Unique has been the position of India in the contemporary world due to its multi-national, multi-lingual, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural nature. However, it has been this very uniqueness which has given a number of 'hiccups' to policy makers and has consistently held centre-stage of social theorists. In view of its multiple identity, the task before the policy makers of organising the provincial units has remained never-ending and ever-growing. These identities are constantly in motion. The same identity cannot explain a phenomenon all the time. At any given point of time an identity emerges and asserts depending on the context or circumstances. This thesis calls for a deeper analysis to explain how the identities emerge, articulate, assert and change. It is this dilemma that this study seeks to comprehend. It seeks to focus on the various forms that demands for provincial units have assumed and subsequently the different forms that these very movements have assumed over the passage of time.

Ever since the advent of freedom, India, the land of many languages, has been a witness to linguistic-ethnic issues occupying considerable space in socio-cultural, economic and political domains. The linguistic factor, among the many factors, has been particularly predominant in the demarcation of State boundaries. In fact the saliency of the linguistic-ethnic factor can be gauged from debates over the status of India. In view of the persistent linguistic-ethnic conflicts, the common theme has
been that India is a nation-in-the-making or nation--in-the becoming rather than a complete nation-State, Perhaps; "the principal impetus for linguistic states came as India's political participation deepened and became increasingly representative of a new post-independent generation of Indians whose habits of mind and valuations were deeply rooted in their own language and culture rather than in enlightened nationalism and internationalism".

As the initial nature of autonomy movements has been based on the linguistic-ethnic principle, this study seeks to examine the political processes associated with the linguistic and ethnic question. The context in which this question is being studied is the query which is repeatedly asked: what are the sections that are basically interested in such a formation? And what interests are gained and safeguarded by mobilising the people in support of such provinces. But it becomes difficult to comprehend that despite the demarcation of linguistic units, the rumblings over demands for newer provinces and thus a separate status has belied the liberal expectancy that the founding of linguistic-ethnic provinces would herald peace at last. So even as groups clamouring for a linguistic-ethnic entity have succeeded in attaining a separate status fresh demands of the ethnic and sub-regional identities in these very States have emerged. Thus there has been in motion a transmutation and transformation of identities.

This question can, perhaps be best understood when viewed from an eco-politico-socio cultural perspective. But is it purely the failure to link appropriate linkages with the overall techno-economic and socio-cultural milieu? Or more aptly, is it the adoption of suspicion and mistrust towards the federal units which can better explain the hurdles faced in greater integration? As one of the observers has aptly opined: "The diversities demanded more space in the form of autonomy and if they were pushed and squeezed-in the stridence at times was so intense as to crack if not break the mould". Since the turbid nature of the issue is more clearly manifested in the cases of Andhra, Punjab and Assam, an attempt to comparatively analyse the problem in these States is made.

Andhra Pradesh has perhaps the honour of being the first State to be carved on the linguistic basis in the post-Independence period. The Punjabis realised their goal only in 1966 in the last major phase of reorganisation after a long struggle. While Assam had to undergo some spruining or territorial fragmentation so that it could attain more homogeneity. Both Punjab and Assam faced serious apprehensions and were under direct focus during the partition of the Indian subcontinent. Assam managed to remain with the Indian mainland minus its Sylhet district but the erstwhile form of Punjab was split with the East Punjab being attached to India. But despite gaining their separate status newer demands of sub-regional and ethnic identities have asserted

in these States. In the Punjab the problem has assumed the proportions of almost severance from the Union. But why was the linguistic-ethnic question inadequate to meet the challenges of the people. An attempt to analyse the hierarchised behaviour namely, the attitude of the Bengalis towards the Assamese, the Assamese vis-a-vis the tribals, Tamils versus the Telugus, Andhras towards the Telanganites, Punjabi Muslims versus Punjabi Sikhs and Hindus and the vice-versa. The factors contributing to the failure of the assimilation theory or more appropriately the reasons for the success of the politics of (diverse) identities in the case of India is sought to be enquired.

India: a single nation or multi-national State?

As language and ethnicity are considered to be important ingredients for constituting a nation, the question that invariably arises is whether India is a single nation or a multi-national State. In order to understand the question it is essential to know what exactly the terms 'nation' or Nationality', 'ethnic' denote.

The issue of language, ethnicity, and nationality are interconnected. The term ethnicity generally refers to conceptions of peoplehood. In common parlance, ethnic relates to a human group having racial, religious, linguistic and other traits in common. Weber believed ethnic groups to be those 'which entertain a subjective belief in their common descent...regardless of whether an objective blood relationship exists”. It is thus primarily based on a myth of common ancestry,
which carries with it traits believed to be innate. Nationality on the other hand is conceived to be denoting "a group of persons speaking the same language and observing the same customs". For Rupert Emerson, nation is a single people, traditionally fixed on a well-defined territory speaking the same language and preferably a language all its own, possessing a distinctive culture and shaped to a common mould by many generations of shared historical experience.

As such language which represents a distinguishing factor of nationality is an important determinant of national integration. "National Integration" has been defined as nothing but "the breakdown of sectarian group-existence of the traditional society and its supercession by the generalist loyalties and their commitment to the nation". A study group of the Royal Institute of International Affairs lists a number of factors that contribute to national integration: a common language, a common religion, a common racial origin, a common historical and geographical environment and a common will. But "a common language" the report underscored "constitutes one of the most unifying and integrating factors of nationality". Even J.S.Mill saw nation "as a portion of mankind united among themselves by

For details see Chapter "Language and Nationality", in Ostrower, A: Language, Law and Diplomacy (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvanian Press, 1965) p.50.
common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others and which make them cooperate with each other more willingly than with other people.......".7

India: a country or nation?

With this criterion in mind for a nation, many dismiss India to be a nation as it is 'a conglomeration of languages, cultures and races'. It is widely believed that India is certainly a country but not a nation because it meets the requirements of neither a common language nor a common culture. Nonetheless it is certainly a country which contains a number of emerging nationalities with different languages and cultures of their own.8 India is thus, called a multi-national State. However language alone does not constitute the badge of nationhood.9 In other words, the bonds which make people a nation are not necessarily ethnic and linguistic, although those are undoubtedly the most important factors. Rather as Stalin put: "A nation is a historically evolved stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture".11 So besides, a common language and a common historical experience,

9Karat, op.cit., p.ix.
Garner, op.cit., p.103.
11From Stalin, J: Marxism and the National Question, p.79in Ostrower, op.cit., p.43.
another factor which can bring about the supposed oneness or unity is territory.

