



DEMAND FOR SMALLER STATES IN INDIA

S.USHA SHREE

Lecturer in Political Science, Sarada Vidyalaya Jr. College for Girls,
Sham Sheergunj, Hyderabad.

Introduction

The demands for smaller states in India very essential part of the political games. Significantly, the necessity of new states formation and its local importance should be analyzed. The historical institutionalism framework also helps explain why over time state borders have become less stable and subject to change in some parts of the federation and not in others. Borders, understood as a form of institution, rest on the notion that they are a critical element influencing competition among groups. Struggles over the size and shape of the state are part of the 'rules of the game': which interests are legitimate, what resources can be mobilized, the questions that are open for debate, and how these change. While there may be no routine challenges, these may emerge from time to time, and changes in boundaries and the hegemonic space are deeply contested by other elite groups until finally the Centre decides whether or not to divide the state. In the Hindi heartland, governments have been more responsive to arguments in favor of unity than division, which has reinforced the 'stickiness' of state boundaries as opposed to fluidity. Finally, it is important to understand the semi-autonomous timetables of how the dynamics of federal restructuring works, moving from the sub-state, state to national politics.

In the 1st Article of the Indian constitution, India has described as a union of states. Article 2, 3 of the constitution of India provides inter alia for formation of new states by altering the boundaries of the existing states. As a consequence, demand for and formation of new states had become a regular phenomenon in our democratic polity. The constitutional provision under Article 3 was incorporated with a benevolent idea to realize geographical and economic unification aspirations of people and an instrument to achieve electoral gains. The situation carves for some constitutional parameters considering the far reaching implications resulting from frequent for and creation of new states. Several new states and union territories have been created out of existing states since 1956 Bombay state was lit into the linguistic states of Gujarat and Maharashtra on 1 may 1960 by the Bombay Reorganization Act.¹ Nagaland was made a state on 1 December 1963. The Punjab reorganization Act of 1966 divided the Punjab along linguistic and religious lines, creating a new Hindu and Hindi-speaking state of Haryana on 1 November, transferring the northern district of Punjab to Himachal Pradesh, and designating Chandigarh, the shared capital of Punjab and Haryana, a union territory. Statehood was conferred upon Himachal Pradesh on 25 January in the Indian Union as a state on 26 April 1975. In 1987, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram became states on 20 February; followed by Goa on 30 may, while Goa's northern exclaves of Daman and Diu became a separate union territory. In 2000 three new states were created; Chhattisgarh (November 1, 2000) was created out of eastern Madhya, Uttaranchal (November 9, 2000), since



renamed Uttarakhand, was created out of the Hilly regions of northwest Uttar Pradesh, and Jharkhand (15 November 2000) was created out of the southern district of Bihar. The Union Territories of Delhi and Pondicherry (renames to Pondicherry) have been given the right to elect their own legislatures and they are now counted as small states. In the constitution of India, article 3 deals with the formation of the new states and alteration ion of area, boundaries or names of the existing states. According to the constitution of India, for the introduction of the bill regarding the formation of the new states or reorganization of the states and boundaries, previous sanction or reorganized or their boundaries may be altered by the union parliament by simple majority in the ordinary process of legislation. Impelled by the successful agitation for a Telugu speaking state in 1952-53, the government set up the states Reorganization commission (SRC). For a better reflected indigenous characteristic the task of the SRC was to consider dividing the existing states into units.

THE NEW STATES FORMATION IN INDIA

The state reorganization commission (SRC) Stipulated that the precedent states, formed on the basis of administrative convenience, economy, military strategy and security “for the purpose of imperial interests or the exigencies of foreign government”, no longer coincided with the actual needs, wishes or affinities of the people (report 1955: section20) with existing demands for boundaries that corresponded with natural characteristic of groups, the government was compelled to commission a group to examine the existing provincial borders of India. It was at this time that the SRC recommended that certain “other” considerations be accounted for when creating states. Therefore, the commission began to focus on features that would conduct the second phase of state formation i.e., local as well as administrative factors bearing consideration in their deliberations included (Report 1955: section 93).²

Economic and administrative consideration the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India Successful working on the national plan; and Linguistic and culture homogeneity.

