

BLOCK 3
REGIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND
MOVEMENTS

ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

BLOCK 3 INTRODUCTION

India consists of various regions which have uneven levels of development. Some regions are more developed, and some are less developed or backward. Different regions also have different social and cultural features. Such diversities exist within the regions in a common administrative unit such as State or Union Territory. Often, the regional differences get expressed in the form of regional aspirations. In several regions within various states or across more than one state, there exist grievances among the people. They feel that their regions are discriminated by their respective state governments, central governments or by other regions. They argue that their aspirations can be met if relations between their regions and the state where are located at present are reorganized. In India, there are demands in various regions for reorganization of relations between different regions. These demands take the following forms: movement for autonomy to regions within a state or Union Territory, insurgency or for creation of a new state out of one or more than one state. The three units in this block are about regional aspirations and movements. Unit 6 is about movements for autonomy within Indian states. Unit 7 deals with the cases of insurgency in India. Unit 8 discusses the movements for separate statehood in India.



ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

UNIT 6 AUTONOMY MOVEMENTS*

Structure

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Constitutional Provisions and Regional Autonomy
- 6.3 Features of Autonomy Movements
- 6.4 Examples of Autonomy Movements
 - 6.4.1 “State Within the State” and Autonomy: Meghalaya
 - 6.4.2 From Separate State to Autonomy: Bodo Movement
 - 6.4.3 The Context of Bodoland Movement: The ULFA
 - 6.4.4 Karbis’ and Dimasa Kacharis’ Autonomy Movement
- 6.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 6.6 References
- 6.7 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

6.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the meaning of autonomy in a federal structure;
- Analyse the reasons for the autonomy movements;
- Explain provisions in Indian constitution about autonomy in Indian federal structure, and
- Discuss examples of autonomy movements in India

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Autonomy movements are collective action of people in a region or across regions seeking rearrangement of relations among federal units – central, state and local governments in a country in such a way that the people involved in such action enjoy autonomy of their region to manage their affairs. The autonomy is sought in multiple spheres of identity – cultural, ethnic, economic, political, etc. It is needed to legislate on these issues relating to the regions demanding autonomy or execute decisions on them. The notion of autonomy in a federal structure has multiple meanings: creation of a separate state out of one or more states within the Union of India or rearrangement of federal relations within an existing state of the Union of India giving autonomy a region. Autonomy is often confused with self-determination. Although self-determination and autonomy are sometimes used interchangeably, in Indian context they convey different meanings. Self-determination often refers to establishment of a sovereign out of the existing sovereign state. It is also known as cessation in which one region in a country wants to secede and become a sovereign state. Indian constitution does not approve establishment of a sovereign state out the sovereign state. The movement in a region of a state for rearrangement of federal relations between

the region and the state is called autonomy movement. Such autonomy is demanded by creating and administrative device such as regional, district or territorial councils.

Movement for creation of separate state of one or more states is known as statehood movement. You will read about it in unit 8. The movement which seeks to establish sovereign state out of Indian republic and see involvement of people and violence are known as insurgencies. You will read about them in 7. In this unit, you will read about the autonomy movements in this unit.

6.2 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND AUTONOMY

India is a federal polity which has 28 states and 11 Union Territories (after J&K was converted into two Union Territories). Each of these states consists of regions which have diverse social, linguistic and cultural groups, and unequal levels of development. As India follows a federal system, enactment of laws regarding relationships between the states and Union of India are regulated according to the provisions of the Constitution. There are three lists of subjects which fall in jurisdiction of the states and Union of India separately known as State List and Union List, and jointly as Concurrent List. These provisions are meant to address the grievances of people in a region if they are not satisfied with the arrangement of powers relations within the existing boundaries of the states. The VI Schedule (Article 244) has provisions for creating autonomous bodies – autonomous district, regional or territorial councils in four states of northeast India. These states are Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura and Mizoram. Article 371, which ranges from Article 371-A to Article 371-J provides special provisions for Nagaland, Assam, Manipur, Sikkim, Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh in northeast India, and for Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka in other regions of the country. This Article is aimed at providing special grant to the backward regions for their development, at protecting their culture and customary laws. The device Inner Line Permit (ILP) exists to protect culture and economy of people in the states of Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Mizoram and Tripura. Under this device, an Indian citizen who is not a resident of these states, can enter them only after getting permission of the central government, known as ILP. There is a demand for introduction of the ILP in states like Meghalaya and Manipur. There are also provisions in the constitution for changing the boundaries of the states, creation of new states and giving autonomy to the regions within the states. As you will read in unit 8, according to Art. 3 of the Constitution new states can be created in Indian Union. The 73rd and the 74th Constitutional Amendments provide for subjects which fall under the jurisdiction of the rural and urban local governance respectively.

6.3 FEATURES OF AUTONOMY MOVEMENTS

Although the aim of autonomy movements is to get power relations between the regions within a state restructured without coming out of its jurisdiction, it has not been the first demand of all autonomy movements. Some autonomy movements started with the goal to have a separate state carved out of one or more states but in the course of the movement their demand scaled down to

getting autonomy within the existing state. In the case of Meghalaya, the movement started with the goal to have a separate state carved out of Assam but the supporters of separate statehood accepted the status of a state within the state in 1970-72. Like the demands in the statehood movements and insurgencies, the autonomy movements have following features:

- 1) These are raised in the areas where people feel discriminated by the more resourceful regions in economic, social, cultural or political aspects.
- 2) These demands are generally raised by articulate sections of the society – middle classes, students, civil society organizations, political parties.
- 3) The supporters of autonomy demands generally allege that their region has become “internal colony” of the developed regions; their natural resources are exploited by outsiders and they are not paid back royalty or allowances in equal proportions of usage of their resources.
- 4) Their region is not given adequate representation in political institutions in the state, and decisions about them are taken by the governments without their involvement.
- 5) Their language and culture are not given due recognition and in several cases the dominant language is imposed on them.
- 6) The autonomy movements have some political context.

While these are the commonest factors which cause the autonomy movements in India, their impact may vary from case to case.

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.
 ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What do you mean by autonomy movements?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What are the features of autonomy movements?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6.4 EXAMPLES OF AUTONOMY MOVEMENTS

You will read below various examples of cases of autonomy movements: demand for separate state was converted into granting an autonomous state (Meghalaya); movement in which the demand for Bodoland which was scaled down to acceptance of autonomy within the state of Assam; Karbis and Dimasas Kacharis who initially wanted separate state of Poorvanchal within Assam accepted autonomy within the state.

6.4.1 “State Within the State” and Autonomy: Meghalaya

The case of Meghalaya is an example where a demand was made for creation of a hill state out of Assam, but instead of a separate state an autonomous state was created within Assam – “a state within the state” which existed during 1970-72. Although the demand for a separate state of Meghalaya – in the tribal-dominated Jaintia, Khasi and Garo hills, which formed parts of Assam then, became more strident in the 1960s, it started getting raised in the 1950s. These were among the regions which were governed by the VI Schedule areas in Assam. The people in the VI Schedule areas were not satisfied with its provisions. They argued that it did not adequately safeguard their interests and the people in the plains of Assam did not treat them properly. Besides, the resolution of the Asom Jatiya Mahasabha to make Assamese as the official language of all in Assam, which then included non-Assamese speaking hill and plain areas also incensed them. In this context, the Chief Executive Member (CEM) of the Garo Hills District Council, Williamson Sangma convened a meeting of the CEMs of all district councils on 16 and 17 January 1954. The meeting was attended by CEMs of Lushai, North Cachar, Garo and the United Khasi-Jaintia Hills District Councils, the CEM of the Mikir Hills District Council could not attend the meeting. The meeting discussed two points: formation of a separate Hills state; and Amendment of the VI Schedule because “it confers no real autonomy”. Sangma emphasized that there was no alternative to the new Hill state. However, the CEM of the Mizo District Council argued that demand for a new state could be advanced only after the demand for autonomy was made and rejected. The suggestions of the meeting were sent to several members of parliament seeking amendment to the Sixth Schedule. This meeting was followed by an Assam Hills Tribal Leaders’ Conference at a Tura from 6-8 October 1954. The meeting was attended by 46 delegates (except those from Mizo hills). The conference unanimously called for “a separate state for the autonomous districts of Assam” and decided to send memorandum to the State Reorganization Commission (SRC). The SRC rejected the demand on the ground that the agitation for separate state was confined to the Jaintia, Khasi, Garo hills, excluding other areas of Assam. Pataskar Commission rejected the proposal for a separate state. Instead of a separate state, an autonomous state, which came to be known as Meghalaya was created on April 1, 1970 within the state of Assam. It was created following the passage of 22nd Amendment [the Meghalaya Amendment Act 55 of 1969] (following passage of the Assam Reorganisation (Meghalaya) Bill, 1969 by the both Houses of Parliament. The autonomous state had three-tier system of power distribution. The Executive power was vested with the Governor of Assam who was aided and advised by the Council of Ministers in Meghalaya as an autonomous state within Assam; legislative assembly was created with membership open to all

Indians in Meghalaya with exception of Shillong where all seats in (autonomous districts) were reserved for Scheduled Tribes; and the Governor was empowered to nominate three persons to the legislative assembly from minority communities who in his opinion were not adequately represented. The Governor of Assam was empowered to constitute village courts and courts of appeal with jurisdiction over tribals and tribals. Several state subjects were transferred from Assam to Meghalaya excluding public order, armed police, railway police, industry and sale tax. The Assam and Meghalaya legislatures were given concurrent jurisdiction of agriculture, forest, transport, communication and waterways. The distribution of power between Meghalaya and Assam faced challenges. In 1972, Meghalaya became a separate state.

