CHAPTER -4

IDEOLOGY, ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP OF THE MOVEMENT

'Social movements are conscious collective actions informed of an ideology, aided by an organisational weapon and initiated by a core person/group to bring about change in any direction (past/future) using any means (violent/non-violent)' (Oommen 1990: 146). It is the presence of the ideology and the organisation that differentiates a social movement from collective behaviour. Every social movement implies collective behaviour but every collective behaviour is not a social movement. This Chapter is divided into three parts. Part I discusses the ideology of the Uttarakhand movement, Part II deals with the organisation of the movement, and Part III is devoted to the leadership of the movement.

Ideology is a system of values and goals. It has three facets-
(i) Diagnosis: it relates to the diagnosis of the situation and points out what is wrong. (ii) Prescription: it provides the solution and tells what can be done. (iii) Action: it provides the rationale behind action and who should do it.
According to Oommen (1990) a movement can be defined as a stream of associations in interaction and/or in confrontation. Different associations in a movement may profess different ideologies (usually ideological differences account for a multiplicity of associations in a movement) as in agrarian or student movements. And a situation may necessitate more than one diagnosis and many prescriptions. In such a situation it is but natural that the ideology of a movement (represented through a stream of associations) may not form a coherent organised whole. The ideology of the Uttarakhand movement presented here is the sum total of points of view expressed by different informants and associations championing the cause of the movement. It has five important dimensions which have been discussed below.

**Economic – Geographic Dimension:**

Economic backwardness of Uttarakhand region has been the most important issue in the movement for statehood. It has been argued that the structure of economy in the hills is different from that of plains in Uttar Pradesh. The planners and administrators planning for economic development either fail to understand or do not take into account the distinctiveness of the region in terms of its economy, topography, resource base and possibilities of development. The scientists, engineers
and technicians coming to the region to work on different projects are often ignorant of the problems in the region. As a result majority of the schemes initiated in the last four decades have met with failure.

The distinctiveness of the region however got due recognition by the Planning Commission of India in its report (1992-93) on the development of the hill areas. It states that the Government of India should revise the parameters of minimum needs programme for the hill areas keeping in mind its topography and geographical features. The parameters for hill region should be based on distance and altitude instead of population.

Economic resource base and scope of development in a region depends to a large extent on its geographical features. The schemes, which are formulated to meet development needs of the plains are imposed on the hills ignoring their area specific requirements. There is an instance when the government of Uttar Pradesh issued orders to bore tubewells in the hills as an anti-drought measure(UKD memorandum to the Prime Minister on November 27, 1987).

Uttarakhand region abounds in water, forest, and mineral resources. Innumerable medicinal herbs are found in the hills. There is a huge potential for development of tourism and horticulture but schemes for their development still eludes the region.
The problems of development in the hill areas are distinct in nature and calls for a different set of strategies to tackle them. One of the most pressing problems in Uttarakhand region is the lack of infrastructural facilities to meet the basic needs of widely dispersed population. Compared to the plains, the expenditure on development of infrastructure in the hills is relatively high. Implementation of the schemes takes more time and the projects have longer gestation period. The frequent natural disasters further accentuate the problems of the region by causing damage to the existing assets. The maintenance of infrastructure also incurs relatively high recurring costs.

According to 1991 census 70 per cent population of Uttarakhand lives below poverty line. The figures for Uttar Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh are 50.1 per cent and 27.1 per cent respectively. Whereas, the national average is 46 per cent. 75 per cent population in the region depends on agriculture for livelihood but per capita availability of agricultural land is only 0.65 hectares. Only 13.1 per cent land is cultivable, out of which just 3 per cent has irrigation facilities. The total agricultural production of the region is just enough to support the population for only three months in a year. Nine out 13 districts in Uttarakhand have been declared 'zero-industry' areas.

Due to lack of employment opportunities in the region the youth migrate to other areas to earn their livelihood. According to a study by Vohra
(quoted in Nautiyal 1995:129) 46 per cent of the youth have migrated out of the region and 59 per cent families have at least one member working outside Uttarakhand. People in the region depend for their livelihood, largely on the money sent by the emigrants. The money-orders account for 62 per cent increase in the per capita income in the region. Thus, the money-orders are the backbone of the economy in Uttarakhand. No wonder, it is nicknamed as ‘money-order economy’.

The ideologues of Uttarakhand movement often argue that Himachal Pradesh, though comparable with Uttarakhand in terms of population, area, topography and resource base, is relatively more developed for it is an independent special category state in India Union. It is claimed, if Uttarakhand gets statehood it can match Himachal Pradesh in developmental achievements. The report of the Planning Commission of India (1992-93) also underlines the comparability of the two regions and their differential developmental achievements. It states that the hill areas of Uttar Pradesh are contiguous with Himachal Pradesh and face similar problems. But Himachal Pradesh owing to its special status have been receiving special grant-in-aid from the Centre besides other planned and non-planned financial assistance. Consequently, there has been more development in Himachal Pradesh as compared to the hill region of Uttar Pradesh. The report also states that due to resource
crunch and problems in other areas of Uttar Pradesh – especially in the
eastern part, Bundelkhand and middle zone- it is not possible for the
state government to finance the sub-plan for UP hill areas. The report
suggests that the Central Government take up the financial responsibility
and provide enough assistance to the hill region.