More so the very existence of an absolute interdependence between nationality and language stands suspect in the light of bi-lingual and multi-lingual societies. And generally it is not possible for a common language, hence a common nationality to coincide with a single ethnic territory as is clearly put forth by Fredrick Engels who held "No State borders coincide with the natural boundaries of a nationality that is with the boundaries of language". The maxim 'one people, one State', has thus throughout human history, been honoured most often in the breach. National and ethnic pluralism has been the rule, not the exception. Little wonder, most nations including India are plural societies.

How to distinguish ethnicity from nationality?

But the moot point is how do we distinguish ethnicity from nationality. This question all the more assumes significance in the present examination of autonomy in the case of Andhra, Punjab and Assam movements as these very movements popularly referred to as 'ethnic issues' may as well be called 'nationality problems'. "Nationality" as Deutsch understood, denoted "a community of people who have some characteristics which go to make a nation and who are striving for a measure of political, economic and cultural autonomy". Nationalism thus aims at autonomy in the complete form. An ethnic group, on the other hand, aims just at possessing special constitutional status entailing special rights
in a country, but never at outright sovereignty. Ethnic groups rightly called "pre-national" have just provincial autonomy or sovereignty sans political one as their goal. However, ethnic separatist movements when fail to achieve or regain effective political, cultural and often economic control over their homeland within the rules of the system resort to separation and independence thus, converting ethnic into nationality movements. So an ethnic movement can be prevented from turning into a nationality one by conceding some space at the social, political and economic levels.

The linguistic-ethnic question; Indian context

In India, language - the important ingredient for constituting a nation - has been the subject of continued conflict among the States of the Indian Union. The history of modern India has been a witness to linguistic and ethnic issues occupying the forefront in the socio-cultural, economic and political domains.

Problem of the demand for linguistic provinces

A brief historical sketch

Contemporaneously, the problem of linguistic reorganisation was the logical offshoot of the prevalence of multiplicity of languages, but the problem was engineered by the British policy of the division of Bengal in 1905. In both pre and post-independence periods, state recognition itself has been a

\[12\] Phadnis, op. cit., p,35.

critical factor in explaining and giving rise to ethnic and cultural movements.\textsuperscript{14}

In the British period:

The provincial boundaries of the British regime in India were fixed primarily with an eye on 'administrative convenience'.\textsuperscript{15} An outcome of the policy was splitting of people belonging to a particular linguistic group into separate provinces or to bring people belonging to different linguistic groups into one entity. Hence it has been generally believed that in carving out provinces the British were guided by imperial considerations of administrative convenience rather than the linguistic principle. But the success of the policy should be traced more to the Indian society with its multiple embedded identities which provided the space for such a strategy. Besides the other things, this helped the British to keep the Indian people divided and to weaken their unity in their fight for Independence. Subsequently in the Indian camp, it came to be firmly believed that the progress of a people united by bonds of language would be hindered by their being placed under different administrations. Reasoning on similar lines, persistent demands for linguistic provinces emanated from various quarters of the country.

The movement for linguistic provinces which emanated during the colonial period witnessed a number of committees, British as well as Indian to look into the issue of basing provinces on

\textsuperscript{14}Brass, Paul R: The Politics of India Since Independence (Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 1990) p.130.
\textsuperscript{15}Karat, op. cit., p.31.
linguistic and ethnic ties. The first Committee asked to look into the question was the Montague-Chelmsford Committee.

Montague-Chelmsford Committee:

The Committee discussed a resolution on February 6th, 1918 passed by B.N. Sharma, President of the first Andhra Conference recommending to the Governor General-in-Council:

"the redistribution of provincial areas........on language basis wherever and to the extent possible especially where the people speaking a distinct language and sufficiently large in number desire such a change", (pp.25-41).

The response to the resolution was not so warm. But despite the resolution having failed to make any dent did help in making the authorities recognise the principle underlying it.

The Montford Report, 1918:

The report on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, popularly known as the Montford Report published in July 1918 recognised that the then map of British India was "shaped.....with little regard to natural affinities or wishes of the people" (para 39). The committee concluded linguistic reorganisation of States as impractical, but was in favour of small homogeneous States (para 246). At the same time, however the committee opined that "it is also a strong argument in favour of linguistic and racial units that by making it possible to conduct the business of the legislatures in the vernacular they would contribute to draw into its arena of public affairs men not acquainted with English".
But since this recommendation clearly contradicted the basic premise of colonial rule 'English alone could be the language of the Government; nobody rules in the colonised tongue' it was never followed up.\textsuperscript{16}

Indian Statutory Commission:

The linguistic issue found a place again in the Indian Statutory Committee appointed to review the working of the Government of India Act, 1919. The Chairman of the Commission, Simon had 'great natural sympathy' with the body of the people who felt their own race and language were very important to them. Hence, expectedly the report of the Commission published in May 1930, recognised though indirectly the strength of the demand for linguistic provinces. It observed:

"The cases of Orissa and Sind, however are only prominent examples of a class of question which arises at many points when provincial boundaries are considered. These boundaries, as a rule, have none of the characteristic of a natural frontier. ... (p. 26). We therefore propose,.......that the Government of India should set up a Boundaries Commission....which would investigate the main cases in which provincial readjustment seems called for and,......work out a scheme with a view to seeing how far agreement is possible.\textsuperscript{17}"

Thus even while admitting the force of the linguistic principle, the Indian Statutory Commission did not commit itself to this

\textsuperscript{16}Karat, op. cit. , p. 63.
principle of provincial redistribution.

**Formation of Orissa: Floodgates for linguistic provinces opened?**

A brief sketch of the formation of Orissa, the first linguistic State in the British period has been made. But a separate province of Orissa based on the linguistic principle was created in 1936, needless to add after a long struggle. Initially, efforts for the creation of a separate province of Orissa started from the beginning of the present century although it was not until the 1920s that the problem could gain some official recognition.

In 1927, the Simon Commission after going into the issue recognised that:

"The province of Bihar and Orissa, constituted in 1912 is the most artificial unit of all Indian provinces. It was formed by bringing under a single administration three areas which differ markedly not only in physical features but in many, racial, linguistic and cultural characteristics".\(^{18}\)

The issue was raised at the first Round Table Conference held in 1930 at London by the Raja of Parlakhemundi who emphatically stated: "the ideal of an All-India federation is meaningless to the Oriyas unless they get a separate province. Formation of a separate province is a life-and-death problem to us".\(^{19}\)

---


\(^{19}\) Ibid.
The Government of India thereby constituted an Orissa Boundary Committee in 1931 under the Chairmanship of Samuel O' Donnel. The Government of India (Constitution of Orissa) Order 1936 was issued creating a separate province of Orissa under the Governor within the federal scheme of the Government of India Act, 1935 thus inaugurating the new province of Orissa on April 1, 1936 making it the first linguistic State to be so created during the colonial times.