The linguistic states were legitimized and the report was acted upon in 1956. During the time of the SRC, it became clear that the constitution says relatively little about state units. The constitution details the federal design specifying how states relate to the center economically, fiscally and administratively. Roughly speaking, the states are entrusted with the so called nation-building activities of health and education, and with a continuing responsibility for agricultural development. State plans have to be submitted to New Delhi for approval and state policies and revenues raised from state sales taxes, agricultural taxes and grants-in-aid from central government mainly support programmes. Central government takes responsibility for the country’s major industrial and infrastructure projects and for defence and foreign relations. When speaking about states and the central government these are the primary references made in the constitution. However, little is mentioned regarding the creation of new states. In reference to the change that new states would be created, it merely says that the federal government can make new states (Indian constitution,



Article 3). Unlike most other federations, the states themselves do not have to vote on the creation of new states. A bill with a simple majority ratifying the formation of the new state must be approved by the parliament of India (both the Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha).

The State Reorganization Commission was created in early 1950 to examine and consider the division of the larger states in smaller units. After the recommendations of the SRC were made and implemented, the central government development four general guidelines, formal and informal, that later statehood demands were based upon. The following are the four rules explicated by Paul Brass (1974:17-19):³ Regional demands must fall short of secession.

Demand for the division of multilingual states must have some support from different linguistic groups. Regional demands based on language and culture will be accommodated, but that regional demands which are explicitly based on religious differences will not be accepted.

Regional demands will not be conceded capriciously. That is, a regional movement must not only have a legitimate case, but it must have broad popular support in the region.

DEMANDS FOR SMALLER STATES IN INDIA

Now a day's demands for separate statehood share a number of characteristics with the pre-1990 claims. Language, control of resources and, preservation of culture and identity are among the characteristics shared with both present and past demands for statehood. Like past claims, contemporary conflicts over regional control tell us that a local leader with closer ties to a locality is what the people of India requesting. Larger states such as Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh that currently are attempting to accommodate state separation movements are too big and diverse and end up alienating some, or all, of their constituents. In Modern day India is being asked to realign federal system into smaller units that encourage local-based politics. Nevertheless, what is the different from past claims for separate state is the expected outcome of these contemporary demands. While the Indian government was more reluctant to admit new states into Indian Union, today's government, as witnessed in early August 2000 when three new states were approved, seems to be much likely to grant statehood demands.

In recent times smaller states, namely, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh, have achieved much higher growth rates in their GSDP than the targets set for the Tenth five Year plan, whereas the growth rates achieved by their parent states, namely, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh fell significantly short of the targets. Further the growth rates achieved in the first two years of the Eleventh plan, that is 2007-08 and 2008-09, by Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand were significantly higher than those achieved by their parent state. Apart from releasing the creative energies of the people, viability of smaller states may have contributed



to better governance, attracting greater private investment from outside as well as Planning and utilizing resources more efficiently.

Anyway, the population of Telangana is over three-and-a-half crore now-much more than three crore for the whole of Andhra Pradesh at the time of its formation. The demands on governance have multiplied over this half a century. Apart from the commitment to the development of the region, a smaller state being more easily accessible to the common people can intelligently and speedily grapple with their problems. Moreover, governance at the grassroots can be improved in a smaller state by strengthening the Panchayati Raj institutions which have been deprived of their functions, finances and functionaries it is indeed ironical that the ruling party in Andhra Pradesh, which owes allegiance to Rajiv Gandhi, who visualized the 73rd and 74th Amendments to the constitution, has not taken any initiative to revitalize these institutions. On the contrary, every attempt has been made to undermine these institutions by floating several top-down schemes and parallel implementation structures, even naming some of these schemes after Rajiv Gandhi. In smaller and relatively homogeneous like Telangana and Andhra, the empowerment of these local elected institutions can be expected to be high on the agenda, among other things, because of the greater pressures these elected representatives can bring to bear on the new establishments.⁴

Over the last half-a-century, two new dimensions have been added. Population growth and the multiplicity of development functions have rendered governance in large-size States inefficient. Secondly, in the context of development planning under democracy, significant regional diversities with respect to the historically inherited levels of infrastructure and institution within the certain large states have given rise to serve tensions concerning the distribution of benefits from development. These tensions have reached a point where harmonious development seems no longer possible without their break-up into smaller states which are relatively homogeneous.

On the other hand, Telangana agitation for statehood is possibly the oldest manifestation of regionalism in India. It began prior to Independence when efforts were made by the Nizam of Hyderabad (princely ruler) to maintain Hyderabad as an independent state distinct from India. This though did not happen and Hyderabad was merged with the larger Madras province as part of India. Later the Telugu speaking portion of the Madras province was separated to create the Telugu speaking state of Andhra Pradesh. This If popular support was the main consideration in advancing statehood, then the state of Uttarakhand would have been created several years ago. Finally, Brass's last principal of state formation, that states must be formed on the basis of rationale and not capriciously is to be questioned these principals are useful in explaining why in the past India either opted for or against new states. While several small and even miniscule regions, both in and outside the Hindi belt, have been demanding separate states for themselves, some of these demands have been more persistent than others which have largely been dormant.