6.4.2 From Separate State to Autonomy: Bodo Movement

The Bodos, the plain tribes of Assam, have been clamouring for autonomy for several years. The Bodo Autonomy movement has passed through two phases: One, from the late 1960s to 1979; and two, the post-AASU movement (1979-85), i.e. from 1985 onwards. The notion of Bodo autonomy has vacillated between demand for creation of a separate state to be carved out of the state of Assam and a region enjoying autonomy within the state. The demand for a separate state of Bodoland was the main demand in the initial years of the Bodo movement. The first phase of Bodo movement began in 1967 for creation of new state of Uadyanchal. Establishment of Nagaland state in 1963 became the immediate context of demands for creation of Bodoland like the demands for the states of Meghalaya, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh out of Assam in the 1960s. Even though, among the regions inhabited by the hill tribes in Assam, in 1972, Meghalaya became a separate state and Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram became Union territories, and in 1963, Nagaland had already become a separate state, Bodoland demand did not pick up further momentum.

The next phase of Bodo autonomy movement started in 1987, after the Assam Accord of 1985 was signed. The movement became more consistent and strident in this phase. Like several other smaller indigenous communities, the Bodos also had participated in the anti-foreigner movement led by the AASU (All Assam Students Union) movement. But after the signing of the Assam Accord, they felt that their cultural autonomy and political rights were not recognised by the dominant groups in Assam. The Bodos developed a feeling that they were not fairly treated in the Assam Accord, even though they had participated in the Assam movement (1979-85). They felt that Clause 6 of the Assam Accord was against their cultural and economic interests. In the perception of the Bodos, this clause would submerge the Bodo identity into the high caste identity of Assamese. Sanjib Baruah in the book *India Against Itself*, has a chapter “We Are Bodos, Not Assamese”: Contesting a Subnational Narrative” which underlines the attempts by Bodos to prove this distinct identity. In order to showcase distinctness of their identity, the All India Bodo Student Union prepared a 92-point charter which was used in campaign for a Bodo homeland. Sanjib Baruah classifies these demands into three categories: cultural and linguistic, about economic opportunities and development, and residual demands. The distinct culture of Bodos was symbolized by their language (Bodo), dress, food, culture, etc. which was different from those of the Assamese.

From the 1993, the focus of Bodo movement affecting districts such as Kokrajhar, Baksa, Chirang and Udalgarh shifted from a Bodo homeland to acceptance autonomy for Bodos within the state of Assam. Dilution of homeland was reflected in the provisions of Bodo Accords signed between Bodos and governments in 1993, 2003 and 2020. However, a faction of the Bodos still wanted creation of the state of Bodoland. In the light of the first Bodo Accord of 1993, Bodoland Autonomous Council (BAC) was created covering Bodo-dominated districts. It, however, did not define territorial jurisdiction of BAC. Due to failure to identify territorial jurisdiction of BAC, election to it could not be held. And by 1996, the Bodos returned to demand of Bodo homeland. The council was derecognised by two militant factions – the Bodoland Army and Bodoland Liberation Force (BLTF). They called the council as “stooge of Dispur”. The second Bodo Accord or 2003 created Bodoland Territorial Council (BTC). The BTC’s jurisdiction extended over 3082 villages and it was given power to legislate over 40 subjects. It provided for an Executive Council consisting of maximum 12 Executive Members including a chief and a deputy chief. It also provided for adequate representation of the non-tribals. The third Bodo Accord was signed in January 2020 between Union Home Ministry, the state government and Bodo groups. Some of its important features were as follows. Apart from the central and state governments, the signatories to this accord also included some militant groups which did not sign earlier accords. Bodo Territorial Area District (BTAD) will be replaced by Bodo Territorial Region (BTR). A commission headed by a retired judge will be set up to work out mechanism for inclusion into BTR of villages which have majority of tribals and are contiguous to the present Bodo Council. Similarly, villages which currently have non-tribal population located in Bodo Council but are contiguous to non-Sixth Schedule Areas (meaning areas outside the council jurisdiction) will be excluded from the BTR. The BTR will have more legislative, executive, financial and administrative powers. The accord provided for autonomy within Assam, side-lining the issue of separate state or Union Territory). An amount of Rs. 250 crore per annum by the state for a period of three years for development of areas under the BTR, and centre will contribute an equal amount for the same period. The seats in the BTR will be increased to 60 from 40.

6.4.3 The Context of Bodoland Movement: The ULFA

Apart from Bodos’ reservations about the clause VI of the Assam Accord, another reason for the Bodoland movement from 1985 was the demand by the high caste dominated ULFA for a sovereign state of Assam, which included the areas inhabited by the plain tribes such as Bodos. The ULFA sought to establish a sovereign state, as it had existed in the form of Ahom kingdom before its sovereignty was compromised by annexing the Ahom kingdom with British India. It differed with the AASU. For it, all inhabitants of Assam who believe in and respected Assamese culture and land were Assamese irrespective of the ethnicity and place of origin. But for the AASU, Bangladeshis who came after December 31, 1971 were foreigners, who needed to be expelled from Assam. The ULFA became got strong foothold in Assam during the Congress government headed by Hiteswar Sekia which was formed following Congress victory in 1983 assembly election. Its activities peaked during the first regime of the AGP (1986-90). The ULFA took resource to violence, extortion, kidnapping, etc. They had formed

parallel government and collected taxes from businessmen and others. ULFA complained that Assam had become colony of India: its natural resources were used for development of other regions, the state government in Assam was not paid adequately by the centre royalty for extraction of natural resources such oil and natural, the state was discriminated in industrial investment. The Hiteswar Sekia government offered amnesty in 1993 to those ULFA members who surrendered. They came to be known as Surrendered ULFA or SULFA. The state government as well as the central governments used coercion on the ULFA members, as they also indulged in extortion. The government targeted them with the policies known as “Operation Bajrang” and “Operation Rhino”.

6.4.4 Karbis’ and Dimasa Kacharis’ Autonomy Movement

Two tribes of Assam – Karbi in Karbi Anlong and Dimasa Cacharis in North Cachar hill districts of Assam have also been demanding carving out of an autonomous state withing the existing state of Assam from these two districts. Earlier, these two tribes did not participate in the Assam movement (1979-1985). Nor did they support the demand for the hills states, which later resulted in the formation of Meghalaya state out of Assam. An autonomous state had existed earlier as the state of Meghalaya within Assam between 1970-1972 before Meghalaya became a separate state. Since the 1960s, two hill districts of Karbi Anglong and North Kachar hills have been complaining of limitations of Autonomous district councils created under the Sixth Schedule. In fact, autonomous district council in Karbi Anglong district is one of the oldest councils which is in existence since 1951. Two of the oldest autonomous district councils - Nagaland and Mizoram became separate states in 1963 and 1987. The demand of the Karibis and Dimasa Kacharis started after the formation AGP government, at the same time when the second phase of the Bodo movement became more strident and regular. The mobilization for the demand is spearheaded by an organization known as ASDC (Autonomous State Demand Committee). The reasons for their agitation lay in the Assam Accord of 1985 like those of the Bodos. According to Monirul Hussain, the declined of the Congress and the left and the victory of the AGP in 1987 assembly election left the Karbis and Dimasa Kacharis with a feeling of neglect. Earlier, they had some representation in these parties. The feeling of neglect resulted in their demand for a state within the state. Demand of the Karbis is a demand for elevation of an administrative unit from Autonomous Council to a state within a state govern them. The Karbis enjoy autonomy under Karbi Anlong Autonomous Council which has 26 seats.

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) Why was Meghalaya known as “state within state” in 1971-1972?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What were main aspects of Bodo Accord of 2020?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) Discuss the features of Karbi-Dimasa Kachari Autonomy movement.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6.5 LET US SUM UP

Autonomy movements are collective mobilization of people in a region or across regions with the aim of getting autonomy to their region for managing their economic, social and cultural, and political affairs. Such autonomy is sought by re-arranging the relations between federal units – between a state and regions aspiring the autonomy, in a such way that the regions get autonomy without moving out of the jurisdiction of the parent state. The regions which demand autonomy do not always demand it as their priority. In several instances, their priority is either to get separate state out of the existing state, but in the course of the progression of the movement the demand for creation of new state is dropped and achieving autonomy while existing in the parent state becomes priority. The major examples of autonomy movements in India include Bodoland movement, and Karbis’ Dimasa Kacharis’ and movement. Formation of Meghalaya as an autonomous state within the state of Assam (1971-72), “state within the state” was a unique example in India. Although the people of Khasi, Jaintia and Garo hills had demanded a separate state to be carved out of Assam, the central government granted them an autonomous state, not a separate state. However, in 1972, the autonomous state was elevated to the status of a separate state of Meghalaya. Autonomy movements are generally initiated and led by articulate sections in the regions seeking autonomy. The reasons for the demands lie in the grievances which people in the regions have against their government or dominant regions. They allege the latter discriminate against them in economic, cultural, social and political aspects. Achievement of autonomy of their regions can end the discrimination and result in their development.