**Political Administrative Dimension**

The issue of political under-representation and absence of an
effective and responsive administration is an important
aspect of the ideology of Uttarakhand movement. The
ideologues of the movement complain that Uttarakhand
region is politically under-represented compared other hill
states in India in particular and status of Indian Union in
general. As D S Jalal a teacher in Kumaon University aptly
points out:

One of the important bases for the demand is that in
comparison to the majority of states in India the region is
under-represented both in the state assembly and in the
Parliament. Uttarakhand region sends only 19 MLAs to UP
Assembly. An MLA in the region represents relatively more
population and covers larger area. Each MLA here represents
a population of 3.1 lakh and an area of 2700 Sq. Kms. If the
area covered by an MLA in Uttarakhand region is taken as a
unit with a value of 100 and a comparison is made with the
area covered by an MLA in any other state of Indian Union,

He further states:

Similarly if the population represented by an MLA in Uttarakhand region is taken as a unit (with a value of 100) and a comparison is made with the population represented by an MLA in any other state, the latter will have following relative value: in U.P-105, Maharashtra-88, Bihar-86, Tamilnadu-77, West Bengal-74, Gujarat-73, Andhra Pradesh-72, Rajasthan-71, Orissa-69, Kerala-67, M.P-66, Karnataka-64, Assam-57, Punjab-55, Delhi-43, J & K-33, Haryana-29, Himachal Pradesh-24, Tripura-15, Manipur-10, Meghalaya-10, Goa-9, Arunachal Pradesh-9, Mizoram-7, Nagaland-6 and Sikkim-4.

Further, talking about the rationale behind the demand of statehood for Uttarakhand the informant says:

The demand for an autonomous Uttarakhand state is not based only on the fact that U.P is unwidely and there is a strong case for its division but the rationale behind the demand is that the region of Uttarakhand is bigger than 9 states in terms of population, 11 in terms of area, 13 in terms of population per Parliamentary constituency, 20 in terms of area per Parliamentary constituency, 23 in terms of area per
Assembly constituency and 25 in terms of population per Assembly constituency.

Nineteen MLAs representing Uttarakhand regions do not count for much in UP Assembly with a strength of 425 members. Thus, it is practically insignificant in the electoral politics of Uttar Pradesh. Its unimportant status is reflected in the statement made by Mulayam Singh Yadav in September 1994 when he was Chief Minister of UP. He said that he did not depend on Uttarakhandis support to run his government.

The activists of the movement hold the bureaucracy as primarily responsible for the underdevelopment of the region. The lack of sincere and committed administrators is felt by one and all. Dr. Virender Penuli, an ex-MLA observes that,

The bureaucracy in the region is characterized by three P's – Promotion, Probation and Punishment. The officers who come to serve in the region have either been recently promoted or new recruits on probation, or have been transferred to the hills as a punishment. Due to lack of facilities and comforts bureaucrats are always trying to go back to plain areas. Usually they decline postings in the hills, as a result posts remain vacant most of the time.

On the other hand the Editor of Nainital Samachar notes that, "The transfer to the hills is not always a punishment, it
could be a 'prized posting'. Exceptions are always there but majority of the bureaucrats here make money as it is not always possible to physically verify the actual work done”.

The government of UP in a report (1992) submitted to the Union Ministry of Home admits lack of sincerity and commitment to work among the bureaucrats in the region. It also takes cognizance of the problem of ineffective administration in Uttarakhand region. The report suggests creation of a 'single line administration' system to ensure efficiency and speedy development of the region. The new system will ensure that employees serving within the region, in due course of time, get promoted to higher level posts. So that the knowledge and expertise gained by them in the region in not wasted and can be utilized to accelerate the process of development. The report rules out the possibility of such a system till Uttarakhand remains a part of UP. Thus, it recommends formation of a separate state of Uttarakhand.

The demand for a separate Uttarakhand State also finds support with social forces endeavoring for federal restructuring of over-centralized Indian Polity. They see modifications in the Centre-State relations to make room for decentralization of power and optimum people's participation to establish federalism in India both in letter and spirit. It is felt that mere creation of new states
in India will not serve any purpose unless they enjoy decision making power. The objective of equitable development can be achieved only in a democratic, federal and secular polity.

A convention of such forces for federalism took place in Delhi in October 1991, which concluded on the note that, "India has to be re-organized on a federal basis with multi-layered autonomy so that each and every social group or identity may live with honour and dignity and may have the right of self-determination" (Kothari et al:2).

