



STUDY GUIDE

**HISTORY OF INDIA
SINCE 1947**

PREPARED BY

Dr. C. AMOSE

Associate Professor of History

Head, Department of Public Administration,

Muslim Arts College

Thiruvithancode - 629174

Kanyakumari District.



History of India since 1947

1. To understand the conditions of India on the eve of Independence
2. To study the contributions made by the architects of India
3. To know more about the foreign policy of India which is always working for global peace.
4. To understand the emergence of regional sub-nationalism in India and its results

Unit I : Position of India on the eve of Independence- The problems of partition-Integration of Indian States- States re-organisation.

Unit II : Prime Ministers of India- Jawaharlal Nehru – Internal and Foreign Policy- LalBahadur sastri- Indira Gandhi- Emergency – Birth of Bangladesh

Unit III : Rajiv Gandhi – Foreign Policy – National Front Government- Narasimha Rao- Ata;Bihari Vajpaye

Unit IV : Peasants Struggle – Terrorism in Punjab – Assam Struggle – Telengana Struggle – Foreign Policy of India – India and Non- Aligned Movement- India and UNO-SAARC.

Unit V : Development of Education- Planned Economic Development – Transport and Communication- Cultural Activities in India.

- Visit Historical and important Tourist places in India

Reference Books

1. Biphan Chandra, India after Independence, (1947-2000) Penguin Books, New Delhi, 2000.
2. Braw P.K., Politics of India since Independence, New Delhi, 1999.
3. Chakaravarthy S.R, Contemporary India, New Delhi, 2005.
4. Dharamraj. J., Contemporary History of India, (Tamil) Tensy Publications, Sivakasi, 2014.
5. ‘Varalatra Suvadugal’ (Tamil) Thina thanthi Pathippagam, Veperi, Chennai, 2010.



History of India since 1947

Unit I

Position of India on the eve of Independence

Backround of Independence:

It all started in the year 1757, after the Battle of Plassey, when the Nawab of Bengal surrendered to the East India Company. In 1765, Company was granted all the rights over Bengal and Bihar. This was the starting of the subjugation India faced from that day till the year 1947. The timeline of the 200 years of oppression and subjugation India faced from the British. In the year 1757, East India Company won the Battle of Plassey, and in 1764. Battle of Buxar in Bihar. The two wins gave the company the power to collect revenues and appoint its first Governor-General, Warren Hastings .The company then started expanding its dominions in Mumbai (then Bombay) and Chennai (then Madras). After 1765, the company was facing opposition from Marathas. Tipu Sultan and the Sikhs. East India Company subjugated all these powers to get control over India.

Haider Ali rose to power in Mysore and went on to extend his kingdom up to the Krishna River. He was such a threat to the British that from the year 1767 to 1799, One po the company compensated four wars to destroy his powers. After the first Mysore war, a treaty was signed between the company and Haider Ali which said that the company will help Haider Ali if somebody else attacks him in future. However, the company did not help him when Marathas declared a war on him. This event resulted in more Mysore wars. Involvement of English in the internal politics of the Marathas resulted in the first Anglo-Maratha war. The early years of 1800, the British power grew when the Maratha power.

The defeat of the Marathas in the Anglo-Maratha wars was the result of the Marathas failing to unite with each other. In 1845, after Ranjit Singh's death in Punjab, Englishmen attempted to extend their powers at the borders. This resulted in the first Anglo-Sikh war.



In the year 1848, Lord Dalhousie arrived in India as the Governor General. Two other developments in the 1800s led to growing unrest among Indians. One was the growing number of Christian missionaries coming to India to preach Christianity, which clashed with the beliefs of the Hindus and the strong beliefs of Indian Muslims.

The 1857 Great India Mutiny came to a head at this time. Muslim troops thought pig grease was being used in the bullet cartridges, while Hindu troops thought the British were using grease from cows, which they hold sacred. This resulted in a serious rebellion. Britain ruled about 60 per cent of Indians directly and the other 40 per cent indirectly through native princes who followed British policies. With time the East India Company increased its powers and started to administer the country.

In 1940, they set up Tata Iron Works which was the world's largest Iron factory. However, its policies were disliked by Indians and together they revolted against the company. This led to the downfall of the company and the administration of India went directly under the Queen. By mid-nineteenth century, the British introduced the railways, telegraph and postal service in India.