6.6 REFERENCES

Baruah, Sanjib (1999), *India Against Itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality*, Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Bathari, Uttam (2015), “The Case of Karbi-Dimasa Autonomy Movement”, in Sandhya Goswami (ed.), *Troubled Diversity: Political Process in Northeast India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Bhattacharya, Dipankar (1993), “KarbiAnlong Revisited” *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 28.

Chaube, S.K. (1999), *Hill Politics in Northeast India*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman.

Das, Samir Kumar (1994), *ULFA United Liberation Front of Assam: A Political Analysis*, Delhi, Ajanta.

Gohain, Hiren (2019), *Struggling in a Time Wrap: Essays and Observations on the Northeast’s History and Politics with Particular Reference to Assam*, Guwahati, Bhabani Books &Gifts.

Hussain, Monirul (1987), “Tribal Movement for Autonomous State in Assam”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 8, pp. 1329-32.

Hussain, Wasbir (2020), “How the Bodo Accord was accomplished, establishing a wider templet for peace in the Northeast”, *The Times of India*, February 06, 2020.

6.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

- 1) Autonomy movements are collective actions of people in an area or across areas within a state which seek autonomy of the region while remaining within the jurisdiction of the state in which they are located. Autonomy of the region is supposed to provide autonomy to the inhabitants of the region to participate in decision-making on the issues concerning the region.
- 2) The autonomy movements have following features. They are raised in the areas which feel discriminated by the other regions or by the government in economic, social, cultural or political aspects. The demands are generally raised by articulate sections of the society.

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

- 1) From 1970-1972 Meghalaya was known as “state within the state” because it did not exist as a full-fledged state then but a state enjoying certain powers within the state of Assam. It enjoyed the status of an autonomous state, the executive power of which vested with the Governor of Assam. And he was aided and advised by the Council of Ministers in Meghalaya as an autonomous state within Assam. The autonomous state of Meghalaya had power to enact on subjects excluding public order, armed police, railway police, industry and sale tax. The legislatures of Meghalaya and Assam had concurrent jurisdiction on agriculture, forest, transport, communication and waterways.

- 2) The some of the important aspects of the Bodo accord of 2020 were as follows. Unlike the earlier two Bodo accords of 1993 and 2003, the 2020 Bodo accord included all Bodo groups as signatories to the accord along with the Government of India and the Government of Assam. It created Bodo Territorial Region (BTR) in place of the Bodo Territorial Areas District (BTAD) which was set up by the preceding accord of 2003. The signatories made a joint commitment to end violence and seek progress and development of the BTR. The Accord suggested more legislative, executive, financial and administrative powers to the BTR, inclusion of the Bodo-dominated villages situated in the non-Sixth Schedule area in the BTR and exclusion of the non-Bodo dominated villages from the Bodo dominated villages, increase in the BTR's seats to 60 from 40. It was made mandatory for Assam government to earmark an amount of Rs. 250 crore per annum for a period of three years for development of areas under the BTR and for the centre to contribute equal amount.
- 3) Two tribes in the hill districts of Assam Karbi Anglong and North Kachar Hills, Karbis and Dimasa Kacharis demand creation of an autonomous state while remaining under the jurisdiction of the state of Assam. The demand arose after the formation AGP government in 1987.



ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

UNIT 7 INSURGENCY*

Structure

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 What is Insurgency?
- 7.3 Genesis of Insurgency in India
- 7.4 Jammu and Kashmir Insurgency
- 7.5 Insurgency in Northeast India
 - 7.5.1 The Naga Insurgency
 - 7.5.2 Manipur
 - 7.5.3 The Mizo Insurgency
- 7.6 Insurgency in Punjab
- 7.7 The Maoist Insurgency
- 7.8 Let's Sum Up
- 7.9 References
- 7.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercise

7.0 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this unit is to give you a broad perspective on the issue of insurgency in India. After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- Define insurgency;
- Highlight the causes and nature of insurgency in India; and,
- Explain response of the Union government to insurgency.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Ever since the formation of the Indian Union in 1947, insurgency has been one of its biggest challenges. As you will read below in sub-section 7.2, insurgency is an act of revolt against the state or constitutional authority with the involvement of some or large sections of society. Generally, insurgency is marked by violence involving some or large sections of society and the state. There are several examples of insurgency from different parts of India - in northeast India, Punjab, and Jammu and Kashmir, Although there are examples of insurgency from several states in India, their levels of intensity and scope have varied.

7.2 WHAT IS INSURGENCY?

Different scholars define insurgency in different ways. Despite differences, all of them largely agree that there is a common feature in the definition of insurgency: insurgency is an organized armed resistance against the state or constituted authority with the aim of overthrowing the regime. And those people who are engaged in insurgency activities are known as 'insurgents'. Insurgency, therefore,

*Dr. N. Kishorchand Singh, Consultant, Faculty of Political Science, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

involves at least one non-state actor or movement that fights against an established authority to achieve political change (Marston, 2005). S. K. Chaube defines insurgency as a rebellion against an order or an authority. He adds that an insurgent may have a completely different viewpoint on the same issue, and he is one who does not accept a prevailing order, for whom an ‘insurgency’ is an act of resistance or transformation (Chaube 1997). The Indian Army’s *Doctrine for Sub Conventional Operations* defines insurgency “an organized armed struggle by a section of the local population against the state, usually with foreign support. Its goal may be seizure of power and replacement of the existing regime or even liberation of a defined area” (MOD, 2006: 64).

Insurgency is often assumed as identical with terrorism, although there are differences between them. The insurgent tends to use similar kind of violent activities as terrorist do. However, unlike terrorism, insurgency movements generally involve or require material or moral support from some section of the population in order to justify their existence and also to erode the legitimacy of the government. In this regard, insurgent groups normally carry out information and psychological warfare for propaganda and mass political mobilization (Singh 2018: 249, MOD 2006). Terrorist groups, on the other hand, do not enjoy popular support. The goal of an insurgency is to challenge the existing authority with an attempt to bring political change for the control of its territories or a part of it. But the terrorist groups do not attempt to bring political change. Instead, they used violence even against the civilian targets to instill fear and alter public perception on the effectiveness or legitimacy of the government.

A concept related of insurgency is counter-insurgency. It means those measures which are taken by the state to counter the insurgency. It may be defined as a comprehensive civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root cause. However, there is no single set of technique for counter-insurgency. It requires a wide range of military, civilian, political, economic, or social actions of various kinds executed by the government in order to undermine an insurgency and also resolve its root causes. The mere use of force may help to contain or suppress a rebellion for certain period, but it cannot resolve the problem and bring a lasting solution. Therefore, in most countries, including India, counter-insurgency operations are usually executed in a combination of civilian and military means backed by appropriate political, economic, and social measures and also perception management aimed at winning ‘hearts and minds’ of the people (MoD, 2006). In India, military measure includes imposition of AFSPA (Armed Force Special Power Act), 1958 in the insurgency-affected areas. Under the provisions of AFSPA, the army is authorized to arrest a person and search an area suspected to be involved in insurgency.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) Define insurgency. How does it differ from terrorism?

.....
.....

7.3 GENESIS OF INSURGENCY IN INDIA

There are various factors that lead to the genesis of insurgency. Some are real and some are imagined or constructed (history, ideology, politics, ethnicity, religion, language, or combination of different factors). Consciousness about the identity based on these factors has been variously conceptualized as ethno-nationalism, nationalism, etc. The insurgencies have leaders, cadres or popular support, ideologies and specific goals. They have wide range of goals: some insurgencies call for separate state, others for regional autonomy while some others demand for secession or complete independence. Insurgency is in fact a collective mobilization. Insurgencies are often accompanied with violence involving state machineries and insurgents. Occurrence and levels of insurgency have not been a permanent feature.