The inauguration of Orissa stimulated similar movements in several other parts of the country. Although the substance of the demand for linguistic states was politically developed by the second decade of this century they were not directed at the British but found expression in demands of the Congress and the expectation that this demand would be granted with the attainment of Independence. Little wonder the demand has been become a perpetual feature of the Congress Sessions.

The Issue of Linguistic Provinces: Congress Party's Stand
Partition of Bengal:

"As early as 1905 the Congress Party's support for the linguistic-nationality principle was all-clear when it opposed the partition of Bengal and then extended its support to its annulment in 1911. Its stand became even more clear and strong when it adopted this very principle (i.e.) the linguistic basis for constituting the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee, even
before the actual division of Bihar and Bengal in 1908.\textsuperscript{20} It has been generally believed that the partition of Bengal paved the way for the Congress' support to the linguistic principle, since the British Government's intention of destroying the solidarity of the Bengali-speaking people and thereby undermine the national movement in Bengal which was based on this very solidarity became quite obvious.

Assam's versus Sylhet case:

In continuance with its belief in 'linguistic compactness principle', it even supported the Sylhet province case in which it was demanded that \textit{Sylhet be made a part of Bengal so that Assam might be wholly more homogeneous and linguistically compact} and Sylhet on its part could retain its cultural identity and long-historical association with Bengal. In fact the idea of forming administrative units viz., provinces to coincide with linguistic boundaries became a potent agitational theme in the hands of Gandhi under whose inspiration the Congress organised itself into linguistic province ignoring the then existing provincial boundaries. Needless to say that in fact it was the adoption of the principle of linguistic compactness which constituted a turning point for the Congress, to quote Nehru, "it transformed the Congress from a middle class assembly to a mass organisation which helped the Congress to build up its strength deriving support from different regions".\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{20}Karat, op. \textit{cit.}, p.32.

Congress sessions:

It has been generally maintained that the Congress Party's linguistic policy between 1905 and 1920 has not been clear and pronounced despite its support to the principle. Initially the principle made its first official appearance in the Calcutta Session of the Congress in 1917 as a result of the Andhradesa movement begun in 1913. But even before the Calcutta session the issue was raised in 1915 when P. Sitaramayya, an Andhrite tried to move a resolution in favour of that principle. But the resolution met with no success.\footnote{Ibid, p.199.} The issue was raised by the Andhras again in the Lucknow 1916 session of the Congress, but in vain, as this time also it failed to gather mass support.

It was however, in the Calcutta session of 1917 that the issue saw light, as to quote Sitaramayya "the subject was hotly contested in the Subjects Committee. Even Gandhi thought that the question might wait....but Tilak saw the point, namely the linguistic provinces were an essential prerequisite for provincial autonomy. The subject held the field for over two hours in Calcutta and was ultimately accepted at 10.14 p.m".\footnote{Sitaramayya, Pattabhi: History of the Indian National Congress (1885-1935) p.147 cited in Ghose, Shankar, op cit., pp.199-200.} The principle gained a concrete shape only in 1920 at the Nagpur session when the Congress accepted it for the first time in principle. From then onwards the demand for linguistic provinces became 'a political cry'. It was at that session that a resolution was drawn up with a scheme for the division of the country on the linguistic basis. And in 1921 the Congress went
ahead in establishing provincial committee based on language.

All Parties Conference:

The question of linguistic reorganisation surfaced in 1928 when an All-Parties Conference constituted a small committee with Pandit Nehru as Chairman to frame a Constitution for India. While endorsing the demand for linguistic provinces, the committee admitted that the present distribution of Indian provinces has no rational basis and believed that its distribution was merely due to accident and circumstances attending the growth of British power in India.

Hence on the whole the present distribution has little to do with geographical, historical, economic and linguistic reasons. Even from a purely administrative point of view it has met with little success. The committee did not merely stop by stating that the existing distribution of provincial boundaries has no basis. It rather went to the extent of lending its support for their redistribution on the linguistic basis and concluded that the two most important considerations in rearranging the provinces should be (i) the linguistic principle and (ii) the wishes of the people.

Ever since the endorsement of the linguistic principle by the Nehru Report in 1928, the Congress has stood in firm faith of the principle. It reiterated its faith in this policy at Calcutta in 1937 and at Wardha, the following year. Even on the eve of Independence in its election manifesto of 1945-46, the Congress commitment to the principle was conspicuous.
Post-Independence Era:

However, with the attainment of freedom and a change of leadership from the British to the native hands; the Congress developed cold feet with regard to the policy. The Indian leaders started expressing the fear that demarcation of provinces on such a basis (like linguistic) would foster the growth of sub-nationalism in the reorganised States and could add to the process of partitions whereas even the one that had taken place has been very painful and cruel. They felt the only way of maintaining solidarity was to give a commanding position to the Centre in the new set-up. Quite ironically therefore the stand taken by the Indian leaders with regard to the reorganisation of provinces assumed a similar tone as that adopted by the British colonialists during their regime. Perhaps the predominance of the industrialists over the peasantry could account for the leaders losing sudden faith in the linguistic demand since the industrialists were more keen to exploit the labour and economic resources of a wider periphery than be confined to the local market. But the Congress probably extended its support to such a policy during the national movement in order to make the struggle broad-based as all nationalities irrespective of their nationality would extend their whole-hearted support to the goal of the national independence in the fond hope that they can achieve their separate provinces soon after gaining freedom. Moreover it is likely that the magnitude of the problem that this conception involved did not become manifest to the Indian leaders prior to independence, as the entire focus of the Congress
movement was on gaining freedom from the British.\textsuperscript{24} But in the post-independence era though the Congress maneuvered to avoid the whole issue, it was in vain as the movement for linguistic provinces strong before independence became irresistible after its achievement.

Linguistic Provinces Commission:

In order to pacify the persistent demands for linguistic states, a Linguistic Provinces Commission, the first such Commission in the post-Independence phase, under the Chairmanship of S.K.Dar, a retired Judge of the Allahabad High Court, and other members, Dr. Pannalal and Jagat Narayan Lal was set-up on June 14, 1948 during the formation of the Constituent Assembly to examine the question. The terms of reference of the Commission were:

1) What provinces, if any, should be created and what broadly should be their boundaries?

2) What should be the administrative, financial and other consequences in each province?