The British passed many acts but every time they passed a bill, it was met with dissatisfaction from the Indians. It was then the leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and others rose to protest openly against the British rule in India. World War I and World War II pushed India's chances for Independence since the British relied heavily on Indian forces. Two years after the World War II ended, the British granted India its Independence on August 15, 1947.

Agriculture in India on the eve of independence.

The Indian economy was an agro-based economy on the eve of independence. 75% of the Indian population was earning a livelihood from agriculture. Despite being a primary source of income for a major population, this sector faced a decline under the British rule.

A landholding is defined as the area of land that a person or a family owns. Land holdings in India were not only small but scattered as well. Small and scattered land holdings



were very difficult to cultivate. At the time of independence, old and outdated methods of farming were used in the agriculture sector. There was insufficient use of fertilisers and other machines. Agriculture was excessively dependent upon rainfall. Good rainfall implied good output, while poor rainfall implied poor

Level of productivity, ie, output per hectare of land was extremely low. Low productivity implied a low level of output. Low output could be produced due to fragmentation despite large areas being under cultivation. Subsistence farming is one where the primary objective of a farmer is to produce for his own family. The sole aim is to produce for self-consumption or for his family rather than selling to others to earn money. Owners were seldom the tillers of the soil, and they never shared the cost of output. Instead, they shared the output. They were only interested in maximising their rental income. The tillers of the soil (farmers) were given very less for subsistence. The consequence was backwardness and stagnation of agriculture.

Political integration of India

Before the Indian independence Political subdivisions of the Indian Empire in 1909 with British India (pink) and the princely states (yellow) in 1947, India (also called the Indian Empire) was divided into two sets of territories, one under direct British rule (British India), and the other under the suzerainty of the British Crown, with control over their internal affairs remaining in the hands of their hereditary rulers. The latter included 562 princely states which had different types of revenue-sharing arrangements with the British, often depending on their size, population and local conditions. In addition, there were several colonial enclaves controlled by France and Portugal. After independence, the political integration of these territories into an Indian Union was a declared objective of the Indian National Congress, and the Government of India pursued this over the next decade.

In July 1946, Jawaharlal Nehru pointedly observed that no princely state could prevail militarily against the army of independent India.^[1] In January 1947, Nehru said that independent India would not accept the divine right of kings.^[2] In May 1947, he declared that any princely state which refused to join the Constituent Assembly would be treated as an enemy state.^[3] Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon were more conciliatory towards the princes, and as



the men charged with integrating the states, were successful in the task.^[4] Through a combination of factors, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon coerced and coalesced the rulers of the various princely states to accede to India. Having secured their accession, they then proceeded, in a step-by-step process, to secure and extend the union government's authority over these states and transform their administrations until, by 1956, there was little difference between the territories that had been part of British India and those that had been princely states. Simultaneously, the Government of India, through a combination of military and diplomatic means, acquired *de facto* and *de jure* control over the remaining colonial enclaves, which too were integrated into India.

Although this process successfully integrated the vast majority of princely states into India, it was not as successful for a few, notably the former princely states of Jammu and Kashmir and Manipur, where active secessionist and separatist insurgencies continued to exist due to various reasons.

Princely States in India:

The early history of British expansion in India was characterised by the co-existence of two approaches towards the existing princely states. The first was a policy of annexation, where the British sought to forcibly absorb the Indian princely states into the provinces which constituted their Empire in India. The second was a policy of indirect rule, where the British assumed paramountcy over princely states, but conceded to them sovereignty and varying degrees of internal self-government. During the early part of the 19th century, the policy of the British tended towards annexation, but the Indian Rebellion of 1857 forced a change in this approach, by demonstrating both the difficulty of absorbing and subduing annexed states, and the usefulness of princely states as a source of support.^[7] In 1858, the policy of annexation was formally renounced, and British relations with the remaining princely states thereafter were based on subsidiary alliances, whereby the British exercised paramountcy over all princely states, with the British crown as ultimate suzerain, but at the same time respected and protected them as allies, taking control of their external relations.^[8] The exact relations between the British and each princely state were regulated by individual treaties and varied widely, with some states having complete internal self-government, others being subject to significant control in their



internal affairs, and some rulers being in effect little more than the owners of landed estates, with little autonomy.

During the 20th century, the British made several attempts to integrate the princely states more closely with British India, in 1921 creating the Chamber of Princes as a consultative and advisory body, and in 1936 transferring the responsibility for the supervision of smaller states from the provinces to the centre and creating direct relations between the Government of India and the larger princely states, superseding political agents. A more ambitious aim was a scheme of federation contained in the Government of India Act 1935, which envisaged the princely states and British India being united under a federal government. This scheme came close to success, but was abandoned in 1939 as a result of the outbreak of the Second World War. As a result, in the 1940s the relationship between the princely states and the crown remained regulated by the principle of paramountcy and by the various treaties between the British crown and the states.