Drawing from India's experience, Paul Staniland (2017) has identified three types of insurgency in India as: (i) tribal and ethno-nationalist separatist insurgency as in the Northeast or Punjab (ii) religious minority separatist as in Jammu and Kashmir (iii) ideological or Maoist insurgency in central and eastern India. But what is common among insurgencies is the popular dissatisfaction against the established regime and their common desire to bring political change, usually for the right to self-determination.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) What were the factors responsible for the emergence of insurgency?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7.4 JAMMU AND KASHMIR INSURGENCY

Insurgency in Jammu and Kashmir, which had existed as a state till August 5, 2019 when it was divided into two Union territories of Jammu and Kashmir, and Laddakh, emerged in the late 1980s. This was preceded by a period of political uncertainty. In 1974, Sheikh Abdullah reached an agreement with Indira Gandhi, known as 'Kashmir Accord'. Under this Accord Sheikh Abdullah was released from jail. After the release he became the Chief Minister again. But, upon his release, he was asked by the centre to drop the demand for self-determination. Dropping of self-determination demand created resentment in Jammu and Kashmir. A few years after the Accord, the central government dismissed the Faruq Abdullah government that was formed after the death of Sheikh Abdullah. The Kashmir Accord and dismissal of Faruq Abdullah government were viewed as acts of intervention by the centre in the state politics and "subversion of democracy" (Ganguly 1996: 104).

The resentment intensified following the controversial election of 1987 in Jammu and Kashmir. After this election, Kashmir valley witnessed a dramatic rise in armed-rebellion against the Indian state. By the 1990s, two types of insurgency groups emerged in Kashmir. One was the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) which launched a guerrilla revolt against India with the aim to 'liberate' Kashmir from India. The other was the Pakistan-sponsored groups like the Hizbul Mujahideen (HM) based on pan-Islamism (Stanililand 2012: 158; Ganguly 1996). There were multiple reasons for the rise of insurgency in J & K. Younger generation of educated Kashmiris like Yasin Malik, Shabbir Shah and Javed Mir participated in Vidhan Sabha election in 1987. But because of manipulation and rigging in the election, they lost their faith in electoral process and resorted to rebellion as channels for expressing their discontents (Ganguly 1996: 104). Around that time, the use of religion for politics in Kashmir became more intense, transforming the 'political struggle' of Kashmir into a religious struggle exclusively for Kashmiri Muslims. In 1993, around twenty-six pro-separatist parties united to form the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (Hurriyat). There were two factions divided on ideological lines within the Hurriyat: one faction following the 'hard-line', advocating for merger with Pakistan; another faction, the 'moderate' faction, urging for an 'independent' Kashmir. And after the Kargil War of 1999, insurgency in Kashmir became dominated by pro-Pakistan local groups and cross-border proxy groups (Evans 2000). Pakistan sought to control the Kashmir militancy by supporting Islamic groups which are inclined towards Pakistan and systematically undermining pro-independence groups like the JKLF (Patankar 2009: 68).

During the 1990s, a large number of suicide bombings or *fidayeen* attacks were carried out by Pakistan-sponsored groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, Jaish-e-Mohammad, etc. as a part of Pakistan's proxy-war against the Indian state. Insurgency related violence continues until 2003, when a cease-fire agreement between India and Pakistan reduced the intensity of violence. Though violence may have been contained, the rebellion itself was far from over.

Tensions once again escalated in 2008 in the Kashmir valley but with a completely new form, in which Kashmiri youths came out in mass protests on the streets. Unlike the previous generation who took up arms, this new generation has used 'stone pelting' as a new form of agitations which were largely spontaneous (Rai 2018). But, by and large, the new form of mass protests is less violent as compare to the high-intensity violence of the 1980s and 1990s. This is, however, not to suggest that insurgency has disappeared from Kashmir, rather it continues to remain one of the most complex problem in India today.

7.5 INSURGENCY IN THE NORTHEAST

Out of the eight states in northeast India - Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura, and Sikkim, three have witnessed insurgency of higher scale and more enduring than in other states. These three states are Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur. You will read about these states in sub-sections 7.5.1, 7.5.2 and 7.5.3. Insurgencies in these states spanned during the 1950s-1960s. In Tripura, the tribal majority state of Tripura was reduced into a Bengali dominated state after the massive population influx after the

Bangladesh War of 1971. It led to the formation of Tripura National Volunteers (TNV) in collaboration with Mizo National Front (MNF) in 1978. After a decade of violence, TNV surrendered with an agreement in 1988. However, peace could not prevail for long as a new insurgent group called National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT) emerged in 1989. Later, another group called All Tripura Tribal Front (ATTF) emerged. Both groups continued their rebellious operations because of their common agenda to drive out Bengali immigrants. Insurgency in other states started later than in these states: In Assam and Meghalaya insurgencies started in the late 1980s and the 1990s respectively. In Meghalaya insurgency developed with the emergence of the Hynniewtrep Achik Liberation Council (HALC), 1992. In Assam, the ULFA, which was formed on 7 April, 1979, aimed to achieve a sovereign state out of Assam, Bodo movement sought to achieve an autonomous state of Bodoland within the Indian Union. National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB) was formed in 1986 with the demand of forming an autonomous state of Bodoland. HALC aimed to protect the interest of indigenous peoples of Meghalaya against the rise of the outsiders. Later, it was renamed and converted into Hynniewtrep National Liberation Council (HNLC). Besides this, another insurgent group known as the Achik National Volunteer Council (ANVC) emerged in the state.

7.5.1 Naga Insurgency

In northeast India, the Naga insurgency is the oldest. Indeed, some consider it to be “the mother of all insurgencies” in India. It can be traced to political mobilization of Nagas during the second decade of the twentieth century. In 1918, the Nagas formed the Naga Club. In 1929, the Naga Club placed the demand for ‘sovereignty’ before the Simon Commission in 1929. In 1946, the Naga Club was developed into a political organization called the Naga National Council (NNC) under the leadership of Angami Zapu Phizo, with the aim of forming an independent Nagaland. In February 1947, NNC submitted a memorandum to the British administration, in which a demand was put up for an interim government. As a result, an agreement known as Nine-Point Agreement or as Naga-Akbar Hydari Accord which was signed in June 1947 between NNC and Akbar Hydari, the Governor of Assam, on behalf of the British administration. The Accord “recognized” the right of Nagas to develop themselves according to their freely expressed wishes guided by the Naga customary laws. It also entrusted special responsibility to the Governor of Assam, as the Agent of the Union Government, to ensure the observance of the agreement for a period of ten years. And after the expiry of this period, the NNC would be asked whether they wanted the agreement to be extended or a new agreement would be reached regarding the future of Naga people. (Naga-Akbar Hydari Accord, https://peacemaker.un.org/files/IN_Naga-Akbar%20Accord.pdf, accessed on April 4, 2019).

A few months after the Naga-Akbar Hydari agreement was signed, NNC under Phizo declared independence of Nagaland on August 14, 1947. It was one day before India attained Independence. Following attainment of Independence on August 15, 1947, the Naga-inhabited territory as a part of larger state of Assam came under the Republic of India. But NNC did not accept inclusion of Naga-inhabited territory as a part of Indian Union. This led Phizo to launch an armed struggle against the Indian government for an independent Naga state. The Government of India responded by creating a state of Nagaland in 1963. In 1964,

an agreement was signed between Government of India and NNC following a peace mission; as a result, the operation (insurgency) was suspended. Again, an agreement, known as the 'Shillong Accord', was made in 1975 between the NNC and the Union government. However, the accord failed to bring permanent peace in Nagaland. A faction of NNC cadres like Issac Chisi Swu, Thuingaleng Muivah and SS Khaplang refused to accept the Shillong agreement terming it as 'sell-out'. They formed the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) in 1980 to continue their movement

However, in 1988, NSCN too was split into two factions : One, NSCN-IM led by Thuingaleng Muivah, Isak Chisi Swu; and another NSCN-K led by S.S Khaplang. Since then, the two rival factions have continued separate struggles for Naga independence. However, these groups entered ceasefire agreements with the Government of India, the NSCN-IM in 1997 and NSCN-K in 2001. Following these agreements, NSCN-IM dropped the demand of sovereign state and raised a new demand for 'Greater Nagaland' or 'Nagalim'. 'Greater Nagaland' or 'Nagalim' implies unification of all contiguous Naga-inhabited areas in different states beyond Nagaland, i.e. Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Manipur along with some parts of Myanmar into a single administrative unit. This demand evoked opposition in other states than Nagaland resulting inter-ethnic and inter-state conflict and violence in the region. Again, on 3 August 2015 Union Government and different Naga groups reached an agreement—the Naga Framework Agreement—with the purpose of addressing the issues raised by the latter.