3) What would be the administrative consequences in the adjoining territories.\textsuperscript{25}

In its report released on December 13, 1948 the Commission came out strongly against the formation of linguistic provinces. Even while recognising the clashes, conflicts and grievances in the provinces, it came out strongly against the formation of


\textsuperscript{25}Rao, K.V.Narayan, \textit{op.cit.}, p.204.
linguistic provinces. The Indian leaders thus mouthed precisely the same premise, as regards the provincial boundaries as that, with which they fought vehemently against the British colonialists. In fact the Commission members emphatically maintained "if the intention was to create sub-nations in India there could not be a better way of doing it than by linguistic provinces....". The Commission held that "after sometime when the future of the Indian states has been more clearly determined and veil-established some of the existing provinces should be reformed. But they make it quite clear that such reformation shall not be based upon linguistic considerations (but) rather upon administrative convenience."\(^{26}\)

JVP Committee

The Assembly perhaps armed with the Dar report decided to follow any principle other than the linguistic while organising the States. But the report of the LPC resulted in strong protests and created discontent among sections of Congressmen especially from the non-Hindi areas who petitioned the working committee to reconsider the issue. The persistent demands for linguistic provinces pouring in from all over the country, necessitated the Congress to appoint yet another Committee at its Jaipur session in late 1948, which became popular as the JVP Committee, consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya to reconsider the report of the Dar Commission in the new political context.

\(^{26}\)Ibid, pp.208-209.
The JVP Committee proved to be a mile-stone in the linguistic policy for even though it did not endorse the linguistic policy completely made an exception with regard to Andhra by holding that Andhra has a strong case on the ground that it consisted of the largest compact area which was situated in one State. The Commission also pleaded for separate provinces for Mysore, Hyderabad and Travancore.

Formation of Andhra: Foundation of linguistic provinces laid

In the meantime the Andhras were becoming very agitated and their discontent over the issue was mounting. The turning point in the linguistic policy of the Congress came on December 15, 1952 with the passing away of Potti Sriramulu27 on October 19, who went on a fast unto death demanding a separate province for Andhras. The death of Sriramulu engulfed the entire state in chaos and rioting leading to Nehru's much-awaited announcement on December 19 of the creation of a separate Andhra State with the undisputed Telugu districts excluding the city of Madras in the Lok Sabha. As a follow-up to the announcement a Committee under the Chairmanship of Justice K.N.Wanchoo, Chief Justice of Rajasthan High Court cropped-up, whose main task was to consider and report on the financial and other implications of the decision and the questions to be considered in implementing it. The D-Day finally arrived when on October 1, 1953 the Andhra State under the Chief Ministership of T.Prakasam was inaugurated by Nehru with Sanjeeva Reddy as the Deputy Chief Minister.

Thus in a way it was the death of Sriramulu that paved the way for the formation of Andhra and speeded up the process of the linguistic reorganisation of India. The success of the Andhra struggle stimulated similar demands for reorganisation in other parts of the country. The Karnataka Sahitya Parishad demanded a Karnataka in 1954 and similarly the Kerala Sahitya Parishad gave a call for the realisation of Aikya Kerala, several movements were launched all over the country demanding separate linguistic provinces.

**States Reorganisation Commission**

The mass struggles unleashed in 1953 compelled the Central Government to appoint a States Reorganisation Commission to look afresh into the question of linguistic reorganisation of Indian provinces. The Commission consisting of Fazl Ali as Chairman and K.M.Panikkar agreed that 'linguistic homogeneity' provides the only rational basis for reconstructing the States (p.46) after an examination of all aspects of the demand. The Commission accepted the linguistic principle in general but recommended rather reluctantly the formation of Kerala, Karnataka, Tamilnadu, Hyderabad, Rajasthan, Vidarbha, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Bengal, Bombay and Jammu & Kashmir. Although the Commission granted the wishes of the Malayalee-speaking and Kannada-speaking, the Punjabis bore the brunt of the commission as their demand was turned down and similarly the Commission did not agree to the demand for splitting Bombay into Gujarat and Maharashtra.

---

28 *Karat, Prakash* op. cit., p.42.
States Reorganisation Act, 1956:

The States Reorganisation Act passed almost at the close of 1956 provided for a bilingual Bombay and a multilingual Hyderabad. The reactions to the report were diverse but the strongest response came in Bombay city which was besieged by riots over the issue. The provision of a bilingual Bombay State even resulted in the birth of two language front organisations, the Samyuktha Maharashtra Samiti and Maha Gujarat Janta Parishad. Eventually in 1960, the bilingual State of Bombay was split-up into Maharashtra and Gujarat.

The provision for a multi-lingual Hyderabad recommended in the report was reversed in 1956 itself, resulting in the splitting-up of Hyderabad State into three with Telugu-speaking areas merged with Andhra, the Marathi-speaking areas with Maharashtra and Kannada-speaking areas with Mysore. The merger of the Telugu-speaking areas of the Hyderabad State with Andhra led to the emergence of Andhra Pradesh on November 1, 1956.

Meanwhile the agitation for separate Punjabi Subah continued undeterred. It however, bore fruits only with the issuance of a

date for self-immolation by Sant Fateh Singh— which led Lal Bahadur Sastri and Kamaraj to announce the reorganisation of Punjab in 1966. Its several parts were distributed among three units, the core Punjabi Subah, the new State of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. Several new States were also carved-out in response to tribal demands in the north-eastern region of the country from time to time.\textsuperscript{30}

However, the SRC Report and the reorganisation that followed did not mean the end of the process. It rather exacerbated those issues which the report did not resolve.\textsuperscript{31} All the reorganisations except those in the Punjab and the north-eastern region of the country have satisfied the grievances of principal large communities of India.\textsuperscript{32} The dissatisfaction basically arose in Punjab due to the failure of a clear-cut demarcation between Sikh and Hindu-majority areas, thereby resulting in the non-inclusion of some Sikh-majority areas in Punjab and secondly, the declaration of Chandigarh as the joint Capital of Punjab and Haryana. By 1966, India had been reorganised on the basis of major linguistic groups resulting in what may be termed as legitimacy crowning the principle of lingual reorganisation.

**Centre's Reorganisation Policy:**

The process of carving out provinces on the linguistic basis was thus a long-drawn process. There were various phases in which new

\textsuperscript{30}Brass, Paul, op. cit., p.147.
\textsuperscript{31}Karat, Prakash, op. cit., p.42.
\textsuperscript{32}Brass, Paul, op. cit., p.147.
and separate provinces were created. For dealing with the reorganisation of States, the State strategy was more pluralist in practice than the ideology which appeared 'integrationist and assimilationist'.