Neither paramountcy nor the subsidiary alliances could continue after Indian independence. The British took the view that because they had been established directly between the British crown and the princely states, they could not be transferred to the newly independent dominions of India and Pakistan. At the same time, the alliances imposed obligations on Britain that it was not prepared to continue to carry out, such as the obligation to maintain troops in India for the defence of the princely states. The British government therefore decided that paramountcy, together with all treaties between them and the princely states, would come to an end upon the British departure from India.

Reasons for integration:

The termination of paramountcy meant that all rights flowing from the states' relationship with the British crown would return to them, leaving them free to negotiate relationships with the new states of India and Pakistan "on a basis of complete freedom". Early British plans for the transfer of power, such as the offer produced by the Cripps Mission, recognised the possibility that some princely states might choose to stand out of independent India. This was unacceptable to the Indian National Congress, which regarded the independence of princely states as a denial



of the course of Indian history, and consequently regarded this scheme as a "Balkanisation" of India.

The Congress had traditionally been less active in the princely states because of their limited resources which restricted their ability to organise there and their focus on the goal of independence from the British, and because Congress leaders, in particular Mohandas Gandhi, were sympathetic to the more progressive princes as examples of the capacity of Indians to rule themselves. This changed in the 1930s as a result of the federation scheme contained in the Government of India Act 1935 and the rise of socialist Congress leaders such as Jayaprakash Narayan, and the Congress began to actively engage with popular political and labour activity in the princely states. By 1939, the Congress's formal stance was that the states must enter independent India, on the same terms and with the same autonomy as the provinces of British India, and with their people granted responsible government. As a result, it attempted to insist on the incorporation of the princely states into India in its negotiations with the British, but the British took the view that this was not in their power to grant.

A few British leaders, particularly Lord Mountbatten, the last British viceroy of India, were also uncomfortable with breaking links between independent India and the princely states. The development of trade, commerce and communications during the 19th and 20th centuries had bound the princely states to the British India through a complex network of interests. Agreements relating to railways, customs, irrigation, use of ports, and other similar agreements would get terminated, posing a serious threat to the economic life of the subcontinent. Mountbatten was also persuaded by the argument of Indian officials such as V. P. Menon that the integration of the princely states into independent India would, to some extent, assuage the wounds of partition. The result was that Mountbatten personally favoured and worked towards the accession of princely states to India following the transfer of power, as proposed by the Congress.

The princes position:

The rulers of the princely states were not uniformly enthusiastic about integrating their domains into independent India. The Jamkhandi State integrated first with Independent India.



Some, such as the rulers of Bikaner and Jawhar, were motivated to join India out of ideological and patriotic considerations, but others insisted that they had the right to join either India or Pakistan, to remain independent, or form a union of their own.

Bhopal, Travancore and Hyderabad announced that they did not intend to join either dominion. Hyderabad went as far as to appoint trade representatives in European countries and commencing negotiations with the Portuguese to lease or buy Goa to give it access to the sea, and Travancore pointed to the strategic importance to Western countries of its thorium reserves while asking for recognition. Some states proposed a subcontinent-wide confederation of princely states, as a third entity in addition to India and Pakistan. Bhopal attempted to build an alliance between the princely states and the Muslim League to counter the pressure being put on rulers by the Congress.

A number of factors contributed to the collapse of this initial resistance and to nearly all non-Muslim majority princely states agreeing to accede to India. An important factor was the lack of unity among the princes. The smaller states did not trust the larger states to protect their interests, and many Hindu rulers did not trust Muslim princes, in particular Hamidullah Khan, the Nawab of Bhopal and a leading proponent of independence, whom they viewed as an agent for Pakistan. Others, believing integration to be inevitable, sought to build bridges with the Congress, hoping thereby to gain a say in shaping the final settlement. The resultant inability to present a united front or agree on a common position significantly reduced their bargaining power in negotiations with the Congress. The decision by the Muslim League to stay out of the Constituent Assembly was also fatal to the princes' plan to build an alliance with it to counter the Congress, and attempts to boycott the Constituent Assembly altogether failed on 28 April 1947, when the states of Baroda, Bikaner, Cochin, Gwalior, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Patiala and Rewa took their seats in the Assembly.