7.5.2 Manipur

Manipur has the highest number of insurgent groups representing various ethnic communities. Insurgency in Manipur began with signing of Instrument of Accession or 'Merger Agreement' by Maharaja of Manipur with the Union of India in September 1949 in Shillong. In Manipur, it was generally alleged that the Maharaja was forced to sign the agreement. This led to mass protest against joining of Indian dominion by Maharaja. Hjam Irabot, a communist leader led an armed struggle for creation of Independent (Sovereign) state of Manipur. However, he was outlawed and he escaped to Burma in 1950 where he died the following year. Though Irabot's movement failed to achieve the goal, it sowed the seeds of Manipuri nationalism. Later, in 1964, secessionist insurgent group called the United National Liberation Front (UNLF) was formed under the leadership of Arambam Samarendra for the "restoration of Manipur's sovereignty". In 1968 Revolutionary Government of Manipur (RGM) was formed to act like parallel government. Later, following the socialist ideology, many other secessionist organizations came into existence in the state. For example, People's Revolutionary Party of Kangleipak (PREPAK), People's Liberation Army (PLA) and Kangleipak Communist Party (KCP) were formed in 1977, 1978 and 1980 respectively. Many insurgent groups representing different tribes also emerged in 1990s demanding for some form of autonomy or separate homelands. In the 2010s, underground outfits representing the tribes such as Kuki, Zomi, Hmar, etc. are under Suspension of Operation (SoO) Agreements with the Governments of India. To counter, the insurgency in Manipur, Armed Forces Special Powers Act of 1958 has been in operations since September 1980.

7.5.3 The Mizo Insurgency

Mizo insurgency started in 1960 with the formation of an organization called the Mizo National Famine Front (MNFF) which was formed under the leadership of Laldenga to provide relief to the remote Mizo villages during the *Mautam* famine (a Mizo word for 'bamboo flowering') in the Mizo Hills in 1959-60. The poor handling of the famine by the Assam and Union governments caused great frustration among the Mizos. Mizo and Lusai hills were then part of Assam government till 1972 when Mizoram became a separate state. The Mizos felt that Union government and the Assam governments did not take sufficient steps to help during the famine. The miseries caused due to the famine added to their complaints of step-motherly treatment at the hands of the Assam Government's decision to make Assamese language as an official language of the state. It left Mizos worried about the future of their identity and their culture. Under these circumstances, the Mizo organizations (MNFF) argued that their issues cannot be addressed by in the Indian state. They believed that their grievances could be resolved if they had their sovereign state.

Soon after the famine ended, in October 1961 Laldengaturned MNFF into a political party by dropping the word 'Famine'. Thus, Mizo National Front (MNF) came into existence, and in 1966 it launched a major uprising for establishing a sovereign state for the Mizos. The demand for secession resulted in the outbreak of violent clash between the MNF and Indian security forces. An agreement of 1976 reached in Kolkata between the MNF and the Government of India and subsequent negotiations reduced the intensity of violence. Finally, after two decades of turmoil a political settlement was reached through Mizoram Accord of 1986 signed between the MNF and Government of India. In February 1987, Mizoram became twenty-third state of the Indian Union with Laldenga as the first Chief Minister of the state of Mizoram. Since then Mizoram has been the most peaceful state in the region. So far, the Mizo Accord remains the most successful political settlement in the history of independent India. The Mizo Accord is often referred to as 'the only insurgency in the world which ended with a stroke of pen'.

7.6 INSURGENCY IN PUNJAB

Punjab witnessed insurgency which began in the late 1970s and reached its peak in the first half of the 1980s. This insurgency is also known as Khalistan movement for the establishment of an independent Sikh state called 'Khalistan'. The Khalistan state was to be set up to implement Anandpur Sahib resolution, a resolution which was passed by at Anandpur Saheb in 1971. It was violent movement in which thousands of people were killed. The Khalistan movement was led by Bhandranwale. To escape arrest, in 1983, Bhindranwale along with his followers occupied and fortified the Sikh shrine Akal Takht inside the Golden Temple Complex from which he led the insurgency campaign. To counter escalating violence, June 6, 1984, Indira Gandhi government at the centre ordered a military action, known as 'Operation Blue Star' into the Golden temple in order to flush out militants from the Golden Temple complex. During the operation, around 200-250 Khalistanis/militants including Bhindranwale were killed. The 'Operation Blue Star' caused resentment among Sikhs against Indira

Gandhi-led government. This resulted in assassination of Indira Gandhi in 1984 by two of her Sikh bodyguards. After a few years of 'Operation Blue Star', the insurgency came to virtual halt, especially by 'Operation Black Thunder' in 1991, an operation which was carried out K.P.S Gill, chief of Punjab police.

Various reasons have been given in academic literature for the rise of insurgency in Punjab: political, social-cultural and economic. Citing political reasons, Atul Kohli argues like other self-determination movements, Punjab insurgency happened because of centralization and intervention in the state politics by the central government, and lack of accommodation of self-determination by the central leadership. One stream of argument about the political reason underlines that the Khalistan movement emerged from the competition between the Congress and Akali Dal to dominate political space in Punjab. Those who argue that Social and cultural, and economic reasons led to the rise of Punjab insurgency emphasize that green revolution and changing customs caused economic crisis and erosion in Punjabi culture. These created anxiety among people. Supporters of Khalistan movement understood that establishment of Independent Khalistan state would help to address the social, cultural and economic crisis in Punjab.

7.7 MAOIST INSURGENCY

In some parts of the country such as Jharkhand, certain areas of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Odisha, some sections of the society are involved in insurgency which is inspired by Maoist ideology professed by China's communist leader Mao Tse Tung. Such insurgency is known as Maoist or Naxalite. The aim of the Maoist insurgent is to end class-based division and replace the Indian state with the state whose policies and character are guided by Maoist political ideology. Their strategy involves armed rebellion by well-organized groups against the state institutions including police and the propertied classes who they consider their class enemies. The term 'Naxal' is derived from a village called Naxalbari in Darjeeling district of West Bengal where the movement was originally emerged in 1967. It originated as a small peasant rebellion by members of the Santhal tribe against the exploitation and oppression by local landlords. This movement which started as a local incident soon developed into a series of events. The Naxalite movement was led by Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) founded in 1969 headed by Charu Majumdar. Within a few years of its beginning, the 'Naxal' movement spread to other states such as Bihar and Andhra Pradesh. However, Charu Majumdar was arrested 1972 and jailed like several other Naxalite leaders. Following the release of several Naxal leaders in 1977, the Naxal movement was fragmented into four major groups on ideological ground: Maoist Communist Centre (MCC), People's War Group (PWG), the Party Unity (PU), and CPI-ML (Liberation). The MCC, PWG and the PU rejected the idea of parliamentary democracy and merged to form the unified CPI-Maoist in 2004. The CPI-Maoist launched an armed rebellion against the state forces after which the movement became more intensified. In 2009, the Government of India launched counter-insurgency operation called "Operation Green Hunt" to counter the Maoist insurgency.

Check Your Progress 3

- Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
- ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) Explain the genesis of insurgency in Jammu and Kashmir.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What were the reasons for insurgency in northeast India?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) What were the main causes of insurgency in Punjab?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7.8 LET US SUM UP

Different states in India have witnessed insurgencies. Insurgency is a resistance, often involving violence, that questions the state or constitutional authority to achieve political independence with the support of some sections of society. The states which have been affected by insurgencies at different times in the post-independence India are Nagaland, Mizoram, Manipur, Assam, Punjab, and some states affected by Naxallite movement, and Jammu & Kashmir (which was divided into two Union Territories in 2019). Insurgency movements generally have features such as organizations, leaders, ideologies, and mobilization strategy. The state takes measures to counter the insurgencies known as counter-insurgency measures. These measures include military action and civil policies. The insurgencies are caused because of real and imagined grievances experienced by the people in the insurgency-prone areas.

7.9 REFERENCES

Baruah, Sanjib (1999), *India Against Itself : India Against Itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Chaube, S.K (1999), *Hill Politics in Northeast India*, Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Ganguly, Sumit (1999), *The Crisis in Kashmir: Portents of War, Hopes of Peace*, Cambridge University Press.

Kohli, Atul (1990), *Democracy and Discontent: India's Growing Crisis of Governability*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

_____ ed. (2001), *The Success of India's Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Défense (2006), *Doctrine for Sub Conventional Operations*, New Delhi: Headquarters Army Training Command, <http://indianstrategicknowledgeonline.com/web/doctrine%20sub%20conv%20w.pdf> (accessed on 15 March 2019).

Oetken, Jennifer L (2009), "Counter-insurgency Against Naxalites in India", in SumitGanguly and David P. Filder ed. *India and Counterinsurgency: Lessons Learned*, London: Routledge.

Phadnis, Urmila and Ganguly, Rajat (2001), *Ethnicity and Nation-Building in South Asia*, New Delhi: Sage.

Rai, Mridu (2018), *Kashmir: From Princely State to Insurgency*, Oxford Research Encyclopedia for Asian Studies, <http://oxfordre.com/asianhistory/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277727.001.0001/acrefore-9780190277727-e-184> (accessed on 18 March 2019).

Rustomji, Nari (1983), *Imperilled Frontier: India's North-eastern Borderlands*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Singh, Gurharpal (1987), "Understanding the Punjab Problem", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 27, No. 12, pp. 1268-77.

Varshney, Ashutosh (1991), "India, Pakistan and Kashmir: Antinomies of Nationalism", *Asian Survey*, Vol.31, No. 11, pp.997-1019.