A similar convention of Dalits and minorities held in Punjab in 1990, adopted a resolution which reads,

"The convention opines that India is a country of multiple overlapping identities based on caste, tribe, religion, region and nationality. But Indian State does not recognize their right to cultural-political autonomy and economic betterment. The state in practice is communal, castist and oppressive. It resorts to dubious means of genocide, arson, looting and rape against those groups who hold views and beliefs contrary to that of the 'mainstream'. These values which justify even the most heinous crimes against the humanity are nothing but a self-reflection of upper-caste rulers from Hindi-belt and some self-seeking people associated with them (translated from Hindi, quoted in Nautiyal 1994:47).

The convention proposed that if the human rights were to be protected and the nationalities in India wanted to fulfill their
identity aspirations and become autonomous Republics, then Indian State needed to be reorganized on federal basis in a real sense. A true federal governance requires a constitution which guarantees: (a) Reorganization of states; (b) Delegation of all the powers to the states except pertaining to foreign affairs, defense, finance and communications; and (c) Equal representation to all the states irrespective of their size, to constitute a federation of equals.

On 7-8 October 1991, a Founding Convention for a Federal Front was organised in Delhi by like-minded people, parties and organizations to mobilize public opinion on the issue of federal reorganization. The convention issued a proposal that supported the creation of separate states of Jharkhand, Uttarakhand, Bundelkhand, Chhattisgarh, Vidarbha and Telangana on the basis of cultural unity to fulfill mass aspirations.

**Environmental Dimension**

Environmental protection and conservation of natural resources in the central Himalayas has been an important issue in the Uttarakhand movement. Garhwal witnessed famous Chipko Andolan during 1970s against commercial use of forests. The hill people allege that the successive governments have been exploiting the forest resources of the region without taking any
concrete measures to check the degradation of the environment. Enactment of the Forest (Conservation) Acts have done more harm than good to the people in the hills. Not only their rights in the forests have been curtailed their entry into the reserved forests has also been banned. Now, they are forced to take long detour in search of fodder, fuel-wood and drinking water. The conservation efforts made by the government without taking into account the day-to-day needs of the local people have only added to their hardships making their lives even more miserable. The feeling is ripe in the region that only a separate state of Uttarakhand can safeguard their interests, check environmental degradation and restore ecological balance in this part of the Himalayas.

The benefits of the development that has taken place in the region in the last five decades have by-passed the local people. Soon after Indo-Chinese war in 1962 an extensive network of roads was created throughout Uttarakhand. It ended relative isolation of the region. The resultant greater accessibility to the region accounts for the exploitation of resources of the region such as timber, resin, medicinal herbs and mineral deposits by the contractors from outside. Thus, local people lost their resources to the outsiders. The commercialization of agriculture
soon followed. The land previously used by local farmers for subsistence farming became accessible to the entrepreneurs for cultivation of cash crops like fruits grown in cold climate. The construction of motorable roads also encouraged pilgrimage to places like Badrinath, Kedarnath, Gangotri and Yamnotri in addition to tourism in general. Mass tourism over burdened the capacity of environment as it over-populated the pilgrimage routes with hotels, restaurants and shops to cater to the needs of the tourists. Ultimately, the issue, as Berreman (1987) points out, is about, the clash between the desire of Uttarakhand people for regional self-determination and the desire in the plains for the Himalayan resources.

The Planning Commission of India set up a committee in March 1992 headed by S.Z. Kasim to help formulate a national policy for integrated development of the Himalayas. R.S. Tolia, representing UP government, informed the Committee that the ecological balance in the area has been greatly compromised due to increase in human and cattle population. Moreover, delimitation of large tracts of land as reserved forests and wildlife sanctuaries have forced the people to cultivate whatever land available even without developing terraces or taking other
measures to check soil erosion. The forest department has only partly succeeded in its conservation efforts due to stiff resistance from local population who want that their daily needs of fodder and fuel wood should be given precedence over any other use of the forests. The Report notes that unplanned activities in the Himalayas are a major danger to ecological balance. It holds increasing pressure on cultivable land leading to soil-erosion and environmental degradation.

Contrary to the above position the ideologues of the movement hold commercial exploitation of forest resources as the main cause for degradation of environment in the region. Thus, the demand for Uttarakhand State subsumes the demand for proper management of the Himalayas.

Identitarian Dimension

Though the culture of Uttarakhand is not homogenous throughout the region, the degree of cultural sharing within the region is greater than between it and the plains. It is a well known fact that geographic, social and political barriers limit interaction between people. This largely accounts for cultural diversity in the region at sub-regional and local level. At the broader level the region as a whole share distinctive
socio-cultural feature such as ceremonial forms, deities, worship, architecture, dress, ornament, folklore, traditional technology, organization of family and caste, marriage rules, rituals regarding birth and death. These features mark it off as a separate socio-cultural region. The cultural commonality within the area also generates a fellow-feeling under the circumstances of confrontation with people of having differing characteristics and interests.