Many princes were also pressured by popular sentiment favouring integration with India, which meant their plans for independence had little support from their subjects. The Maharaja of Travancore, for example, definitively abandoned his plans for independence after the attempted assassination of his dewan, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. In a few states, the chief ministers



or dewans played a significant role in convincing the princes to accede to India. The key factors that led the states to accept integration into India were, however, the efforts of Lord Mountbatten, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon. The latter two were respectively the political and administrative heads of the States Department, which was in charge of relations with the princely states.

Mountbatten's role:

Mountbatten believed that securing the states' accession to India was crucial to reaching a negotiated settlement with the Congress for the transfer of power. As a relative of the British King, he was trusted by most of the princes and was a personal friend of many, especially the Nawab of Bhopal, Hamidullah Khan. The princes also believed that he would be in a position to ensure that independent India adhered to any terms that might be agreed upon, because Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Patel had asked him to become the first Governor General of the Dominion of India.

Mountbatten used his influence with the princes to push them towards accession. He declared that the British Government would not grant dominion status to any of the princely states, nor would it accept them into the British Commonwealth, which meant that the British Crown would sever all connections with the states unless they joined either India or Pakistan.^[44] He pointed out that the Indian subcontinent was one economic entity, and that the states would suffer most if the link were broken. He also pointed to the difficulties that princes would face maintaining order in the face of threats such as the rise of communal violence and communist movements.

Mountbatten stressed that he would act as the trustee of the princes' commitment, as he would be serving as India's head of state well into 1948. He engaged in a personal dialogue with reluctant princes, such as the Nawab of Bhopal, who he asked through a confidential letter to sign the Instrument of Accession making Bhopal part of India, which Mountbatten would keep locked up in his safe. It would be handed to the States Department on 15 August only if the Nawab did not change his mind before then, which he was free to do. The Nawab agreed, and did not renege over the deal.



At the time, several princes complained that they were being betrayed by Britain, who they regarded as an ally, and Sir Conrad Corfield resigned his position as head of the Political Department in protest at Mountbatten's policies. Mountbatten's policies were also criticised by the opposition Conservative Party. Winston Churchill compared the language used by the Indian government with that used by Adolf Hitler before the invasion of Austria. Modern historians such as Lumby and Moore, however, take the view that Mountbatten played a crucial role in ensuring that the princely states agreed to accede to India.

Pressure and diplomacy

By far the most significant factor that led to the princes' decision to accede to India was the policy of the Congress and, in particular, of Patel and Menon. The Congress' stated position was that the princely states were not sovereign entities, and as such could not opt to be independent notwithstanding the end of paramountcy. The princely states must therefore accede to either India or Pakistan. In July 1946, Nehru pointedly observed that no princely state could prevail militarily against the army of independent India. In January 1947, he said that independent India would not accept the divine right of kings, and in May 1947, he declared that any princely state which refused to join the Constituent Assembly would be treated as an enemy state.^[40] Other Congress leaders, such as C. Rajagopalachari, argued that as paramountcy "came into being as a fact and not by agreement", it would necessarily pass to the government of independent India, as the successor of the British.

Patel and Menon, who were charged with the actual job of negotiating with the princes, took a more conciliatory approach than Nehru. The official policy statement of the Government of India made by Patel on 5 July 1947 made no threats. Instead, it emphasised the unity of India and the common interests of the princes and independent India, reassured them about the Congress' intentions, and invited them to join independent India "to make laws sitting together as friends than to make treaties as aliens". He reiterated that the States Department would not attempt to establish a relationship of domination over the princely states. Unlike the Political Department of the British Government, it would not be an instrument of paramountcy, but a medium whereby business could be conducted between the states and India as equals.



Instruments of accession:

Patel and Menon backed up their diplomatic efforts by producing treaties that were designed to be attractive to rulers of princely states. Two key documents were produced. The first was the Standstill Agreement, which confirmed the continuance of the pre-existing agreements and administrative practices. The second was the Instrument of Accession, by which the ruler of the princely state in question agreed to the accession of his kingdom to independent India, granting the latter control over specified subject matters. The nature of the subject matters varied depending on the acceding state. The states which had internal autonomy under the British signed an Instrument of Accession which only ceded three subjects to the government of India—defence, external affairs, and communications, each defined in accordance with List 1 to Schedule VII of the Government of India Act 1935. Rulers of states which were in effect estates or talukas, where substantial administrative powers were exercised by the Crown, signed a different Instrument of Accession, which vested all residuary powers and jurisdiction in the Government of India. Rulers of states which had an intermediate status signed a third type of Instrument, which preserved the degree of power they had under the British.