In the course of struggles for linguistic States, the Centre apparently developed a set of four formal and informal rules in its reorganisation efforts:

1) The first rule which began as a practice but was formalised in the Constitution itself in 1963 was that recognition would not be granted to those groups which made secessionist demands.

2) The second rule, a heritage of the partition of the Indian subcontinent is that the regional demands based upon religious differences will not be entertained. The case of Punjab fits into both the cases.

3) The third rule is that the demand for a province should be able to mobilise large numbers of people from the concerned region in sustained agitations to persuade the Central Government to recognise that the demand enjoys "popular support."

4) The final rule is that the Centre would not agree to the reorganisation of a province if the demand was made by only one of the important language groups concerned. It was perhaps this rule which was put into practice in the case of . . . . . .

33 Ibid, pp.147-149.
34 Ibid, pp. 149-150.
36 Ibid, pp. 150-151.
Hence in the post-independence era Andhra Pradesh emerged as the first State to be carved on the linguistic basis, whereas it took a long time and a long struggle before the Punjabi-speaking people could realise their goal. In the case of Assam, the Assamese had to go through an incredible degree of territorial fragmentation so that what is left of the State can unambiguously be a State of their own.

So the struggles begun in the colonial times bore fruit in the post-Independence period. A brief sketch of the origins of the three States under study is made:

Demand for Andhra:

The historical origins of an organised Andhra dates back to 236 B.C- 218 A.D rule of the Satavahanas. The establishment of a factory in Masulipatnam in 1611 marked the beginning of colonial foothold in Andhra. The transfer of the Circar districts to the Company in 1766 and the Rayalaseema in 1800 by the Nizam, perhaps marked the beginning of the splitting of the Telugu-speaking people. The demand for uniting the Telugu-speaking people: began to express itself in this century initially through library and literary movements from 1913 onwards. The publication of works like Andhra Charitramu ( when translated History of the Andhras) helped the Telugus realise that in the days gone by they were at par with other people in India in the extent of their kingdoms,

intellectual attainment and their civilisation. It was thus as early as December 12, 1911 the first known recorded plea by the Andhras for uniting the Telugu-speaking people inhabiting contiguous areas and thereby forming a separate province was made on the occasion of the Delhi Coronation Durbar. However a separate province for the Telugus was carved only in 1956, making it the first linguistic province to be so created in the post-Independence phase. Subsequently it was witness to the emergence of sub-regional identities and a transmutation of those identities.

Demand of the Punjab:

The British could bring the Punjabis under their orbit of influence only in 1856, that too consequent to the death of Ranjit Singh. The demand for Punjab (in this century) originated in 1909 after almost six decades of British rule, as a consequence to the Morley-Minto reforms which intensified "....the struggle for political power and for the opportunities which political power confers....". The demand arose in protest against the Communal Award granted to the Muslims of the Punjab province on grounds of narrow majority and economic backwardness. The erstwhile Punjab province was split during the partition with East Punjab coming to India's share. In the post-Independence period the Punjabis waged a long struggle to attain their goal of a separate province within the Indian Union which was achieved in

1966. In the eighties however there has been a transformation of identities as the problem aggravated to secessionist proportions in the form of Khalistan.

**Demand for Assam:**

The third State under study, Assam, was also a demand which saw light during the British period. The Treaty of Yandabo in 1826 marked the descent of the British on the Assamese soil thus paving its way into the British sphere of influence. Until 1873 Assam remained a peripheral region under the overall control of the Bengal Presidency. In 1874, it was formed into a Chief Commissioner's province but with what Guha\textsuperscript{39} termed 'strange bed-fellows' as the densely populated Bengali Muslim district of Sylhet and Cachar, a Bengali Hindu district, Garo hills and other hill districts were clubbed to it. Assam was similarly affected by the Bengal partition of 1905 in which the Bengal Presidency was partitioned into a predominantly Bengali Muslim province in the East consisting of Assam, and a predominantly Bengali Hindu province in the West. Assam continued to have an "involuntary partnership"\textsuperscript{40} with Sylhet till the partition of the Indian subcontinent. In the post-Independence phase too, it underwent frequent territorial rearrangements in order to attain some degree of homogeneity. But in the aftermath of the Assam Accord, reached to put an end to the agitation to drive-out the immigrants, fresh identities among the tribals have emerged.

\textsuperscript{39}See Guha, A: Planter Raj to Swaraj (New Delhi: ICHR, 1977) p. 27
\textsuperscript{40}Ibid, p.335.
But despite the reorganisation, and most of the vociferous provinces attaining separate status, more and more demands began to be raised in different parts of these very states calling for 'more autonomy and a separate status' thus inevitably leading to the question: why was the linguistic reorganisation 'inadequate' to meet the challenges of the people? The inadequacy of the linguistic question became manifest in the light of Telangana and Andhra agitations witnessed in Andhra Pradesh. In the case of Punjab, it stood witness to cropping-up of the demand for Khalistan, and the concomitant rise of terrorism, whereas the process of reorganisations in Assam seems to be a perpetual problem. The size of the state has been already reduced drastically. Even now there seems to be no respite in the wake of contemporary demands of Bodoland, Udayachal and similar demands from tribal groups arising from time to time.

The cropping of new demands from different parts of the country has been a strain on the polity necessitating an analysis of the causes behind the trend. In fact in the face of the seemingly incomplete reorganisation, a sequel of the continuing demands, India has been charged of being a nation-in-the-becoming rather than a complete nation-state. Since it has been more than four decades of the first phase of reorganisation (in 1956) and almost five decades of Independence, one is at a better position to analyse the reasons for the apparent failure of the various reorganisations, in the light of ever growing demands, to satisfy the aspirations and urges of the people.
In the course of this analysis, a basic question which crops-up is: who are the people behind the movements demanding linguistic provinces and what interests are gained and safeguarded by mobilising the people in support of such provinces?

This question can be best explained when viewed from an economic perspective. Perhaps the problem needs to be analysed from a politico-economic stance. The call for the carving of linguistic provinces apparently emanated from the agriculturists, as the demands for linguistic provinces assumed strong overtones in agriculturally strong states. Industrialists on the other hand seem to be interested in an integrated whole and hence are against any division of provinces on such a basis. The Indian bourgeoisie have always felt alarmed with whatever they thought would strengthen regional or State forces. In the fifties they opposed the formation of linguistic States and even after more than a decade in 1969, the President of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry moving the resolution on National Integration and the Business Community, remarked that the most serious constitutional and administrative blunders committed by the Indian States are:

1) The adoption of the federal constitution, and on top of it.
2) The reorganisation of the federating units into linguistic States. In India according to him, the linguistic States have been the cause for the emergence of provincialism in its ugly from.\(^1\)

The opposition to the linguistic provinces theory by the industrialists was clearly manifested in the Maharashtra case, where the call for a separate province was strong in Marathi-regions than in Gujarati-speaking areas as the Gujaratis are advanced capitalists having a big stake in the national economy. The Gujarati bourgeoisie, as a result found less utility in championing nationality interests and was more willing to compromise for a bilingual state with advantages of a huge commercial Centre like Bombay, within its orbit.