The activists of the movement complain that Uttarakhand is the only region in the Himalayan belt left without a politico-administrative identity of its own. All other regions have such separate identities, which is an outcome of the recognition of their distinct socio-cultural identities. The attention is drawn to the strategic location of Uttarakhand region, which shares international border with Nepal in the east and Tibet on the north. It is pointed out that India can neglect the region only at its own peril.

Interestingly the dimension of the linguistic-cultural identity has been relatively less visible in the last phases of the movement than other dimensions, namely, – economic, political and environmental (see Chapter 5 and 6). Perhaps the reason lies in the nature of the regional identity, which is not monolithic. And it
is not only the socio-cultural divide at the sub-regional level but also differing images of the region in the minds of the inhabitants that accounts for it.

Berreman (1987) notes that there are two images of Uttarakhand region- ideal and real. We owe ideal image largely to the Hindu Scriptures. The whole of the Himalayas particularly the region of Uttarakhand is a sacred land to the believing Hindus like all holy places actual or mythical, the Himalayas are idealized. They are the abode of the gods and the land of unparalleled beauty. As Fonia writes, "Perfection is the other name for this holiest of the Holy Land" (cited in Berreman 1987:273). In praise of the glory of the Himalayas the Skanda Purana reads: "In a hundred ages of the gods I could not tell the glories of Himachal. As the dew is dried up by the morning sun, so are the sins of mankind by the sight of Himachal" (Ibid). Bharti observes that "The Himalayas is a state of mind they tend to be ascriptive rather than actual mountains". Further, "...the Himalayas of the Rishis and the Yogis is more important as an ideal to us than the actual rocks and the miserable huts of the people there" (cited in Berreman 1987:273).

In contrast to this ideal image there is the actual Himalayas inhabited by hard-working farmers, herdsmen and artisans with
their mundane and pragmatic concerns. Their customs, traditions and practices are of a distinct type yet within the fold of Hinduism. And considered unholy by the advocates of orthodox Brahminism, the revelation that people exhibiting unholy practices inhabit the holiest of places comes as a shock to the outsider and the idealists alike.

Berreman (1987: 273 – 74) points out:

If outside advocates of orthodox Brahmanism are alarmed at these revelations, a section of the educated elites of the mountains themselves, and especially those who are expatriates, are embarrassed as well as alarmed for they are anxious to be identified with the ideal rather than the actual Himalayan culture. They are likely to be people who have denied, repressed, forgotten, or concealed the actual in favour of the ideal in confidence that the latter and the cultural mobility it represents – is the avenue to the social, economic, and political mobility (and often spatial mobility as well) they have sought.

Berreman describes this as “plainsward mobility” or “plains emulation”

Another scholar Dhasmana (1987: 200-214) notices “the psychological mentality of the elite class and how the migrant claim has been a status symbol during different times” and calls this the “migrant syndrome”.
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He elaborates that:

From time immemorial it (migrant syndrome) has been a typical characteristic of the people of Garhwal and Kumaon, specially of the elites..., sooner a person attained some status in socio-economic field, he claimed to have migrated from different parts of the country. This syndrome as a status symbol was in vogue for over four hundred years. During this period leading class of the Brahman and Rajput castes could list their claims to have migrated from different parts of the country and established a superior hierarchy over the remaining people....The migrant claim was a race for social status and an attempt to sever links from the Trans-Himalayan culture. In this process the people living in this area developed a sense of discontent for their culture and ethnic origin(ibid:202).

With the establishment of the British rule in the hills migration to the plains for education and employment began. For over a century, preceding Indian independence, it was a kind of seasonal migration of rural hill population to the cities in the plains. Later, those who got good jobs or succeeded in earning money started settling down in the place of their work. “Not everyone of them revealed their origin. Some such settlers dropped their agnatic clan titles and adopted the common prevalent caste titles in plains”(Ibid:203).

During the last fifty years Garhwalis have been quite successful in various fields. “They are not shy of their origin and are proud to
call themselves as the Garhwali. People who had dropped their
agnatic clan titles have reverted to their usage. A new concept in
the migrant syndrome has become the status symbol today. This
is the concept of being a Garhwali but settled outside Garhwali" (Ibid:203).

If the ideologues of the movement had focused on the linguistic-
cultural identity as a bases of mobilization the 'migrant syndrome'
and the desire to identify with the 'ideal image' of the Himalayas
would have played a divisive role. It would have affected the
process of mobilization adversely. Hence, the emphasis on
distinct geography and underdevelopment of the region.
Oommen (1990) defines organisation of a movement as "the machinery through which the ideology is sought to be propagated and communicated". A movement's organisation translates its ideology into programmes. In the life span of over a half a Century, Uttarakhand movement has seen many organisations appear and disappear, passing through the process of fission and fusion, or lying dormant forever (see Chapter 2).

