CHAPTER-II

STATE AUTONOMY: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Defining the class character of the Indian state is a difficult and complex problem, as one has to take into account the philosophical and historical foundations of the state. The existing economic and social classes, the prevailing modes of production and the relationships of domination and subordination in the social set up of which the political pattern is the ostensible expression. An analysis of class structure also involves a study of the economic basis of society. Besides the role of different classes, state autonomy to certain class or to its fraction and the nature of relationship between the dominant class and the managers of the state will have to be empirically established.

State is one of the important institutions of society. It emerges with the emergence of the classes and class conflicts. It has to play a significant role in maintaining the existing socio-economic order. In a society, which is divided into classes, the state cannot act as a neutral entity. It acts with a bias in favour of that class which possesses land capital. It is the dominant or ruling class, which wins and controls the means of material and mental production, and appropriates surplus value. In this situation, the state is considered to be subservient to the economically dominant ruling class. This point is contested by Nicos Poulantazs and the Neo-Marxists who hold that the state is not an instrument or class rule because there is a specific autonomy of political structure from economic instance of political power from economic power.¹
The question of specific autonomy and relative independence of politics and state is quite crucial. Without going into the detail of the debate over specific autonomy it has been argued that the state and the exercise of state power occurs within particular class contexts and lies beyond the maximising propensity of the state managers as particular patterns of class relations that reinforce the limits of state managers. But it is not possible for the state managers to be ants or the servants of the ruling class. The class power cannot be automatically translated into state power. Infact there is no automatic translation. Thus the ruling class and state managers are two different entities. The two may overlap but at the same time may remain separate and different. It..."Remains and cannot in a class society but remain the protector of an economically and socially dominant class". 2

The state is important precisely because it is the system for determining the boundaries and the rules of all the other systems of activity in a community. Political authority is the way in which communities regulates all their different spheres for owning, producing and exchanging not merely goods and services, but also status, honour, kinship, customs; shame and blame. All these spheres have production and distribution systems of their own, but all are ultimately defined and defended by the state. Political authority also has a sphere of its own, whose shape, size and scope varies between societies, and which is in turn limited by a variety of processes. The state's sphere is about the power of some people to control and regulate the activities of others on behalf of a central authority.
Individual citizens, as members of a community, therefore participate in a number of different spheres of activity of which the economic and political are likely to be the most important determinants of their status, influence, opportunities and constraints. Their individuality is shaped within these systems of relationship, and acquire a meaning through their membership of the community to which they belong. Individual human beings possess certain characteristics, rationality, free will and moral agency, which seem to mark them out as different from other living organisms and give them some kind of autonomy, based on their decisions about their actions. This autonomy appears to be connected with individuals.

However, the nature of this autonomy is shadowy. Does it reside in every human being as a primary quality, prior to any other characteristics or possessions they subsequently acquire and choices they may make? Or can it be understood only in terms of the actual conditions in which they live, in which their personalities develop, and their life plans are made? These questions have an important bearing on how the rights of individuals and the powers of the state have been analyzed.

There are a number of elements in a state, which go to make up an individuals requirement for autonomy. First an individual needs some basic security and predictability about his or her life-to be safe from physical assault, to have the means for physical survival, to know what other resources are at his or her disposal, to know that these will not be stolen and so on. Second, an individual needs certain rights against being compelled to do things other than follow his or
her plans. Forced labour or military service infringes autonomy, unless they can be shown to be a necessary for the basic security, which is the first condition for autonomy. Third, an individual needs to have choices between courses of action, and to have the opportunity, information and incentive to exercise these choices. Without these elements the autonomy, which consists in having one's own principles, plans and projects, will not be a practicable reality.