A strong belief is that the major interest of the big-industrialists is an all-India centralised market and the freedom to exploit the raw material and labour of all nationalities. They have therefore no qualms in riding "roughshod" over demands which may threaten their untrammelled freedom to continue the exploitation of all the regions of the country. There was widespread opposition from these quarters to the popular forces which however won their demand for linguistic provinces.42

Literature Survey:

There have been various studies on the linguistic and and ethnic politics of Andhra, Punjab and Assam. A survey of some of the studies on linguistic and ethnic politics in general and studies on Andhra, Punjab and Assam in particular are made.

In his study Karat (1973) opines that the demand for States' autonomy crops-up due to the imbalances in the Centre-State relations and flows directly from the political oppression of regional nationalities by the all-India monopolists and landlords (p.136). No wonder there has been widespread opposition from the start. However the creation of linguistic States has strengthened the hands of the regional bourgeoisie (p-48). He concludes by calling for a recomposition of the present system of India by granting more autonomy on linguistic-nationality basis (p.173). He believes this to be the only way to ensure the unity of the country on an enduring basis, as linguistic nationalities given freedom from monopoly landlord exploitation will come together to strengthen the unity of India.43

Arguing on somewhat similar lines, Alam (1984) in his article states that regionalistic demands get flared up because of the contradictions among the ruling classes as the interests of the all-India bourgeoisie/monopoly capital clash with the non-big bourgeoisie at the regional level.44

Narain (1984) believes regionalism in India to be a complex amalgam of geographical, historico-cultural, economic, politico-administrative and psychic factors out of which the economic component forms the crux of it. This is clearly brought out in the Telangana Movement "where economic grievances and

43 Karat, op.cit.
demands triumphed over considerations of linguistic homogeneity".\textsuperscript{45}

In a study by Reddy & Sharma (1979) it is confirmed that regionalism is a direct reaction to the long and deep-rooted economic injustice in matters like employment opportunities and economic development. This study while tracing the Telangana Movement and its grievances held that economic exploitation leads to a feeling of deprivation resulting "in a new identity solely on the basis of living together in the same area to overcome cementing forces like language, caste and party loyalties".\textsuperscript{46}

In his paper Subramanyam (1984) draws a historical sketch of the Andhra Movement. While commenting on the post-formative agitations, he holds the tensions in Andhra Pradesh rose to high altitudes due to historical factors as the Andhra area was exposed to the mechanism of democratic process much earlier than Telangana. Hence Telangana lagged far behind Andhra resulting in an impression that the development of Telangana remained stagnant amidst the overall growth in Andhra Pradesh.\textsuperscript{47}

Another work on the same subject by Acharya (1984) argues more or less on similar lines. He holds the disequilibrium among various regions of the state to be the main cause for the emergence of hostile attitudes. Most of the Telangana grievances,

\textsuperscript{45}Narain, Iqbal: "A Conceptual Analysis in the Indian Context", in Majeed, Akhtar \textit{op.cit.}, pp.19-35.


Acharya opined, arose due to the economic conditions of the people characterised by inequalities and regional imbalances. In fact, the two agitations have highlighted that the factor of language as a decisive force has failed to keep the State intact.\textsuperscript{48}

Making a comprehensive study of the Andhra Movement, Narayana Rao (1973) is of the opinion that though all the Andhras were conscious of being a historical-linguistic group the bond of language by itself had not been sufficiently strong to make different Telugu-speaking regions- the Circar, Rayalaseema and Telangana-come together unconditionally under one administration. In fact, it was the prospective political and economic advantages that might accrue to each region which really influenced the attitudes of that region towards the creation of an Andhra province rather than an emotional or sentimental commitment to Andhraidentity.\textsuperscript{49}

In a study Kumar (1984) opines that regionalism whether communal or linguistic grew in India as a result of the alleged inequitable distribution of the economic resources amongst the different socio-cultural sub-regions. On Sikh regionalism, Kumar holds that although initially it was predominantly communal later it shifted to more pragmatic grounds. Hence he feels that the


\textsuperscript{49}Rao, K.V.Narayan, op.cit.
regionalism of the Akalis now is more issue-oriented and less religion-oriented.\(^{50}\)

The paper by Singh, Gopal (1984) seeks to probe the objective material forces which led to the Punjab situation assuming frightening dimensions in recent times. The communal colour lent to the agitation has been the result of the clash between the bourgeois aspirations among the Sikh rural gentry and the bourgeois hegemony of the Hindu traders, merchants and industrialists. In other words, the growing aspirations get blocked by the established hegemony.\(^{51}\)

In line with the prevalent theories on the Punjab crisis, Jannuzi (1990) believes the outburst to be rooted in the 1947 and 1966 partitions and the constant search by the Sikhs for a homeland in which they could be dominant. However, paradoxically Punjab's crisis is associated with its spectacular economic success or what is popularly known as 'Green Revolution'. Since the small farmers, landlords and peasants were not full participants in the economic progress, they were placed in a position of at least relative deprivation as they perceived it. And it is mainly from these bypassed rural poor that the agitation derived its main support.\(^{52}\)

\(^{50}\)Kumar, Pradeep: "Communal Dimension of Regionalism in Indian Federation" in Majeed, Akhtar op. cit., pp.145-158.


\(^{52}\)Jannuzi, op.cit.
In his work on the Punjab crisis, Alam (1986) moves away from the usual refrain of the crisis as either arising out of contradictions of Punjab economy, especially the Green Revolution or simply giving long historical account of the Sikh Movement. Rather he believes the crisis to be the outcome of excessive centralisation of political power. Initially the movement began in the sixties centred round more autonomy to the states in general, but later on, it assumed a distinct shift in the late-seventies and eighties to more autonomy to Punjab in specific. Apart from deprivation or exploitation, conditions of restrained capitalist growth in agriculture and weak linkages in the industrial base resulted in the cumulation of discontent.53

Jafar (1987) in his work examines how the Sikh community once a asset for the nation erupted into a frightful volcano. Blaming the British for many of the distortions in India's economic, political and cultural spheres, he squarely puts the blame for Punjab crisis on the British strategy of divide and quit. Doling out the familiar theories on Punjab—of stagnation reached after a high growth-level in the agricultural economy and a weak industrial base, he strongly believes only a sincere Centre can bring a solution to the Punjab impasse.54

Pettigrew (1987) holds the Punjab Movement to be a revivalist movement based on Sikh's perception of religion and historical

tradition. Analysing the Bhindranwale phenomena, Pettigrew attributes his high fame purely to the failure of the Akalis to be the true representatives of the Sikhs and instead settle down to the role of opposition in the state. The Punjab problem necessitates the transfer of decisive power making from the Centre to the state capital in all aspects of development.