The third and the fourth phase of the movement, from late 1970s to the end of 1995, are marked by proliferation of associations. In the late 1970s many student organisations such as the Uttarakhand Chhatra Sangh, the Uttrakhand Tarun Sangh, the Uttrakhand Chhatra – Yuva Sangh came into existence in Delhi. In the same period Uttarakhand region witnessed emergence of the Uttaranchal Rajya Parishad and the Uttarakhand Rajya Parishad formed by well known leaders, Indramani Badoni and Trepan Singh Negi respectively. These associations could not survive for long.

During 1980s associations grew like mushrooms in Delhi. The organisations such as the Uttarakhand Sangarsh Samiti, the Uttarakhand Mahasamaj, the Uttarakhand Pragitisheel Yuva
Manch, the Uttarakhand Rajya Nirman Parishad were formed but disappeared soon after. The trend continued till early 1990s. B. R. Tamta, the former Municipal Commissioner of Delhi formed the Uttarakhand Vikas Sangharsh Manch and the Sanyuk Uttarakhand Rajya Morcha in 1991 and 1994 respectively. Some organisations like the Uttarakhand Pragatisheel Morcha (1991), the Uttarakhand Chhatra Morcha (1992), the Parvatiya Parishad and the Akhil Bhartiya Garhwal Sabha came into existence in the region.

This part of the Chapter deals with the organisation of the Uttarakhand movement. Here, we discuss only those organisations which have had important bearing on the movement. These organisations not only persisted over relatively long periods of time but also contributed to the ideology of the movement. The processual linkage between ideology and organisation is manifested here.

The Uttarakhand Kranti Dal

In July 1979 many intellectuals from all over Uttarakhand representing different walks of life gathered at Mussoorie to discuss issues relating to Uttarakhand. The deliberations lasted two days. The participants felt the need for a regional political party to champion the cause of Uttarakhand
movement. Thus, Uttarakhand Kranti Dal (UKD) was formed. D.D. Pant, former Vice-chancellor of Kumaon University, was elected its founding president.

The UKD pursued a single point agenda: to achieve statehood for Uttarakhand. It believes that only a separate Uttarakhand state can make up for the deficiencies, solve the problems, stop outflow of the resources, and protect the cultural heritage of the region. This is the only way to speed up the process of development and to bring Uttarakhand on par with other regions.

An important achievement of the UKD has been that it has succeeded in popularizing the demand for a separate state among the masses in Uttarakhand. Before its coming into being the movement was confined to the meetings and seminars organized by the intellectuals in the cities like Delhi, Bombay, Lucknow or Chandigarh. The rallies organized by the UKD at Kumaon Commissionary Headquarters at Nainital in 1986 and at Garhwal Commissionary Headquarters at Pouri in 1987 successfully re-oriented the movement towards the hills. Another rally on Nov. 23 1987 at Delhi boat club drew people's attention towards the issue of Uttarakhand. The UKD also observed bandhs in Uttarakhand region in September 1987, September 1988 and February 1991 to press for its demand.
In February 1989, the UKD in a unique way tried to neutralize the ill-effects of the forest (conservation) acts, on the Uttarakhand region. Thousands of development projects in the hills were held up for want of mandatory environmental clearance from the Central government. The UKD decided to resort to direct action when the talks with the government failed. It called upon the people to fell the trees coming in the way of implementation of development schemes and plant more trees to compensate for the loss.

The UKD held its first annual convention at Haldwani in 1980 and released its constitution. It states the party's commitment to employ non-violent Gandhian means to pursue its goal of achieving statehood for Uttarakhand. It also sheds light on the UKD's vision of future Uttarakhand State. It informs that the UKD will endeavour to establish in Uttarakhand State, when it comes into being, a socialistic society free from all forms of exploitation.

In the assembly elections held in 1980, the UKD ran its candidates and could manage to win one seat. Its candidate Jaswant Singh Bisht got elected from Ranikhet. Despite limited resources and inexperience the UKD managed to get 15.2 per cent of the total valid votes polled. It generated some hopes for the UKD to become a mass based regional political party to
champion the cause of Uttarakhand movement. But at the same time some opined that it was premature to get into electoral politics. In 1985 the UKD again contested the elections and its candidate Kashi Singh Airee got elected from Didihat Assembly seat.

The critics allege that the UKD strayed away from the path of movement and lost itself in the labyrinth of electoral politics. In 1989 elections the UKD formed an alliance with the Janta Dal. Though, the tie-up with a big political party helped it win Ranikhet and Didihat Assembly seats, it proved self-defeating in the long run. The UKD’s image got tarnished and it lost its credibility. In the next elections in 1991 it had to pay dearly for its political opportunism. Both of its candidates failed to get re-elected. Its percentage of votes decreased from 19.79 in 1989 to 2.92 in 1991.