The state's rule over its subjects can be justified in terms of its ability to provide the conditions for these elements to be available to them, they have become the citizenship. The state's original concern was with security – the protection of the community from outside attack, and of individuals from attacks by others and in early societies its role did not extend far beyond these spheres. In advanced societies the state is also concerned with protecting individuals from unwarranted compulsion, and with ensuring freedom of choice. But each of these spheres contains difficult issues, new issues about autonomy keep appearing as societies develop, and economic relations change. Thus the state becomes open to new claims from groups of citizens who feel radically disadvantaged in relation to others.4

In developing countries where political decisions at the top are the main instrument through which resources are distributed, emergence of regional parties as an effective means to control the government or atleast to have a share in political decision making becomes a natural form of regional, expression. It does not pose a threat to national unity and security. Such a threat appears which different groups suffer from a sense of cultural domination or
economic inequality. The problem therefore is to balance two different forces of unity and diversity, of centralization, of political decision-making and of state autonomy. It is not merely a problem of institutional erosion but also of constitutional arrangement.

India is not yet a modern state in the full sense of the term but actually is an old civilization consisting of a large number of cultural and linguistic groups which want to maintain their identity and to ensure their development within a political union. The process of modernization and development is affecting the transformation of the country as a whole and also of these ethnic and cultural groups. The question is what should be our goal—the establishment of a modern nation state or to achieve the development of the various constituent elements of the Indian civilization with all its multiplicity and distinctiveness. Sooner we accept the fact that India cannot be transformed into a Weberian nation-state better it is for us. If this interpretation is accepted then it will be clear that unity should be sought not merely in terms of imposed external unity by a strong central government but also in terms of the recognition of ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity of the people and their willing cooperation. The states must become an equal partner in the progress of the country their autonomy should be strengthened and respected. The state autonomy should be synthesized with political unity of the country. National interest should be harmonized with regional aspirations.

Nobody will contest that unity and security of the country should be maintained, as without national unity and security,
autonomy of the units will be meaningless. The question is whether this unity should be sought in terms of imposed external unity by a strong centre or in terms of the recognition of ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity of the people and their willing co-operation. In a multi-ethnic society like ours maximum autonomy should be conceded to units but at the same time political unity of the country must be maintained. While it should be accepted that the need for decentralization is a historic necessity. It must not be carried too far to jeopardize our national interest. Any suggestion to restrict the power of the central government to their subject of defence, currency and foreign affairs ought to be rejected. But states must become equal and willing partners in the development of the country.

Autonomy has become one of the major concerns of our social and political existence. Right to autonomous life is now a political, cultural, and social call of both individual and the groups a rare conformity that points to the critical importance of the problematic of autonomy in the agenda of critical thinking. The notion of autonomy, both as something that belongs to human beings and human nature, and as something that is the source or basis of morality that is duty, is bound up inextricably with the philosophy of our time. The term began to be applied primarily or even exclusively in a political context to civic communities possessing independent legislative and self governing authority. Then the term was taken up again in the context of individual rational persons that is in the context of their individual rights and existence, for their individual rights and existences, for their individual modes of behaviors. In the background of the upsurge of anti-colonial movements the term gained new perspective and
meaning, which would now imply not only new rights, but also new responsibilities, autonomy means it became, the emblem of group rights, in particular minority rights. In time the idea of autonomy became not only the standard of rights or responsibilities, but also an issue of governmentality – something that denotes transaction, government negotiation, and relating to others on the basis of set rules. So now we have questions, if autonomy has been emblematic of rights, does it take into account the gendered nature of the term? Can we trace the birth of the autonomous subject? What are the relevant constitutional and juridical thoughts shaping the universe of autonomy? Why is autonomy, an idea that holds universal attraction for mass politics, related to so much violence? Is autonomy one more regulated term, or is the concept autonomous, so that we can speak of autonomy of the autonomies? And is private property, to go to the fundamentals, a problematic for autonomy? What is autonomy without access to resources? On the other hand, if forms of ownership of resources determine autonomy, what is left of autonomy as a norm? if we relate the concept of autonomy to the more familiar notions of freedom or self-determination, we can locate in this case the questions of responsibility and the conditions of freedom. Autonomy generally is held as a valued condition for persons in liberal cultures.⁶

In the context of the emerging demands for group autonomy, the further question to be probed is if this not now the occasion to investigate and re-envision the concept of democracy with the norm, principles, and various forms of autonomy and more importantly in a way, where the standards of minimal justice become the foundation for a new democratic outlook inscribed by practices of autonomy.
perched on understanding of each other. Accommodation becomes the form of responsibility for the agency that will’s autonomy.