CREATION OF TRS FOR SEPARATE TELANGANA

In December 2009, Telangana Rashttra Samiti leader Mr. K. Chandrasekhar Rao started his fast unto death, demanding the creation of the separate state of Telangana in Andhra Pradesh. The union government acceded to the demand and announced that the government would initiate the process of creation as a separate state. Before discussing the implication of the demands of creation of different states, it is pertinent to elaborate the basic and background of these demands.

Language is one of the most important contributing to diversity of India. According to 2001, census as many as 29 languages are being spoken by more than one million people in the country. Yet, more or less; the group of people speaking same language has historically tended to congregate together in an identifiable of geographic areas on linguistic lines. Since historic times, hinterlands of minority groups speaking different language than that of majority group have been found. For example, a large number of Marathi speaking people have settled in Indore and Gwalior, which are otherwise predominantly inhabited by Hindi speaking population. Despite these small aberrations, Language continued to be a common linking factor of the people in same geographic region. As a result, the language of the Majority people of the geographic region was accepted to be the language of commerce, trade, education and all the transaction. Rich literature in these regional languages flourished over the years. Naturally language emerged as a common thread binding people together. The common bonding fostered by common language was so strong that at times it transcended other strong forms of identity such as religious lines met with stiff resistance from Indians.

Because the Linguistic were formed, it was expected that the unification of geographic region under one state with majority people speaking the same language would pave the way for uniform and rapid development of the states. However the expectation of uniform development could not be fulfilled in some cases. As a result, demands for creation of new states started being made with greater favor. These demands of smaller states in general have the following characteristics: The region, where the demand for a separate state was being made had a distinct culture of its own and it was further beyond the language of the state. As a result, the region needed a separate state of its own in order to safeguard its distinct culture. The region, where demand for a separate state was being made was more backward than rest of the state and the rulers of the state failed to provide proper attention to the development of the region.

As a result, the region needed a separate state in order to have its own development. The region, where demand for a separate state was being made was more developed than rest of the state. As a result, higher revenue from the region was being spent on other parts of the state, thereby denying the region the right share of its development. The demographic characteristic of the region where the demand for new state was being made was different from the rest of the state. As a result, the policy of caste-based reservations of the parent state had undesirable effect on the region.



CONCLUDING REMARKS

Telangana, India's newest and the 29th state is born. The Government of India had fixed June 2 as the appointed date for the new state, which it created by passing a Bill in Parliament in February. The 63-year-old K Chandrashekar Rao, who led the movement for a separate state of Telangana since 2001, will take oath as the new Chief Minister of the state. His party, the TRS, has won both Assembly and Lok Sabha elections held on April 30. His party won 63 Assembly seats and 11 Lok Sabha seats by decimating the Congress. Hyderabad will serve as a joint capital for both Telangana and Andhra Pradesh for 10 years. Andhra Pradesh will have to build a separate capital within 10 years. The Governor of Telangana will administer Hyderabad till the AP government moves to a new capital.

The Telangana Movement refers to a people's movement for the creation of a new state of Telangana, from the existing state of Andhra Pradesh in South India. The proposed new state corresponds to the Telugu-speaking portions of the erstwhile princely state of State. After several years of peoples movement The UPA government has decided to bifurcate the existing Andhra Pradesh state and The Union Cabinet on 7 February 2014 unilaterally cleared the Bill for the creation of Telangana, clearing the way for its introduction in Parliament. This has been one of the most long-lasting movements in South India. On 18 February, Lok Sabha passed the Bill with Voice Majority. Subsequently, the bill was passed by Rajya Sabha on 20 February 2014. As per the bill, Hyderabad will be the capital of Telangana while the city would also remain the capital of residual state of Andhra Pradesh for no more than ten years. The appointed day for the creation of Telangana State is 2 June 2014.⁵

Foot Notes:

1. J.C.Aggarwal and S.P.Aggarwal (eds.), Uttarakhand: Past, Present, Future (Concept Publishing, New Delhi, 1995), p.89-90.
2. The State Reorganisation Commission noted that although the merging of British and Princely India was Impressive, the project of irrigation, as witnessed by regional demands, was incomplete. The state Reorganisation Commission, Section 105, (Government of India, New Delhi, 1955).
3. These four general guidelines were reiterated in Paul Brass, The politics of India since Independence, (Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 1994), p.37.
4. C. H. Hanumanth Rao, Regional Disparities, Smaller States and Statehood for Telangana, Academic Foundation, New Delhi, 2010, p.127.
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telangana_movement