7.10 ANSWER CHECKING PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Insurgency is an act of resistance against the state or constitutional authority. It has popular support to a considerable extent. Those involved in insurgency are called insurgents. Their goal is to get political independence. It has some similarities and differences with terrorism. Like insurgency, terrorism also involves violence and seeks to achieve political independence or social and economic transformation. But unlike insurgency, terrorism does not get popular support.

- 1) Insurgency in Jammu and Kashmir began in the late 1980s, and by the 1990s several insurgent organizations emerged in the state. The reasons for its growth emerged because of feeling among insurgents that within the present administrative set up their autonomy is not respected.
- 2) Insurgency which arose in different states in northeast India in the post-Independence grew because of real and imagined reasons. These reasons are geographical, social-cultural, economic and political. Some of the insurgencies, especially the Naga and Manipuri insurgencies, grew out of understanding that the areas inhabited by them were independent nations before they were merged with the Union of India. They can be fully independent, if their original independence is restored to them. The Mizo insurgency happened because of the complaints of the Mizos that they were discriminated against by Union and Assam governments which governed Mizo dominated areas before Mizoram became a separate state. The feeling of the neglect grew after the famine (1959-1960) caused by destruction of bamboo crops by the rodents. This gave rise of Mizo insurgency in the 1960s.
- 3) There were political, social-cultural and economic reasons for the emergence of Punjab insurgency. The political reasons included competition between the Akali Dal and the Congress to dominate politics in Punjab. Social-cultural and economic factors include the changes caused by the Green Revolution and changes in cultural habits. The latter, it was, alleged eroded Sikhs' culture. They argued that economic prosperity of Punjab and culture would be restored with the formation of independent state – the Khalistan.

UNIT 8 MOVEMENTS FOR SEPARATE STATEHOOD*

Structure

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Movements for Separate States: Meanings and Scope
- 8.3 Constitutional Provisions
- 8.4 Reasons for the Rise of Separate Statehood Movements
- 8.5 The Cases
 - 8.5.1 Movements in the 1950s-1960s or Linguistic Reorganization of States
 - 8.5.2 Movements for Reorganization of Northeast India
 - 8.5.3 Statehood Movements in the Hindi Belt
 - 8.5.4 Movement for Telangana State
- 8.6 Response of the Political Parties and the State
- 8.7 Let Us Sum Up
- 8.8 References
- 8.9 Answer to Check Your Progress

8.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit discusses the movements for creation of new states in India. After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the meaning, features and causes of movements for separate states in India;
- Discuss the constitutional provisions about reorganization of states;
- Contextualise the politics of separate movements; and
- Analyse the response of the state to the demands for separate states.

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Indian states consist of different linguistic, religious and cultural groups existing along with unequal level of regional development within a state. In certain context, these diversities become the grounds for generation of regional consciousness within a state. Those having such consciousness underline that within the existing administrative arrangement, their region is not given fair treatment by the state government, central government or other regions within their state. And solution to their grievances can be found if their region becomes a separate state from the state in which such region exists. Such new state would enjoy autonomy to take decisions and run administration. Often, advocates of new states engage themselves in collective action or movements to get them. In India, statehood demands have been coming up from the 1950s onwards. New states have been

* Prof. Jagpal Singh, Professor of Political Science, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi

created in the 1950s, 1960s-1970s, 1980s, 2000 and in 2014. Creation of new states has not ended the efforts for more such demands in India. According to estimate by A.K. Singh (2009), there are more than thirty statehood and autonomy movements in India.

8.2 MOVEMENTS FOR SEPARATE STATES: MEANINGS AND SCOPE

The movements for restructuring power relations among administrative units in an area within one or more states are also regional movements as they address regional grievances. These movements generally assume three forms: statehood movements, autonomy movements and secessionist movements. Statehood movements seek separate state consisting of a region from one or more existing states. Autonomy movements, like statehood movements also want administrative autonomy to run their affairs. But, as you will read in unit 6, unlike the statehood movements, they do not want a separate state of out an existing state. Rather, they want autonomy within the existing state. Secessionist movements, unlike the statehood and autonomy movements seek to secede from the Union of India and get a sovereign state. It is important to note that while Indian constitution has provisions for creation of separate states and autonomy within the states, it does not permit secession.

8.3 THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

According to Article 3 Indian constitution has provisions for creation of new states out of one or more existing states. Constitutionally, it is the President who has the power to initiate the process for creation of new state or states. He can do it on his own or he can do it in consultation with the state from which new state has to be carved out. Such state or states can request the President about its willingness to carve a new state out of its/their existing size. The concerned state or states do so by passing a resolution in the state legislature to this effect. In the light of the resolution, the President may ask the Union government to present a bill for passage in the both houses of Parliament. If passed by the both houses, it is sent to President for getting his/her consent, after President gives consent, the (bill/decision) is notified and the process of creation of the new state begins. It is important to note that often political expediency impacts the interpretation of Article 3. Despite the President having power to initiate the process for creation of new states, he does so in consultation (resolution) of the state government. The passage of the resolution also depends on political bargaining or assessment of political implications by political parties in power and in opposition. It has generally been observed, that while in opposition, the parties have supported the demand for creation of new states. But they have opposed it while in the government.

8.4 REASONS FOR THE RISE OF SEPARATE STATEHOOD MOVEMENTS

Since the demands for creation of new states are raised in specific regions within one or more states, the factors that cause the rise of such movements can be

found in the grievances of such regions. These are multiple factors that become the basis of grievances. The factors are related to language, culture, customs, religion, historical background, and level of development. The advocates of new states allege that their regions are discriminated or remain neglected on the grounds of such factors. Together, they become the basis of formation of regional identities, which result in general of movement for creation of separate states. It is important to note that though the multiple factors become the reasons for generation of movements for separate states, some of these factors are more important in some movements than the other factors. In some movements, language is more determining factor than others; in some it is development, in some it is ethnicity and in some it is religion. The relative effectiveness of these factors has varied according to different phases of movements and different regions.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answers with the answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What is statehood movement and how is autonomy movement different from it?

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

2) According to which Article of the constitutions a new state can be created? Explain.

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

8.5 THE CASES

During the post-Independence, there have been several examples of statehood movements in India. They can be grouped in the phases: 1. Movements in the 1950s-1960s or linguistic organization; 2. Reorganization of northeast India: 1963, 1971-72 and 1985; 3. Movements in the Hindi belt 1990s-2000; 4. And the Telangana movement.

8.5.1 Movements in the 1950s-1960s or Linguistic Organization of States

In the 1950s, there were statehood demands based on language. The first linguistic state to be formed after Independence was Andhra State. It was formed on October 1, 1953 after the death of Potti Sriramulu due to fast which he had undertaken demanding creation of the state. Andhra State was formed of Telugu speaking districts of Madras State. In the pre-Independence period, in 1937 Orissa and Sind were formed on the linguistic basis: in these examples the British has deviated from their usual formula of reorganization of provinces which was done on linguistic and military considerations. In the 1920s, even the Congress had established its provincial committees on the basis of language. But after Independence, the government was reluctant to reorganise states based on language. Indeed, this was deviation from Congress policy to set up its provincial units on linguistic basis. The reasons for the shift in the government's policy lay in the changes in the circumstances. Since the country faced multiple challenges after Independence: large scale communal violence following partition, influx of refugees, etc. Under these circumstances the leadership felt that India needed a strong centre, and linguistic organization would weaken it. This deviation led Potti Sriramulu to undertake fast for creation of Andhra State.

After the formation of Andhra State, the Government of India appointed in 1953 a commission known as State Reorganization Commission (SRC) under the chairmanship of Justice Fazal Ali. The SRC submitted its report in 1955. It is important to note that even prior to the appointment of the SRC, the government had set up in 1948 Dhar Commission to look into the language as the basis of state formation. The Dhar commission did not favour the language to be the basis. Again, to examine the Dhar Commission report, a committee consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabi Sitaramaya (JVP committee) was appointed. The JVP committee agreed with the Dhar Commission Report and advised against language being the criterion for reorganization of states. The SRC recommended that states could be reorganised on language basis. On the recommendations of SRC several states were reorganised were created on linguistic basis between 1956-1960.

The creation of Punjab and along with of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh in 1966 was result of Punjabi Suba movement. The Punjab Suba movement took place for creation of Punjab state in which Punjabi language was to be a criterion. But in this case, religion also got associated with the language as majority of Punjabi Suba movement spoke Punjabi language and practice Sikh religion. Master Tara Singh and Sant Pateh Singh played leading role in the Punjabi Suba movement. After carving out of Punjab, the residue areas of Punjab became separate states of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh where Hindi became the sole language of the state.

8.5.2 Movements for Reorganizations of Northeast India

In northeast India, there are two kinds of movements for reorganizations of power relations within the constitutional framework of India: one, the autonomy movement; two, and statehood movements. You have read about the autonomy movements in unit 6. You will read about the statehood movements in northeast,

in this sub-section. The State Reorganization did not suggest reorganization of north-eastern states. The SRC was against the idea of creating separate hill states out of Assam; it was felt that the reorganization of the regions would accentuate the process of isolation of the hill region which was initiated due to the colonial policy of Inner Line Permit and demarcating “excluded” and “partially excluded” areas. Instead of creating separate states of the hill regions, it suggested that autonomy should be given to various cultural and linguistic groups. The SRC also argued that if hill states were created out of Assam, they would not be economically viable. However, Nagaland became a state in 1963; Meghalaya, Manipur and Tripura in 1972; Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram became states from Union Territories in 1985; and Sikkim was annexed into India in 1975.