Autonomy is a freedom or self-determination.\(^7\) we can locate it in the question of responsibility and condition of freedom. Autonomy generally is held as a valued condition for persons in liberal cultures. We uphold autonomous agent as the exemplar of persons who by their judgment and action, authenticate the social and political principles and policies that advanced their interest. Autonomy is more importantly in a way, where the standards of minimal justice become the foundation for a new democratic outlook inscribed by practices of autonomy perched on understanding of each other.

Thus we require both historical and analytical understanding of the issue for a critical enterprise. We require moreover deeper and rigorous understanding of the geo-political and ethno-political grounds on which the calls for autonomy is now articulated and which modulate the self’s understanding of the norm. Similarly the need is to inquire into the ethical grounds on which the call for autonomy is given and practices of autonomy continue. Thus the purpose of this study is to inquire, into meaning and concept of autonomy, their historical background, nature and their political significance.

MEANING AND DEFINITION OF STATE AUTONOMY

‘Autonomy has its etymological roots in the two Greek words for ‘self’ and ‘rule’ or ‘law’.\(^8\) Thus autonomy is literally means ‘self-rule’ or ‘independence’.
The grammatical meaning of the term 'autonomy' is the right of self-government or freedom of self-rule. But in a federal set-up state autonomy does not mean the independence or sovereignty of the states. It indicates two aspects negative and positive. Negative means non-interference of the centre in the prescribed domain of the states. Positive means the rights of the state to work independently in the prescribed area. Thus autonomy has assumed the character of 'state rights', which has been the bone of the federal systems. "State autonomy" does not mean the independence or sovereignty of the states. It stands for non-interference of the centre in the prescribed domain of the states. The right of the states to work independently in the prescribed area is called autonomy.

The provincial autonomy means that in a federal form of government, the units should have sufficient and adequate legislative and administrative powers without any interference from outside control and adequate financial resources for implementing and executing its plans for reconstructing the society on modern welfare lines without any control of the central government in any way.

The term 'provincial autonomy' means, irreducible minimum of political power which has to be granted to the units in order to give them enough facility to develop their own resources according to their own means and needs and in their own way... to put it in another way, the provincial autonomy means in realistic terms the right and capacity of a political party elected with a majority to the state assembly on a particular election program, to put that programme into execution and make it a success unhampered either directly or indirectly by the centre.
According to Niklas Lulimann "autonomy is a legal system provides the ideal case for identifying the logic of social system. This logic maintains their internal coherence and unity through self-reference without resort to planned co-ordination. Because, legal institutions develop through the application of general legislative principle. Autonomy is co-ordination of plans in particular, there is a parallel focus on the inter relationships between formal institutional rules and informal tacit rules of conduct in everyday existence, as was shown in the conceptualization of social and institutional orders as the product of human action but not of human design".  

According to Richard Lindley "autonomy means no less than self-government perhaps in the sense of territorial sovereignty. It is usually records of the conventions of particular social groups. Autonomy one may expect to find different, through related ideas being considered under the umbrella of the key word democracy. Autonomy is a concept being a tool invented by human beings to make distinctions thoughts to be useful. It may be possible to test rival conceptions for adequacy. There are better and worse conceptions related to the different values".

According to Francine Franker "autonomy is a strength for crucial role of politics in the Indian modes of development where nation building, economic development and an egalitarian social order were all supposedly contingent upon the democratic process. Autonomy is further buttressed by the general point that irrespective of an economy of socialism or capitalism, the demand of national security, modern technology and a bureaucracy".
The word autonomy in the political context does not mean and was never intended to mean full independence free from outside control. The concept of autonomy and integration are not exclusively used in political context. Infact the application of these concepts could be easily discerned in the functioning of a system whether mechanical, social or even biological. Take for instance, the human body as a systemic whole, which is obviously an ideal example of an integrated system. It is integrated in the sense that if any part of the body is hurt, the whole body feels it and it's easy part is more or less affected by it. However, there are many sub-systems within the body which do function independently to a large extent viz, the digestive system the circulatory system, the respiratory system etc. these sub systems are not quite independent of each other but they can be termed as autonomous systems within a broad framework. Many such examples can be given for the functioning of big machines and also the natural systems.