Rai (1986) gives a comprehensive account of the Punjab problem since partition. Language generally considered a unifying force which cuts across sectional, sectarian and communal divisions, proves a failure in the case of Punjab. In Punjab it is language which has brought about cracks in the cohesiveness of the Punjabis. In line with other thinkers on the issue, Rai believes it is imperative that more powers ought to be given to the states.

In his volume, Brass (1991) takes a different stance when he holds ethnicity and nationalism as not "givens" but rather "social and political constructions". The kinds of alliances made between centralising and regional or other non-dominant elites is what gives shape to a particular type of ethnic identity and modern nationalism. Bringing out a detailed account of the Punjab stalemate, Brass calls out for more of pluralism and

---


decentralisation. In short, accommodation of regional political demands he urges is a "must".\textsuperscript{57}

Analysing the Assam issue, Gohain (1980) holds the prevalence of the law of undevelopment of capitalism to be responsible for Assam's ethnically polarised reality. In fact, the desire to have a state of their own led the Assamese to go through an incredible degree of territorial fragmentation so that what is left of the state can unambiguously be a state of their own.\textsuperscript{58}

However, the outcome of continued influx into Assam resulted in the development of what Baruah (1980) calls a plural society of separate communities instead of a composite society of people. In the vastly changed demographic situation of Assam it becomes a state where the majority linguistic community has the "slightest of margins".\textsuperscript{59}

Sarin (1980) in a detailed account of the Assam problem, believes that the problem basically arose due to the perception of the Bengalis as "cultural imperialists" out to assimilate them. This perception resulted in the correcting of socio-economic imbalances and the ethnic division of labour with the newly acquired weapon of political power. In short,


\textsuperscript{59}Baruah, S.K: "Cudgel of Nationalism or Tangled Nationality Question", Economic and Political Weekly, March 15, 1980, pp.543-545.
linguistic nationalism has been employed to counter the invasion in the cultural and employment sectors. However, ironically enough, it was Assamese chauvinism that diminished Assam and lost her tribal population.\footnote{Sarin, V.I.K: India's \textit{North-East in Flames} (New Delhi: Vikas Publishers, 1980).}

Viewing the Assam problem from the familiar mould of a heritage inherited from colonial times, Gohain (1985) in another of his works maintains that the Assam problem should be viewed not as a problem vis-a-vis the Bengalis or Muslims, but rather in its totality as an issue in need of a solution with the participation of all the communities.\footnote{Gohain, H.N: "Roots of Assamese Chauvinism", in his \textit{Assam: A Burning Question} (Guwahati: Spectrum Publishers, 1985).}

Gupta (1991) highlights the developmental aspect of ethnic factor thus striking down the general themes of political modernization and development which held "ethnic claims" to be "sources of tension". It is this aspect that he tackles with reference to the political system of India in general and Assam in particular. Recognising its developmental significance, Gupta believes that instead of ethnic lines getting eroded by class formations it is the other way round. Rather than viewing ethnic regionalism and secular nationalism as competing values, it should be realised that regional movements can add depth to nationalism as ethnic politics from the early Andhra Movement to the late Assam Movement have shown.\footnote{Gupta, J.D: "Ethnicity, Democracy and Development in India:}
From these studies it can be discerned that the roots of the demand for states autonomy has its origins in the multi-national or multi-ethnic character of India.\textsuperscript{63}

Lack of uniformity in the economic progress of the various parts of the country and the issue of exploitation by a different nationality generally assumes the shape of a movement demanding an autonomous status in the form of a separate state as is clearly evident in the case of Andhra. The question of linguistic reorganisation of provinces seems to erupt from the bourgeoisie based at the regional level seemingly in protest against constraints imposed by the national bourgeoisie in pursuit of its policy. The call for linguistic provinces, it may be inferred, emanated from the rising agrarian regional bourgeoisie. This trend is most clearly manifested in the cases of Andhra and Punjab.

The subsequent developments in these very linguistic states, however makes it clear that the linguistic question cannot be studied in isolation as it is entangled with the ethnic, economic and religious spheres. This proposition leads to a study of Assam, in addition to Andhra and Punjab, as it is popularly referred to as an "ethnic issue".

Evidently language has played an important rallying point in all

\textsuperscript{63}See Karat, \textit{op. cit.}, & Habib, Irfan, \textit{op. cit.}
these cases. But more importantly, it was economics and political insecurity infused with the factor of language which later pulled the movements to the heights that they have attained during their distinct course. What mattered most in these cases, was not the actual deprivation or grievances - social or economic but their perception or evaluation of deprivation.

In the case of Punjab the lack of openings for the capital generated in agriculture resulted in what Daniel Lerner\(^6^4\) called a revolution of rising frustrations. However in the case of Andhra 'the rising expectations' were saved from being totally shattered as the surplus harnessed from the agricultural sector could be absorbed in the fast growing industrial base.

As in the case of Punjab, Assam too suffered immensely from the 'relative deprivation syndrome'. The Assam identity crisis is the eruption of anger at what may be termed as 'Calculated migration'. The stagnant economy and a resource base inaccessible to native Assamese partly accounted for the Assam impasse reaching its pinnacle. Nowhere was the ethnic crisis management a failure (a miserable one) as in Assam. The Assam and Punjab movements seem to be, in short, frantic responses to a lost or threatened identity.

Hence, understudy interestingly are three types of economies shaping the distinctive course of the autonomy movements.

Comparatively, Punjab has a developed economy, while Andhra has an expanding or developing resource base (which partly explains the early assimilation into the mainstream). At the bottom is the stagnant resource base of Assam, urgently in need to be exploited and made accessible to native Assamese.

In other words, the autonomy movements are the outcome of the failure to balance the multi-ethnic societal demands with available resources. But rather than over playing the role of ethnic claims as "sources of tension", it is crucially important to throw light on the constructive aspect. Needless to add, ethnic movements help draw the attention of the ruling bourgeoisie to the economic imbalances of the region and thus realise the aim of setting right the disequilibrium between different regions, in the process having contributed to the healthy practice of federalism, besides just possessing the infrastructure.