The Hill State Movement

Tribal leaders from the tribal-dominated hills - Khasi, Jantia, Garo and Lusai hills then part of Assam state wanted creation of hill state. Although the hill state movement was largely supported by other hill districts of Assam, it was confined to Garo, Khasi and Jaintia hills. The demand was reiterated in Tura Conference of Tribal leaders in 1954. They formed a Hill Tribals’ Union with W.A. Sangma as its chairman and B.B. Lygndoh as Secretary of its ad hoc executive body. In 1955, Hill leaders meet in Aizawl in October 1955 and formed the Eastern India Tribal Union (EITU). In 1960, replacing the EITU, APHLC (All Party Hill Leaders Conference) was formed at the initiative of William Sangma. The passage Language Bill in Assamese Assembly in 1960, which was considered as imposition of Assamese language on the non-Assamese communities, also contributed to acceleration of hill statehood demand. The APHLC wanted unification of all districts, excluding Naga Hill district, mentioned in Part A of the table in Sixth Schedule to the Constitution. The Naga Hill district was excluded because the leadership in the Naga Hills wanted a sovereign state, while the leaders of the APHLC wanted statehood within the Indian Union. In 1960, Nehru offered Scottish pattern of autonomy for the hill areas to the hill leaders, which was rejected by them. However, the offer was accepted by one faction of the APHLC known as Assam Hills Peoples Conference (HSPC). As a result, Pataskar Commission was formed to look into the autonomy concerning the hill areas. The Pataskar Commission recommended against any change in the Sixth Schedule. This aggrieved the APHLC. In protest, it boycotted the 1967 General election. In such situation, when Indira Gandhi visited Shillong on January 11-13, 1967, she promised reorganization of Assam. Consequently, on December 24, 1969, the Parliament passed the 22nd Constitutional Amendment, i.e., Assam Reorganization (Meghalaya) Bill, creating “Autonomous State” of Meghalaya within Assam. In 1971, the President of India passed certain Acts leading to creation of many new states in northeast India such as Manipur, Tripura and Meghalaya, and Union Territories of Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh.

Movement for Nagaland

You have read about autonomy in unit 6 and insurgency in unit 8. In this section you will read about formation of Nagaland state. The state of Nagaland was formed in 1963. As you have read in unit 7, the movement the preceding formation of Nagaland was not caused due to the imposition of the Assamese in 1960: it started much before for the language agitations. However, the centre responded by making the state of Nagaland in 1963. The same is the case with Mizoram;

like in the Naga hills even in the Mizo areas/Lusai hills, it was not the movement for separate state; rather, it was insurgency which preceded the formation of Meghalaya state.

Assam Accord and Statehood Movements

Assam Accord in 1985 which brought the six-year anti-foreigner movement in Assam also elevated two union territories – Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram to the level of statehood. Thus, we can see that different states were created in northeast India at different point of time. However, following the formation of these states over the years, the demands for separate states have not stopped. The post-Assam Accord period saw the intensification of demand for Bodoland, and for autonomy in KarbiAnlong district. There are several such examples in northeast India.

Other statehood Movements in northeast

Apart from the above movements, there have also been movement for statehood in the areas where Bengali is spoken by majority of population. The Assam language bill of 1960, which provoked language riots in the 1960s boosted up the demand. The Cachar State Reorganization Committee which was set up following the submission of the report of the SRC played main role in statehood demand for Bengali dominated areas: Purbanchal Pradesh.

8.5.3 Statehood Movements in the Hindi Belt

Creation of four new states – of Uttarakhand, Chhatisgarh and Jharkhand in 2000, and of Telangana in 2014 provide the recent examples of reorganization of states in India. Unlike creation of states in the 1950s-1970s, in which language of culture became the basis for creation of new states, from the 1990s, it was the level of development which became basis for their demand and formation of the new states.

Uttarakhand/Uttaranchal

Demand for creation of Uttarakhand was one of such demands for creation of new states out of the state of Uttara Pradesh. The demand for a separate state of UP hills was raised in 1938 in Srinagar session of the Congress. Even as the Independence approached, political leadership from Tehri Garhwal expressed the need for separation of the hill region from plains of UP. In 1946, BadriduttPande, a lawyer and political activist involved in protection of rights of forest dwellers and against *begar*, raised the issues in a public rally held in Haldwani. The demand was sidelined with the merger of Kumaon, Tehri Garwal and British Garhwal with the state of Uttar Pradesh. In 1952, the communist leader, P.C. Joshi demanded in a memorandum to Nehru who sent it to the SRC that UP hills being backward region should be developed into a separate state. Nehru rejected the demand. K.M. Pannikar dissented on making UP a huge state which would be unwieldy to govern. Indeed, three chief ministers from the region H.N. Bahuguna, N.D. Tiwari and G.B. Pant had opposed creation of new state. The ground for opposition by Pant was that since there were no jobs or industries it would be better to retain the region in UP. The demand continued to be raised by elite during the 1960s-1970s. On July 25, 1979 Uttarakhand Kranti Dal, a political party, was formed under the chairmanship of D.D. Pant, a former Vice

Chancellor of Kumaon University. The purpose of UKD was to strive to get separate state to consist of hill districts of Uttar Pradesh. It contested 1980 and 1986 assembly elections. In the late 1980s, the issue was taken by the BJP. Kalyan Singh-led BJP government in 1991, the SP-BSP government in 1994 and the BSP-BJP government in 1997 passed resolution in the legislative assembly for creation of Uttarakhand.

Besides this, on different occasions demands have been raised for creation of Harit Pradesh out of western region of UP, Bundelkhand out of southern parts of UP and some districts of Madhya Pradesh, Poorvanchal out of eastern UP and Oudh Pradesh out of central part of UP. In the first half of the 1990s, demand of Uttarakhand became more popular with participation of people across sections of the society. Initially, the movement for Uttarkahand was not linked with the demand for separate state: it emerged out of a protest movement which was organized against the extension of reservation in 1994 for the OBCs to the hilly regions of UP. Since the population in hilly regions which were then part of UP consisted majority of the high castes in comparison to the OBC, it created an apprehension that the extension of reservation into the region would adversely impact their interests. The people of UP hills protested the government's decision. This resulted in a clash between police and the agitators. The police fired and several people died. This incident is known as Khatima incident. Firing in the Khatima incident further incensed those who argued that they were discriminated in the present state of UP. They asserted that should have their own state to govern themselves. Hence, the demand for Uttarakhand. After the Khatima incident, elections in 1996 and 1998, 1999 Lok Sabha, and 1998 Vidhan Sabha elections became suitable contexts for realization of demand for creation of Uttarakhand. The fact that there were NDA governments both at the centre and UP became suitable for acceptance of the demand.

8.5.4 Movement for Telangana State

The state of Telangana was carved out of the state of Andhra Pradesh in 2014. Prior to becoming a separate, the Telangana region of Andhra Pradesh had an identity which was different from the other two regions of Andhra Pradesh, Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra. During the regime of Hyderabad Nizam, Telangana was part of Hyderabad state and Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra were part of Madras Presidency. The Congress and the Communist Party of India had demanded formation of a state Andhra consisting Telangana, and Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra regions, on the basis of a common language spoken in these regions. In 1953, Potti Sriramulu, a Gandhian, died sitting on hunger strike demanding a creation of Andhra state consisting of Telugu speaking districts of the erstwhile Madras Presidency and Telangana region in Hyderabad state. Following Potti Sriramulu's death, the central government appointed the State Reorganization Commission (SRC) to look into need and criteria to reorganise states. The SRC, which submitted its report in 1955, found that Telangana and other regions Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra were not homogenous. It recommended creation of separate state of Telangana for five years, and formation after the expiry of the five years of a state of a single state of Telugu-speaking regions consisting of other two regions – Rayalaseema along with Telangana Coastal Andhra regions. But much before the expiry of five years of formation of Telangana state, the state of Andhra Pradesh was created in 1956 on the basis