In socio-political domains also the social engineers, scientists and analysts have borrowed these concepts from other fields and tried to make use of them not only in ordering the society but also for explaining and analyzing the related phenomena. Confining my discussion to political field in modern times, it appears to me that the organization of a single large political unit combining a number of small entities with a reasonable degree of independence has been a very appropriate and in able choice for political leaders seized with the problem of nation building. Credit goes to the builders of the American political system who thought about a frame work and invented a model of political organization representing an integrated national
system standing on the pillars of a member of autonomous states which were zealous of preserving their independence but at the same time desirous to come together to form a strong and able political unit. The American model has worked well for more than two hundred years, indeed with timely modifications in keeping with the changing circumstances. The United States has over the years grown into the most powerful nation-state. At the same time the functioning of its political system has also been exemplary and worth emulating. As such the American political model appealed to a number of Afro-Asian countries which emerged out of colonial rule in the post second world war period where the nature and problems of society demanded a federal polity based on the concepts of state autonomy and national integration. The formation of the Indian polity after independence was a case in point.

**CONCEPT OF AUTONOMY**

On 17 September 1978 an historic agreement was signed by President Jimmy Carter of the United States, President Anwar Sadat of Egypt, and Prime Minister Menachim Begin of Israel, it supposedly offered a solution to the Palestinian problem, which has been at the heart of the Middle East conflict since 1948. Sinai was returned to Egypt by Israel, and the Israelis agreed to offer 'autonomy' to the Palestinian Arabs living in the West Bank and Gaza regions. It was no coincidence that the agreement did not define 'autonomy'. Autonomy is, whatever it is, something apparently to be treasured; so the Israelis hoped they would be seen as having conceded something of value, and the Egyptians hoped they would be seen as having won something significant for the Palestinians.  
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It has since emerged that what the Israelis understood by 'autonomy' in the context of the Camp David Agreement is a very limited form of administrative control over some day-to-day affairs. If the Israelis have their way the lands over which the Palestinians might have 'autonomy' would come permanently under Israeli sovereignty, and the Israelis would maintain complete control over such vital matters as internal security and foreign policy. On the other hand the Egyptians understood by 'autonomy' something far more substantial. For them autonomy means no less than self-government. Although there is not eternally true conception of autonomy, the concept being a tool invented by human beings to make distinctions though to be useful, it may be possible to test rival conceptions for adequacy. An adequate conception must fall within the scope of the basic concept. Any conception of autonomy which entailed that people are autonomous if and only if they are never able to make any decisions about how to live their lives, would clearly be inadequate to the concept.\textsuperscript{17}

One reason for the disputes over rival conceptions of many political concepts is that these concepts are used with powerful evaluative force. Thus, 'democracy', 'freedom' and 'peace' are all thought to be so valuable to a decent life, that the claim, say, that a policy is essential for the protection of democracy immediately lends that policy support. Autonomy is, certainly within liberal democratic societies, such a concept. The autonomy of the individual is held to be vitally important. Therefore any adequate liberal conception of autonomy must be consistent with autonomy having this status. An adequate conception will, ideally, be an interpretation of 'autonomy',
which will make it clear why autonomy is held in such high regard. Of course this does not entail that the conception has to show that autonomy really is desirable, but only to render explicable why it is thought to be. This part of a justification of a conception is likely to be controversial, since there are disagreements about what constitutes a desirable political system or way of life. Another task for a political theorist investigating autonomy is to discuss the commitments implied by taking seriously one or other conception of autonomy. The prime reason for presenting political arguments is to persuade people by rational argument.

According to Richard Lindley, the conceptions of autonomy is significant in shaping liberal democratic thought about the state and the individuals and he also says that negative liberty is very much essential for the promotion of autonomy.\(^{18}\)

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF STATE AUTONOMY IN INDIA**

In a federal setup the basis of two sets of governing authority the centre and the state rests on the division of power. Conflicts and tension between the two conflicts and tension between the two authorities are inevitable and universal. This problem is as old as the concept of federation itself. It has troubled almost all federations through out the world at one time or the other and India is no exception.