The Instruments of Accession implemented a number of other safeguards. Clause 7 provided that the princes would not be bound to the Indian constitution as and when it was drafted. Clause 8 guaranteed their autonomy in all areas that were not ceded to the Government of India. This was supplemented by a number of promises. Rulers who agreed to accede would receive guarantees that their extra-territorial rights, such as immunity from prosecution in Indian courts and exemption from customs duty, would be protected, that they would be allowed to democratise slowly, that none of the eighteen major states would be forced to merge, and that they would remain eligible for British honours and decorations. In discussions, Lord Mountbatten reinforced the statements of Patel and Menon by emphasising that the documents gave the princes all the "practical independence" they needed. Mountbatten, Patel and Menon also sought to give princes the impression that if they did not accept the terms put to them then, they might subsequently need to accede on substantially less favourable terms. The Standstill Agreement was also used as a negotiating tool, as the States Department categorically ruled out signing a Standstill Agreement with princely states that did not sign an Instrument of Accession.



Accession process:

The limited scope of the Instruments of Accession and the promise of a wide-ranging autonomy and the other guarantees they offered, gave sufficient comfort to many rulers, who saw this as the best deal they could strike given the lack of support from the British, and popular internal pressures. Between May 1947 and the transfer of power on 15 August 1947, the vast majority of states signed Instruments of Accession. A few, however, held out. Some simply delayed signing the Instrument of Accession. Piploda, a small state in central India, did not accede until March 1948. The biggest problems, however, arose with a few border states, such as Jodhpur, which tried to negotiate better deals with Pakistan, with Junagadh, which actually did accede to Pakistan, and with Hyderabad and Kashmir, which decided to remain independent

Border states:

The ruler of Jodhpur, Hanwant Singh, was antipathetic to the Congress, and did not see much future in India for him or the lifestyle he wished to lead. Along with the ruler of Jaisalmer, he entered into negotiations with Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who was the designated head of state for Pakistan. Jinnah was keen to attract some of the larger border states, hoping thereby to attract other Rajput states to Pakistan and compensate for the loss of half of Bengal and Punjab. He offered to permit Jodhpur and Jaisalmer to accede to Pakistan on any terms they chose, giving their rulers blank sheets of paper and asking them to write down their terms, which he would sign. Jaisalmer refused, arguing that it would be difficult for him to side with Muslims against Hindus in the event of communal problems. Hanwant Singh came close to signing. However, the atmosphere in Jodhpur was in general hostile to accession to Pakistan. Mountbatten also pointed out that the accession of a predominantly Hindu state to Pakistan would violate the principle of the two-nation theory on which Pakistan was based, and was likely to cause communal violence in the State. Hanwant Singh was persuaded by these arguments, and somewhat reluctantly agreed to accede to India.

In the northeast India, the border states of Manipur and Tripura acceded to India on 11 August and 13 August respectively.



Junagadh

Although the states were in theory free to choose whether they wished to accede to India or Pakistan, Mountbatten had pointed out that "geographic compulsions" meant that most of them must choose India. In effect, he took the position that only the states that shared a border with Pakistan could choose to accede to it.

The Nawab of Junagadh, a princely state located on the south-western end of Gujarat and having no common border with Pakistan, chose to accede to Pakistan ignoring Mountbatten's views, arguing that it could be reached from Pakistan by sea. The rulers of two states that were subject to the suzerainty of Junagadh—Mangrol and Babariawad—reacted to this by declaring their independence from Junagadh and acceding to India. In response, the Nawab of Junagadh militarily occupied the states. The rulers of neighbouring states reacted angrily, sending their troops to the Junagadh frontier and appealed to the Government of India for assistance. A group of Junagadh people, led by Samaldas Gandhi, formed a government-in-exile, the *Aarzi Hukumat* ("provisional government").

India believed that if Junagadh was permitted to go to Pakistan, the communal tension already simmering in Gujarat would worsen, and refused to accept the accession. The government pointed out that the state was 80% Hindu, and called for a referendum to decide the question of accession. Simultaneously, they cut off supplies of fuel and coal to Junagadh, severed air and postal links, sent troops to the frontier, and reoccupied the principalities of Mangrol and Babariawad that had acceded to India.^[70] Pakistan agreed to discuss a plebiscite, subject to the withdrawal of Indian troops, a condition India rejected. On 26 October, the Nawab and his family fled to Pakistan following clashes with Indian troops. On 7 November, Junagadh's court, facing collapse, invited the Government of India to take over the State's administration. The Government of India agreed.^[71] A plebiscite was conducted in February 1948, which went almost unanimously in favour of accession to India.

