimination of people at various levels. ULFA was declared as a terrorist organisation by the Indian State in 1990. The growing popularity and increasing members motivated ULFA to target big industries of the state like tea and oil for extortion. Once the news of extortion drives of ULFA spreading outside the state, the Union Government of India banned ULFA (1990) and launched first Army Operation (Bajrang) against ULFA. As a result, hundreds of ULFA cadres were killed or captured by Indian Army from various places of the state. On September 14, 1991, Operation Rhino was launched in by the GOI. The operation proved a success in which most of the ULFA bases (91 in the State) were destroyed and nearly all of the top ULFA leadership were arrested. Over 300 ULFA cadres surrendered within 40 days of Operation Rhino. The ULFA which turned into a violent organisation received a major setback on 26 January, 2004, when it planted a bomb in Dhemaji district of Upper Assam which killed 15 innocent children. This incident was condemned by almost every Assamese who began to question the intention of ULFA. In fact the ULFA started losing its mass base in Assam. ULFA targeted the non-Assamese people to show its strength in various places of Assam such as the killing of the Bihari people in Upper Assam. It mainly operated from Bangladesh and had all its leaders in that country. ULFA has received open support from Pakistan, China, Myanmar and Bangladesh. The ULFA was so involved in militant activities, that it became an extortionist organisation. It was no longer interested in the original ideology of 'SwadhinAxom' of independent Assam. A major point in the study of ULFA comes in the year 2008 when its senior members led by Arabindra Rajkhowa surrendered before the Indian authorities. Rajkhowa along with others formed the Pro-talks faction of the ULFA and began talks with the government of India, Paresh Baruah the Chairman of ULFA did not approve of this pro-talks faction. At present talks are going on between the pro-talks faction of ULFA and the Government of India. The present Government of Assam under the Chief Ministership of Dr. Himanta Biswa Sarma has also been trying to initiate talks with the Paresh Baruah faction.

Check Your Progress

1. Write a brief note on Insurgency? What are the major factors behind the growth of insurgency in Assam?
2. What is the present state of insurgency in Assam with regards to ULFA?
3. Does insurgency pose a hurdle to the development process. Examine?
4. What is AFSPA?

Space for Learners

5.10 Summing Up

After reading this unit you have learn that the idea of self-determination for a community must be respected by the sovereign authority as long as it does not result in the secessionist tendencies which has been the case of Kashmir. In case of insurgency it can be said that the state of Assam has been badly ravaged by the insurgency which mainly started in the 1980s, however the state has been continuously trying to engage itself with the various insurgent outfits in the form of negotiations to bring peace and development back in rack in the state of Assam. It can be said that Assam being the gateway to the entire North East must act rapidly to bring the various insurgent movements under control so that the entire North East can benefit out of it in terms of development and prosperity.

5.11 References and Suggested Readings

1. Barpujari, H.K. 1998. North-East India: Problems, Policies and Prospects, Delhi: Spectrum Publications.
2. Baruah, Sanjib. 1999. India against Itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
3. Bose, S, The Challenge in Kashmir: Democracy, Self Determination and A Just Peace, 1996, New Delhi, Sage Publications
4. Chaube, S.K. 1999. Hill Politics in Northeast India. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.
5. Mahanta, N.G, 2013, Confronting the State: ULFA's Quest for Sovereignty, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