The question aroused how far the states legislatures and the state governments enjoy in practice the autonomy, which they enjoy in theory. This depends on how effectively the constitution of our country is working instead of being reduced to ritualism next to the
constitution and the most important factor that affects autonomy is the impact of political system, more specifically the party system, makes on our constitutional system. It is not so much the text of the constitution as the working of parties that makes a difference to the working of autonomy of the states. With one party in control throughout our country for several years, autonomy of states almost ceased to exist in practice. With different parties at the centre and the states in power, autonomy is asserted and is necessary. In either case autonomy should be real, but in present practice that fact is being completely forgotten. State legislative parties are subjected to long ruling and almost all state ministers are nominated by the centre. This in itself detracts from autonomy and discourages it.

Till 1967 when the Congress party was ruling both in the centre and almost all the states, the relations between the centre and the states by and large were smooth and there were only a few tensions. If at all there were some differences between the centre and the states, they were resolved either on party basis or at the intra-governmental level. However this picture entirely changed in 1967 when non-Congress governments came to power in some states. These states governments challenged the dominant rule of the central government. They wanted greater independence of action. The states, which have been most vocal in criticizing the growing power of the centre and have put forward demand for greater autonomy included west-Bengal, Punjab, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu, later on Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Jammu and Kashmir also joined this category. These states demanded an over all review of the centre state relations.
According to Iqbal Narain "economic component" is the "crux of regionalism" and hence demand for autonomy by states and within states. India is underdeveloped economically. The resources are scarce and demands disproportionately heavy and ever growing in the wake of population explosion. There is thus acute competition among states and among individuals, groups and regions within a state. The tension between states over the location of steel plants and other heavy industries and charges of partisanship levied against the centre in this regard is another instance in point. The current controversy about state autonomy mainly centers round financial autonomy and democratic decentralization. States are financially poor and look always to the centre for relief. State's deficit budget, their loans from market and overdrafts and their debt to Centre have compelled them to clamour for greater financial autonomy. States find it almost impossible to implement their socio-economic programmes with their limited resources of income. If one reads between the lines the memorandum submitted by West Bengal CPM led government and the Akali Dal resolution passed at All India Akali Dal conference at Ludhiana (Oct. 28-29, 1978), it becomes clear that their main fight is for fairer deal in financial resources and for more fiscal autonomy. Politicians consolidate and enlarge their mass base by their persistent demand for more autonomy for states for regions within the states. This is more so particularly in case of regional parties-National Conference in Jammu and Kashmir, Akali Dal in Punjab, DMK and AIDMK in Tamil Nadu and Telugu-Desam in Andhra Pradesh. Because of economic compulsions whenever there is erosion in the mass support base of these parties, they resort to the demand for more state
autonomy and sometimes for secession even. Akalis for example are more vocal and communalize the issue of State autonomy when in opposition and take moderate postures when in government.

**THE DMK AND DEMAND FOR STATE AUTONOMY**

The DMK of Tamil Nadu is a product of regional politics, hence its urge for powers to the states is not unnatural. Karunanidhi the former chief minister realized the need for a balance between populist slogans and the benefits of a federation and, thus, he made the issue of state autonomy the kingpin of his administrative policy. During his rule centre-state relations reached an acute stage and during his regime only the Rajmunnar Committee was appointed to examine the entire question of centre-state relations. The recommendations of the committee are of major significance. Karunanidhi stood “for restructuring the relations between the Centre and the states on the principle of true, wholesome federalism and state autonomy”.20 We will be dealing with this in detail in coming chapter.