Apart from this the general state of affairs in the party has never been good. Barring the first few years, the UKD has always suffered from the problem of factionalism. All the existing political parties in the region have originated partly from the UKD. There is lack of internal democracy in the party. K.S. Airee has been sticking to the post of the party president since 1986 when he was elected to it for the first time. Over the period, the discontent in
the party had been on the rise and in July 1992 in the annual meeting at Chamoli the change seemed imminent but Airee managed to stay on by reshuffling other office bearers. In 1993 the UKD split for the second time leading to the formation of UKD (D) under the leadership of P S Dangwal. The first split had occurred way back in 1987 when the breakaway group formed the Uttarakhand Jana Parishad (Uttarakhand People's Council).

The Uttarakhand Jan Sangharsh Vahini

The Uttarakhand Jan Sangharsh Vahini (UJSV) came into existence in August, 1989. Its precursor the Uttarakhand Sangharsh Vahini had been on the scene for long but it did not associate itself with the movement for a separate state. Though it took active part in Chipko and anti-liquor movement in the hills, it extended its support to Uttarakhand movement only in 1988. It joined the movement with the slogan “Naye Bharat Ke Liye Naya Uttarakhand” (A new Uttarakhand in a new India). A year later, the Vahini renamed itself as the Uttarakhand Jana Sangharsh Vahini after its merger with Uttarakhand Pragatisheel Yuva Morcha and Uttarakhand Jana Parishad (a breakaway group of the UKD) which shared common ideology and objectives with the former. The student wings of the Vahini and
the Uttarakhand Jana Parishad also fused to form the All Uttarakhand Students Federation.

The ideology of the UJSV differs from that of the UKD for the former looks at the problems of Uttarakhand region through an all-India perspective. It believes that mere creation of a separate state within the existing political set-up cannot solve the problems of the region. The conditions in the region can be improved only when the new state has enough autonomy to decide its priorities and type of development it needs. This is possible only in a truly democratic, secular and federal political set-up. Here, the struggle in Uttarakhand region becomes a part of the larger struggle going on in the country for the establishment of a true federalism or a 'new India'. For this reason, the UJSV has always been in league with other mass movements in the country.

The UJSV claimed that the region possessed all the pre-requisites of a regional identity and a self-sufficient state. It aimed to highlight available resources and to work out programmes and strategies to utilize these
resources to achieve its goal through peaceful and democratic means.

Like the UKD, the UJSV also is confined only to some parts of Kumaon. Its Delhi and Bombay units provided only lip service to the cause of the movement. The UJSV too could not resist the attraction of electoral politics. Its leader S.S. Bisht contested 1989 Lok Sabha election from Almora on a Janata Dal ticket. He not only lost the election but also his reputation. His political opportunism became manifest to one and all. In July 1991, the UJSV split. The Splinter group formed Uttarakhand Mahasabha in New Delhi.

The Uttarakhand Mukti Morcha (Uttarakhand Liberation Front)

The Uttarakhand Mukti Morcha (UMM) was formed in January 1991 by a group of people with leftist ideology. The main objective behind its formation was to bring under one banner all the organisations and forces working for the cause of Uttarakhand State. Its membership was open to all secular minded people including those already members of other political
parties or organisations. Thus its members could hold dual membership.

The ideology of the UMM is similar to that of the UJSV. It too underscores the need to look at the problems of Uttarakhand region in the context of the country at large. The problem of underdevelopment in the region cannot be tackled in isolation. There is a need for decentralisation of political power. The Centre should delegate more powers to the states of the Union. It believes that the separatist movements in India basically seek political autonomy and fulfillment of their identity aspirations.

The UMM resolved to wage a joint struggle to gain statehood for Uttarakhand. There were many political parties and groups of people agitating for the formation of a separate state of Uttarakhand. In spite of having a common objective these organisations did not have a mechanism to coordinate their activities. Consequently lots of movement energy was being wasted. So, the need for a common front to spearhead the movement was realised. Thus, the UMM was formed to channelise all the movement energy in one direction through
common programmes of action for all the agitating groups. UMM’s constitution is silent on the issue of contesting elections.

On February 20, 1992 the UMM and the All India Ex-Soldiers’ Action Committee held a joint rally at Delhi Boat Club. The Ex-Servicemen declared their support to the movement and a joint memorandum was submitted to the Prime Minister of India. The UMM observed a daylong bandh in Garhwal on February 27, 1993.

Uttarakhand Party

The Uttarakhand Party was formed in Delhi in 1992 by coming together of individuals from UKD, the Uttarakhand Mahasabha (a splinter group of the UJSV), the Indian National Congress and some organisations of emigrant Uttarakhandis in Delhi. The founding president of the party, Jagdish Kapri, had earlier been a founding member of the UKD and worked for it in Bombay for a long time. The Uttarakhand Party maintained that the long neglect of the region by the successive governments both at the Centre and in the State of UP was the main cause behind the backwardness of the region. Its manifesto states that
"Perhaps, it is a deliberate attempt on the part of the ruling elite of the country to continue neglect of the region to perpetuate poverty otherwise where will the servants come from to work in their house" (translated from Hindi).