of common language – the Telugu, consisting of Telangana, Rayalaseema and Andhra regions. The formation of Andhra Pradesh was received with the apprehension in the Telangana region that Andhra region would be placed in dominant position in the new state due to its superior economic position and higher literacy rate than those in Telangana region. The apprehension prevailed despite the commonness of Telugu language spoken in the different regions. An agitation took place against the formation of the Andhra Pradesh State. As a result, with the purpose of safeguarding the interests of Telangana region within the new state, an agreement was signed between the Congress leaders of Telangana and Andhra and Rayalaseema regions in 1956. It was known as the Gentleman's Agreement. Among others, the Gentleman's Agreement had two important assurances: One, a regional committee would be constituted to look into the regional grievances and recommend measures to resolve them; and two, if chief minister of Andhra Pradesh belonged to one region, the deputy chief minister would belong to the other regions. Within a few years of the signing of the Gentleman's agreement, there was resentment in the Telangana region that the promises made in the agreement were not fulfilled. The leaders of the region alleged that Telangana had become an internal colony; teachers, bureaucrats, students, lawyers, businessmen belonged to the Andhra regions; Telangana remained a backward region within Andhra Pradesh. A group of young intellectuals formed Telangana Praja Samiti (TPS) to mobilise support for creation of Telangana state. Initially, the TPS was an apolitical organization. But after some time of its formation, it was joined by politicians such as Chenna Reddy and Konda Lakhsman. The TPS contested 1971 Parliamentary election with creation of Telangana state as its principal goal. In this election, it won 10 out of the 14 constituencies falling in the Telangana region. After the election, the TPS merged with the Congress, and the issue of Telangana went into background, though the central University was established in Hyderabad. The problems of the Telangana region were addressed by N.T. Ramarao-led TDP government in the G.O. 610 passed in 1985. According to the G.O. people from Telangana region were to be given jobs in certain positions. Although the TDP government led by Chandrababu Naidu was opposed to creation of a separate state of Telangana, it appointed one-man commission headed by J.M. Girglani to look into the implementation of the G.O. 610. The Girglani commission observed that in violation of the G.O.610 people from Andhra region were appointed in the positions meant for the people of Telangana region. The demand for creation of Telangana was revived in 2001 with the formation of the Telangana Rashtriya Samiti (TRS) by K. Chandrashekar Rao (KCR). It contested 2004 Lok Sabha and assembly elections in alliance with the Congress on the promise to create the state of Telangana. The TRS-Congress alliance formed the government in 2004 following its victory with chief minister from the Congress. At the centre's level, since the TRS was a partner in the UPA alliance, creation of Telangana was included in its manifesto. And the UPA government appointed a sub-committee consisting of Pranab Mukherjee and Sharad Pawar to look into the demand for Telangana state. Meanwhile, differences grew between the Congress and the TRS in Andhra Pradesh leading to the exit of the latter from the UPA alliance in 2006.

The movement was further revived in 2007 after the exit of the TRS from the UPA alliance. The students, teachers and non-teaching employees of Osmania

University played leading role in the movement. The Telangana issue dominated the 2009 Lok Sabha election with TRS supporting and the Congress opposing it. However, the UPA government at the centre appointed a committee to be headed by Justice Srikrishna to look into the Telangana issue and submit the report by 31 December 2010. Against the background of demand for several years, the Union Cabinet of the UPA government cleared on 7 February 2014 a bill for division of Andhra Pradesh into two states – Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, which was later passed by the both houses of Parliament. And on June 2, 2014, finally the state of Telengana was created.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answers with the answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What was the attitude of the Central government towards linguistic reorganization of the states?

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

2) Narrate the process of reorganization states in northeast India.

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

3) Identify the features of statehood movements in the Hindi belt.

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

8.6 RESPONSE OF THE PARTIES AND THE STATE

The responses of political parties have been informed by political expediency. And they have been shaped by political contexts. Generally, movements for statehood become more frequent and intense in the times of elections, political competition, factionalism within the parties. The parties have been supportive to such demands when they were in opposition but have been opposed them when

in power. Even the response of the national and local leadership of principal political parties varied depending the caste group which were raising them.

Except movement for creation of Telangana and Jharkhand, demand for other states such as Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand or Harit Pradesh generally lacked popular mobilization. They were largely voiced by professional politicians through seminars, on the floor of house, passing resolution, etc. According to Paul R. Brass the government accepted statehood demands in certain conditions. According to such conditions, the demands should be supported in both the state from which the state would be created and in the areas where such demands are raised.

8.7 LET US SUM UP

Statehood movements aim to create separate state out of one or more existing states. The new states are supposed to have separate legislative and executive bodies to administer the areas coming under the jurisdiction of new state. New states in India can be created according to Article 3 of Indian Constitution. According to this Article only the centre government has the power to create new states, though it may do so with the consent of the concerned state which is generally given through a resolution passed in the state assembly. There are economic, political, administrative political reasons for demands new states. They could be real and constructed. In India, there have been movements for separate states since Independence. Andhra State was the first state in the country which was formed in 1953 after Independence following the death of PottiSriramulu. It was formed on linguistic basis. Indeed, there were demands from several areas for linguistic reorganization of the state. But the central government was reluctant to reorganize states on linguistic basis. However, it appointed State Reorganization Commission (SRC) in 1953 under the chairmanship of Justice Fazal Ali. The SRC recommended the reorganization of state on language basis in the way that apart from the main language, the state will recognise other languages as well. Following the recommendations of the SRC, several states were formed on language basis. However, more demands arose: and Maharashtra was created in 1960; Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh in 1966, on language basis (Punjab on religion basis). The reorganization of northeast was not part of SRC recommendations. It was done later. And its basis was not language but race, culture and customs in the northeast. Thus, Nagaland was formed in 1963, Meghalaya in 1972. Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand formed in 2000 are the examples of new states created in the Hindi belt, and Telangana in 2014 in south India. The new states have not been created on linguistic basis but on the basis of level of development.

8.8 REFERENCES

Bongani, Rama Rao (2011), “Assertion of a Region: Exploring the Demand for Telangana”,

in Ashutosh Kumar (ed.), *Regions within Regions: Rethinking State Politics in India*, Routledge, New Delhi, pp. 197-219.

Mukherjee, Pampa (2011), “The Creation of a Region: Politics of Identity and Development

in Uttarakhand”, in Ashutosh Kumar (ed.), *Regions within Regions: Rethinking State Politics in India*, Routledge, New Delhi, pp. 107-27.

Nag, Sajal (2011), “ ‘Linguistic Provinces’ to ‘Homelands’: Shifting Paradigms of State-making in Post-colonial India” in Asha Sarangi and Sudha Pai (eds.), *Interrogating Reorganization of States: Culture, Identity and Politics in India*, Routledge, New Delhi, pp. 249-81.

Singh, A.K. (2009) *Federal Perspective, Constitutional Logic and Reorganisation of States*, Centre for Federal Studies with Mayank Publications, New Delhi.

Singh, Jagpal (2001), “Politics of Hari Pradesh: The Case of Western UP as a Separate State”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 36, No.31, Aug. 4-10, pp. 2961-2967.

Tillin, Louise (2011), “Reorganising the Hindi Heartland in 2000: The Deep Regional Politics of State Formation” in in Asha Sarangi and Sudha Pai (eds.), *Interrogating Reorganisation of States*. pp. 107-126.

_____ (2013), *Remapping India: The Politics of Borders in India*, Hurst & Co. London.

8.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Statehood movement is a collective action for creation of a separate state from out of a single or more states. An autonomy movement is different from a statehood movement in the sense that it does not aim to get a separate state out of the existing state but autonomy within the state.
- 2) A separate state can be created according to Article 3. Constitutionally, the initiative for this is taken by the President of India. He may do it in consultation with the state out of which new state has to be carved out. The concerned state gives consent through a resolution passed in the state legislature. After this, if the both Houses of Parliament pass it, it gets the assent of the President of the country. It leads to creation of new state.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) After Independence, the central government was not in favour of forming states on the linguistic basis. Since India faced multiple challenges following partition. the leadership believed that such a move would weaken the Indian Union. However, Andhra State was formed on linguistic basis after the death of Potti Sriramulu. Responding to the demands making language as the basis for statehood, the government appointed the State Reorganization Commission (SRC). The SRC recommended linguistic organization of the states. Consequently, in the 1950s linguistic organization took place. Later, government considered to form states in view of popular support to it in the states which were to be affected by formation of new states.
- 2) Reorganization of northeast India took place at different times after Independence. Nagaland was the first state which was formed in 1963. It

was followed by formation of Meghalaya in 1972, and elevation of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram to the status of states after the Assam Accord of 1985. In the post-Accord demands for Bodoland and other states got accelerated. The reorganization of northeast was not done in the light of the report of the SRC. The basis of reorganization of northeast was development and cultural and ethnic factors.

- 3) In different regions of the Hindi belt in India, there have been demands for statehoods. Most important among these were for division into four states including Uttarakhand in Uttar Pradesh, creation of Chhattisgarh in Madhya Pradesh and Jharkhand in Bihar. Principal reason for these states has been level of development in these regions. Excepting demand for creation of Harit Pradesh in western Uttar Pradesh, in other cases in the Hindi belt it has been argued that in the existing states, their regions remain backward due to discrimination by the central and state governments and other regions within their states. Formation of new states will help them develop independently. In the Harit Pradesh case, it was argued it was a developed region and bore expenses for development of backward regions in UP. Except occasional mobilisation, the statehood movements in the Hindi belt lacked popular mobilisation. They were raised by political elite, usually in some political contexts.