**THE AKALI DAL AND THE STATE AUTONOMY**

The Akali leadership in Punjab also voiced the same sentiment. In 1966-67 the Akalies demanded, “this newly created Punjab state be accorded the same status and powers which are given to the state of Jammu and Kashmir under the Indian Constitution of 1950. In October 1973, the Akali Dal working committee passed an important state autonomy resolution, the resolution says; “in this new Punjab, along with other states, the central spheres should be limited to the subjects of Defence, Foreign affairs, Railway, post and telegraphs and currency. Rest of the subjects should be within the jurisdiction of
Punjab and for whose management, the Punjab should have the right to frame its own constitution. The Akali Dal has reiterated this maximal autonomy demand on several subsequent occasions also, the latest being the adoption of the Anandpur Sahib Resolution by the open session of the 18th All India Akali Conference on October 28-29, 1978 at Ludhiana. Gurucharan Singh Tohra, while moving the main political resolution on "autonomy of the State" said "the restructuration of the Centre-State relationship and decentralization of power accordingly", essential for:

a) Preserving and safeguarding the being and self-identity of nations and nationalities and collectively make the Indian people:

b) Protecting the rights and interests of the minorities;

c) Realizing the imperatives and demands of democracy democratic system and functioning; and

d) Removing impediments in the way of economic growth and progress caused by lopsided over-centralized monopolistic planning.

The majority of the leaders, however, would like to assign only four or five subjects of national importance to the centre. While the remaining two leaders plainly demanded a Sikh Home-land-a sort of autonomous Sikh state within the Indian Union. Two moderate views on the subjects are reproduced below:

1) "At present states cannot work independently. More powers should be assigned to them in the developmental and financial
sphere. I am not rigid regarding central powers. It may have more than four subjects. But the trouble is that the centre dictates even in the case of state list. I demand more powers to all states and not for the Punjab alone. There is not a single big industry in Punjab. Our demand is not for autonomous states but simply for more powers to the states\textsuperscript{21}

2) Center should retain foreign affairs, defense, communication and currency. What I stress on more economic and financial powers to the states. The justification of the demand is that once the yoke of the centre goes, states would work independently and they will not have to run to Delhi for each and every thing.

3) States in India are in the position of Municipalities and centre wants to seize whatever rights states already have. State autonomy under present set up is meaningless. No project within a state can be commissioned without clearance from the Centre.

4) We want more powers to the states because the constitution is practically unitary and the states are merely municipalities. Even demarcated state fields are violated by the centre—Agriculture is a state subject but laws are dictated by the centre.

5) We want more powers only for Punjab. It has nothing to do with other states. We are a nation; Hindus dominate both at the Centre and states, while we have no say at the centre. What I demand is a separate constitution for Punjab right to issue
passports, currency and a separate flag as during the reign of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, centre to have only foreign affairs, Defence and communication.

After analyzing the attitude of Akali Dal towards the problem of state autonomy, further question arises to what extent the demand of state autonomy raised by the Akali Dal is justified and how more autonomy can be given to the states without posing a threat to the National government? In answer to this question this author says that the demand made for financial autonomy by the Akali Dal is highly justified and is fully in line with the financial autonomy demand made by some other states. The states are always financially in a very tight position. Hence, the Centre should accept the legitimate financial demands raised by the Akali Dal. But so far as the demand for political autonomy is concerned it is neither feasible nor acceptable because it may lead to disintegration of the country.

**THE WEST BENGAL AND STATE AUTONOMY**

The West Bengal Government document on centre-state relations (adopted in its cabinet meeting on 1st December 1977) demands a thorough revision of the centre-state relations and also calls for amending the articles concerning the distribution of resources between the union and the states. Under the Janata Party rule, provoked by the planning commission guidelines sent to the states for the formation of their plans and the prime Minister’s letter to them regarding their performance in family planning, the West Bengal Government, in order to secure greater autonomy, has intensified its campaign for the revision of centre-state relations. The
West Bengal Finance Minister and Planning Commission had no mandate to issue such guidelines and these were not applicable to them.