The Uttarakhand Party committed itself to develop a strong organisation in Uttarakhand and big cities in the plains to provide direction and momentum to the half-a-century old movement to achieve its goal. It promised to evolve a committed leadership ready to make any sacrifice for the cause of the movement. The party resolved to protect the interest and dignity of the emigrant Uttarakhandis.

The Uttarakhand party made it clear that it would neither contest any elections nor form an alliance with any political party till the formation of a separate state of Uttarakhand. However, its members were free to contest elections outside the Uttarakhand region to mobilize support for the movement. One of the objectives of the party was to press for inclusion of regional languages of Uttarakhand in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India. But the party did
not specify the languages to be included. The party was also to seek protection under Article 371 of the constitution to stop outsiders to buy land in Uttarakhand region. The party took note of the hardships faced by the women in the region and promised to improve their plight.

A month after its formation the Uttarakhand Party organised a seminar for emigrant Uttarakhandi women in Delhi. It was something no other regional party in Uttarakhand had ever done. It promised jobs to women by opening up cooperative societies. But their efforts couldn't fructify owing to lack of communication and factionalism in the women cell of the party.

As soon as the Uttarakhand Party emerged on the scene it carved a niche for itself in the movement. Its leaders toured in Uttarakhand region several times. It got good media coverage. It seemed that the party would surpass all other regional political outfits in terms of popularity. But very soon the enthusiasm of its rank and file evaporated. The members of the executive committee lost interest in the meetings. The communication gap between the President and other
office bearers increased. The President often took decisions without taking into confidence other office bearers. Ultimately some office bearers resigned dubbing the party as "One-man show".

In 1993 the party President's decision to support the BJP in the elections in Uttarakhand region sounded a death knell for the Uttarakhand Party. All along, Jagdish Kapri had held the BJP as the most formidable obstacle in the path of statehood for Uttarakhand. This about turn in the strategy, without taking the office bearers and the rank and file into confidence was to meet the President's ambitions. He later asked all the office bearers collectively to submit their resignation. The party failed to make any impression in the Uttarakhand region.

Yugmanch

Yugmanch, a theatre group was founded in 1975 by a group of intellectuals, writers and stage artists form Nainital to promote drama and folk arts. Since its inception Yugmanch has given over 300 performances of about 30 plays of different genres. As a cultural organisation Yugmanch played an important role in the
last phase of Uttarakhand movement. In September 1994 when the movement was gathering momentum the activists of Yugmanch started organizing 'Prabhat feri' (morning march). Every morning they would walk from street to street in Nainital city singing inspiring songs, exhorting people to come forward and be a part of the movement. It infused enthusiasm into the agitationists to continue their struggle in spite of state repression.

Yugmanch and Jana Sanskriti Manch together brought out an audio-cassette titled 'Kadam mila ke chal' consisting of ten songs. All composed and recorded by amateur artist-activists as part of the struggle. Music too was composed by non-professionals. The songs became an integral part of the protests and meetings of the agitationists.

On October 16, 1994. The Yugmanch with Maitree (an organisations of women) held a poster exhibition in Nainital. A total of 99 posters were on display. It provided a platform to the common people to express through collage, cartoons and poetry their views and reactions on the happenings of previous two and a half months. The exhibition got a good response from the
people who turned up in large numbers to see the posters on themes like state repression, dirty politics of power, issue of reservation for OBCs and their resolve to carry on the agitation.

The Uttarakhand Parvatiya Rajya Parishad (Uttarakhand Hill State Council)

In 1967 local members of the Communist Party of India (CPI) held a two day convention (on June 24-25) at Ram Nagar. The meeting culminated in the formation of the Parvatiya Rajya Parishad to start the movement for the formation of a separate state. On the concluding day a rally was organised which was attended by a large number of people from surrounding areas. In January 1973, the Parishad, now re-named as Uttarakhand Parvartiya Rajya Parishad, in collaboration with emigrants held a meeting in Delhi and organised a rally on January 28 to press for the demand of a separate hill state. It called upon the people to march to Delhi.

In September 1979, the CPI formally extended its support to the movement. Hitherto its local supporters in the hills organised the movement in their individual
capacity. In 1985 the members of the CPI along with its student wing and youth wing undertook a cycle march to generate consciousness about the movement in the region. The participants covered many parts of Garhwal over a period of 20 days. The regional representatives of the CPI met at Rishikesh in May 1987 to constitute a Hill State Committee to organise the movement. The Committee held rallies at Pouri and Uttarakhashi district headquarters in April 1989 and December 1990 respectively. The CPI in its annual conference at Calcutta in March 1989 adopted a resolution in support of the demand for Uttarakhand State. It also submitted a memorandum to the President of India demanding carving out of a separate state of Uttarakhand out of hill districts of western UP and Haridwar.