Scope of the study:
Why this study:

Inspite of fulfilling the major demands for organising the States on linguistic bases, the task somehow remains unfulfilled. This is mainly due to the demands for separate provinces coming-in from those States based on this very linguistic principle. In other words "the struggle of the States for recognition and a rightful share in the political and economic

---

66Gupta, op. cit., p.144.
sphere continues". Hence the much sought-after peace and unity after the recognition of the provinces on linguistic basis has been eluding. It is in this background the linguistic and ethnic policy is sought to be studied.

Language as a factor is generally believed to bring about unity among the people. This in turn is supposed to be binding the people emotionally. Hence, the carving of provinces on linguistic lines was believed to bring about solidarity among the people (of the province) contributing to national integration. But in the course of time, it is seen that language factor has been overtaken by some other factor or factors in the case of Andhra, Punjab and Assam. Even though these States have been carved on the basis of language there has been an apparent failure in preventing these regions from demanding 'more autonomy and a separate status'.

Another question associated with the linguistic question is the problem of intra-regionalism as witnessed in these states. The successive militant movements, viz., Telangana and Andhra agitations in Andhra Pradesh, Assam faces sub-regionalism in the form of the demand of 'Bodoland'. In Punjab the call for a separate Sikh Homeland assumed alarming proportions in the recent past. A section of the Punjabis gave a call for 'severing from the Union'.

A study of the three states - Andhra Pradesh, Assam and Punjab-based on the linguistic principle, is attempted as they have achieved this status after passing through a prolonged struggle. The dissatisfaction of the Telugus inspite of gaining a (long-fought) separate province becomes evident with the eruption of the Telangana agitation hardly a decade later of its formation. In the case of Punjabis it is a gradual aggravation into the Khalistan demand. The Assamese having gone through an incredibly large degree of fragmentation have not yet come to terms with what has been termed to be their homogeneously-formed unit. This makes it clear that there are some other deeper underlying factors taking place in these three states.

In the course of the analysis it becomes clear that the study needs to be looked from a broader perspective. And when viewed from this angle, it is seen to be entangled with the economic, ethnic and religious issues. Hence the proposition that a single factor keeps the people united has almost lost its validity.

Evidently, linguistic and ethnic bonds play a uniting role only when there are no conflict of issues within a particular region / regions. But in the event of conflict of issues involving especially economic and political matters, these (binding) factors seem to be relegated to the background and the economic and political factor take precedence or primacy over the linguistic and ethnic factor. This proposition needs to be seriously analysed.
Methodology:

This study on linguistic and ethnic politics attempts to analyse various reasons / causes for the rise of a particular demand based upon literature survey on the subject.

This is a study, basically exploratory to compare the emerging identities both in time and space. It is more an attempt at discerning the broader, trends in a comparative perspective, comparative studies with a broader framework may not provide deep insights but they do provide a perspective. Such studies fall in the middle range generalisations, which in turn for better macro level theory building and micro level indepth studies.

The data required for the study is gathered (mainly) from secondary sources, government publications and also from official records. Given the constraints of time, space and framework, no empirical data has been collected. Based on secondary sources, such studies would help to take stock of not only the trends but also the overall thinking on the phenomenon. The present study is partly to take stock of the literature and present thinking and set the agenda.

No one identity can, thus explain a phenomenon all the time. At any given point of time a particular identity emerges and asserts depending on the context. Thus identities are contextual. It is this aspect that many of the studies have failed to explain- the transformation and transmutation of identities. Most of the studies have confined to a case study of a particular State rather than a comparative analysis. This thesis tries to fill
both the failings as it is a comparative analysis analysing the
trends over a period of time.

Chapterisation:

The scheme of chapterisation is as follows:

Chapter - I: Includes the methods of study, a brief survey of
the literature on the topic. An attempt has been made to explain
the study undertaken and to specify various concepts related to
the study.

Chapter - II: is devoted to a discussion of the Andhra Movement.
It focuses on the formation of Andhra Pradesh as it unfolds
itself from the 1920s and the various militant movements
engulfing the State in the aftermath of its creation. The Chapter
is subdivided mainly into four: The first phase from 1900-1947,
covers the movement from its inception till India's Independence.
But it was almost a decade of Independence before Andhra Pradesh
could be formed. So in the second phase from 1947-1956, the
events leading to its reorganisation are discussed. But in the
aftermath of gaining a separate status, Andhra witnessed
movements for further divisions in the form of Telangana and
Andhra agitations, which becomes the theme of the third phase
from 1956-1973. The final phase- the fourth- from 1973 onwards is
an account of the subsequent developments culminating in the rise
of the Telugu Desam Party. The rise of the TDP brings forth the
predominance of the linguistic issues, as atma-gauravamu or
self-respect of the Telugu people- the theme of Visalandhra-
became the theme of regional politics once again. The linguistic
base as a sufficient condition in the formation of the State is sought to be enquired.

Chapter - III: mainly deals with the Punjabi Movement. The Punjabi movement now spanning over three-quarters of this century has been subdivided into four phases: from 1909 when the demand took some shape with the birth of organisations like the Akali Dal and the SGPC, the spokes-institutions of the Sikhs' interests. The second phase covers from 1940, the period when the demand for a separate state for the Muslims in the form of Pakistan became a reality rousing the hopes of the Sikhs in attaining a similar demand. However, the demand having been backfired, the main contention of the Sikhs in the post-Independent scenario is the granting of atleast a separate province for the Sikhs (within the Indian Union)- this being the theme in the third phase from 1947-1966. In the final phase from the 1966-onwards, the Sikhs do manage to gain a separate province for themselves, Punjab, but it stood witness in the eighties to the cropping-up of Khalistan (a sovereign state for the Sikhs) a demand reminiscent of the pre-Independence days.

Chapter - IV: makes a study of Assam solely. The Chapter is similarly subdivided into three phases: the first phase is an historical overview of the Assam movement from the Ahom invasion of the Assam in the thirteenth century through the British rule till India's freedom. The second phase covers from 1947 till the signing of the Assam Accord in 1985. The post-Accord scenario forms the main theme in the final phase from 1985-onwards. The period witnessed eruption of movements among the Bodos and. other
tribes mouthing the same charges against the Assamese as those leveled by the Assamese against the Bengalis. The movement has thus turned a full circle.

Chapter - V: consists of a synthesis of the three movements—Andhra, Punjab and Assam under study. A comparative analysis of the movements is attempted in this Chapter. It also consists of the conclusion of the study.