While arguing in favour of the provincial autonomy Jyoti Basu pleaded: “the present political situation with a number of states run by parties different from that which governs at the centre warrants more than ever a massive restructuring of the existing federal arrangements in favour of the states”.22

The west Bengal government document on centre-state relations suggests that:

a) The jurisdiction of the centre should be restricted to defence, foreign affairs, including foreign trade, currency and communication and economic co-ordination.

b) All the other subjects, including the residual jurisdiction should be the exclusive concern of the states. Accordingly the relevant articles of the constitution should be so amended that the centre would not be able to interfere in the affairs of the states in any way even the presidents assent to a state bill would not be necessary.

c) The centre and the states should have separate administrative services with exclusive authority over them.

d) All states should have equal representation in the Rajya Sabha, the special status of Kashmir laid down in article 370 should be maintained, and all citizens should have the right to correspond with the administrative at all levels in their mother tongue.
e) The articles regarding the Finance commission and the distribution of revenue should be amended to provide for 75 percent of the total revenues raised by the centre from all sources for allocation to different states by the finance commission. It should not be the task of the finance commission to decide on the proportion of revenues to be distributed between the centre and the states. Its task should be only to fix the proportion each state should get from the total financial realization by the centre, 75 percent of which is to be allotted to the states. The states must also be accorded more powers for imposing taxes on their own and the right of the union ministry to put restrictions on trade and commerce and intervention within a state as provided in article 302 should be deleted.

Sheikh M. Abdullah, late chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, had long been a vocal and outspoken supporter of the demand for more decentralization of power. According to him: “I am in full sympathy with the demand (for more powers to the states) but as for as Kashmir is concerned... Kashmir's relationship with the centre is well defined under Article 370. Our only complaint is that erosions have taken place and they must be set right. This constitution does not apply to us in toto. We have our own constitution where the residuary powers lie with the state, not with the centre.”

The former President of India, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy also supported the demand as he felt “the federal set-up must become a little flexible and work in its true spirit. Both Sheikh Abdullah and Mr. Basu were thinking along those lines and they could all sit together and talk. That is what they want. And I do not think there is any danger in it”.
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Jagdev Singh Talwandi, President of the Akali Dal, urged the central government to consider the question of autonomy seriously to save the country from a split". Whereas the former Prime Minister, Morarji Desai ruled out any change in the centre-state relationship to give more autonomy to the states as he held that the constitutional framers drafted it "very wisely".

Thus the concept of state autonomy is supported on the following grounds.

1. Autonomy is not independence of the states and the autonomy is demanded under the Indian federal structure and therefore there is no danger of disintegration.

2. The functions of the states as such are increasing day-by-day. It is not proper to make them financially dependent on the centre while they are performing the functions of rural development and implementation of five years plans. If they are assigned separate resources of finance then it will be convenient for them to perform developmental functions speedily.

3. State autonomy is essential for the establishment of true and genuine federal polity. At present the status of the states as such is like municipalities and they are always afraid of central intervention. The centre controls states by issuing directives and even exercises control over the exclusively state spheres like education and health.

4. The autonomy will inculcate a sense of responsibility among the states. They will seek additional revenue resources and will not depend on the centre.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion we say that federalism is, after all, mechanism for national coherence and self-rule built around some broad collective vision of a social and political order and agreed methods of conflict resolution in a context of deep diversity. Consideration of these questions are important not for scotching the problem because of the complexity. But for ensuring a more just, people based, harmonious living with guarantee of dignity for the diversities.27

Autonomy is not only a question of wider jurisdiction for self-rule but also in an important sense, a question of adequacy and dignity both among the political class and the people at large. In general the state autonomy concept is supported on the following grounds. First, autonomy is not independence of the states and the autonomy is demanded under the Indian federal structure and therefore there is no danger of disintegration. Secondly the functions of the states as such are increasing day by day. It is not proper to make them financially dependent on the centre while they are performing the functions of rural development and implementation of five year plans. If they are assigned separate resources of finance then it will be convenient for them to perform developmental functions speedily. Thirdly state autonomy is essential for the establishment of true and genuine federal polity. At present, the status of the states as such is like municipalities and they are always afraid of central intervention. The centre controls states by issuing directives and even exercises control over the exclusively state spheres like education and health. Fourthly, the autonomy will indicate a sense of responsibility
among the states. They will seek additional revenue resources and will not depend on the centre. The concept of a federal polity could materialize in our country only by allowing full freedom of development to every linguistic cultural state.28
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