**Uttaranchal Pradesh Sangharsh Samiti**

In 1987 Atal Bihari Vajpayee then President of the BJP expressed his views against the demand for a separate Uttarakhand state. But the national executive committee of the BJP in its annual meeting, presided over by L.K. Advani, favoured the formation of smaller states. It committed itself to work for the formation of separate
states of Uttaranchal and Vanachal. Therefore, the Uttaranchal Pradesh Sanghārsh Samiti (UPSS) was constituted in September 1988 at Almora to strive for the formation of Uttaranchal State. M.M.Joshi was appointed its life time convener. The UPSS formed a unit in Delhi also.

In February 1989, the UPSS organised a rally at Almora. L.K.Advani addressed the rally and reiterated the party's support to the movement. In April the Samiti held a Uttaranchal Rajya Sammelan (Uttaranchal State Seminar) at Ramse College, Almora presided over by M.M.Joshi on 12 April 1990, Delhi unit of the UPSS held a rally at Boat-Club. The government offices were forced to close-down in Uttaranchal on May 20, 1990. The Delhi unit of the UPSS organised a sit-in at Boat-Club on December 16, 1991 and held a rally at Jantar-Mantar on 30 April, 1993.

Ideology determines the type of organization that develop in a movement. In Uttarakhand movement only political associations emerged as its objectives were economic and political. Here we notice a complete absence of literary and cultural associations.
Leadership

Uttarakhand Movement has been on the scene for over six decades. In this long span of time many leaders emerged and disappeared. With the changes in leadership there had been concomitant changes in the issues raised and styles of communication. In the pre-independence period leaders such as Hargovind Pant, Badridutta Pandey, Pratap Singh Negi and Umanand Barthwal raised the issue of distinct identity of Uttarakhand Region and its special needs for development. In the first decade after independence this demand was raised from time to time by P.C. Joshi, Indra Singh Nyal and Veer Chandra Singh Garhwali. But these leaders could not make it a public issue.

In 1957 Manverndra Shah, the former king of Tehri State, which merged with India in 1949, raised the issue of Uttrarkhand. It is possible that the issue was being used by him to regain the lost prestige and political base. His influence was confined only to Tehri district.

Till the end of 1970s upper caste educated urban middle class leaders such as Daya Krishna Pandey, Govind Singh Mehra, Narendra Singh Bisht, Indramani Badoni, Rishi Ballabh Sundriyal, Lakshman Singh Adhikari, Jagdamba Prasad, Shoorvir Singh Panwar, Trepan Singh Negi and a few others sporadically organized demonstrations and seminars. It was a curious mixture
of leaders who were politically unattached and those affiliated to political parties. Many who had political affiliations were committed to the cause of Uttarakhand but at the same time were bound by the ideology of their party; whoever gained political power considered the issue of statehood dead but for those in the opposition it was ever alive. Everybody wanted to capitalise on the issue but none made sincere efforts to take it to the rural masses. They organised rallies and demonstrations in Delhi, perhaps because they could not mobilise people in Uttarakhand region (Pathak 1989).

It is not that masses in Uttarakhand region lacked political consciousness. They participated in the Chipko and Anti-liquor movement in large numbers. Interestingly a section of political elite of the region integrated into India national and UP state politics did not take part in these agitations. Probably they were confused for the elite-mass gap was too wide to allow them to see clearly what was taking place at grassroots level. In 1970s Uttarakhand witnessed the emergence of a new kind of politics which became a cause of concern for the ruling party and the opposition alike. For it sowed the seeds of a unified ‘Pahari’ identity (Berreman 1983; Pathak 1989).
In 1980s leaders like Dwarika Prasad Uniyal (who played an important role in the formation of the UKD), D.D. Pant, Indramani Badoni and Jaswant Singh Bisht gave a new direction to the movement by making efforts to mobilise support for the cause in the region itself. They played an important role in popularizing the demand in Uttarakhand region.

In the last stages of mobilizational phase of the movement almost all the national and state level parties which in UP extended their support to the movement. The Congress and the CPI (M) were the only parties which did not support the demand. In the 1990s there was no clear-cut leadership for the movement. Indra Mani Bodoni(1921-1999) was the only person who was accepted as a leader in both Garhwal and Kumaon. Scores of political and non-political associations were active in the movement without any coordination among themselves.

From the beginning of the movement till the formation of UttaraKhand state the leadership was never unanimous about the specific objective of the movement. Some favoured an autonomous Uttarakhand within UP, others preferred a Union Territory but the majority sought a separate Uttarakhand State similar to other states in Indian Union.
Throughout the span of the movement leadership has been a monopoly of the Brahmins and the Rajputs who constitute about 75 per cent of the population in the region. The Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and the religious minorities (Sikhs, Muslims and Christians) were not represented in the leadership for these categories, by and large, did not support the movement. The SCs who constitute about 18 per cent of the population complain that nobody cares for their opinion. The minorities got alienated because of the communal tone adopted by one particular national political party.