Jammu and Kashmir;

At the time of the transfer of power, the state of Jammu and Kashmir (widely called "Kashmir") was ruled by Maharaja Hari Singh, a Hindu, although the state itself had a Muslim



majority. Hari Singh was equally hesitant about acceding to either India or Pakistan, as either would have provoked adverse reactions in parts of his kingdom. He signed a Standstill Agreement with Pakistan and proposed one with India as well, but announced that Kashmir intended to remain independent. However, his rule was opposed by Sheikh Abdullah, the popular leader of Kashmir's largest political party, the National Conference, who demanded his abdication.

Pakistan, attempting to force the issue of Kashmir's accession, cut off supplies and transport links. Its transport links with India were tenuous and flooded during the rainy season. Thus Kashmir's only links with the two dominions was by air. Rumours about atrocities against the Muslim population of Poonch by the Maharajah's forces circulated in Pakistan. Shortly thereafter, Pathan tribesmen from the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan crossed the border and entered Kashmir. The invaders made rapid progress towards Srinagar. The Maharaja of Kashmir wrote to India, asking for military assistance. India required the signing of an Instrument of Accession and setting up an interim government headed by Sheikh Abdullah in return. The Maharaja complied, but Nehru declared that it would have to be confirmed by a plebiscite, although there was no legal requirement to seek such confirmation.

Indian troops secured Jammu, Srinagar and the valley itself during the First Kashmir War, but the intense fighting flagged with the onset of winter, which made much of the state impassable. Prime Minister Nehru, recognising the degree of international attention brought to bear on the dispute, declared a ceasefire and sought UN arbitration, arguing that India would otherwise have to invade Pakistan itself, in view of its failure to stop the tribal incursions. The plebiscite was never held, and on 26 January 1950, the Constitution of India came into force in Kashmir, but with special provisions made for the state. India did not, however, secure administrative control over all of Kashmir. The northern and western portions of Kashmir came under Pakistan's control in 1947, and are today Pakistan-administered Kashmir. In the 1962 Sino-Indian War, China occupied Aksai Chin, the north-eastern region bordering Ladakh, which it continues to control and administer



Hyderabad:

Hyderabad was a landlocked state that stretched over 82,000 square miles (over 212,000 square kilometres) in southeastern India. While 87% of its 17 million people were Hindu, its ruler Nizam Osman Ali Khan was a Muslim, and its politics were dominated by a Muslim elite. The Muslim nobility and the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen, a powerful pro-Nizam Muslim party, insisted Hyderabad remain independent and stand on an equal footing to India and Pakistan. Accordingly, the Nizam in June 1947 issued a *firman* announcing that on the transfer of power, his state would be resuming independence. The Government of India rejected the firman, terming it a "legalistic claim of doubtful validity". It argued that the strategic location of Hyderabad, which lay astride the main lines of communication between northern and southern India, meant it could easily be used by "foreign interests" to threaten India, and that in consequence, the issue involved national-security concerns. It also pointed out that the state's people, history and location made it unquestionably Indian, and that its own "common interests" therefore mandated its integration into India.

The Nizam was prepared to enter into a limited treaty with India, which gave Hyderabad safeguards not provided for in the standard Instrument of Accession, such as a provision guaranteeing Hyderabad's neutrality in the event of a conflict between India and Pakistan. India rejected this proposal, arguing that other states would demand similar concessions. A temporary Standstill Agreement was signed as a stopgap measure, even though Hyderabad had not yet agreed to accede to India.^[83] By December 1947, however, India was accusing Hyderabad of repeatedly violating the Agreement, while the Nizam alleged that India was blockading his state, a charge India denied.

The Nizam was also beset by the Telangana Rebellion, led by communists, which started in 1946 as a peasant revolt against feudal elements; and one which the Nizam was not able to subjugate. The situation deteriorated further in 1948. The Razakars ("volunteers"), a militia affiliated to the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and set up under the influence of Muslim radical Qasim Razvi, assumed the role of supporting the Muslim ruling class against upsurges by the Hindu populace, and began intensifying its activities and was accused of attempting to intimidate villages. The Hyderabad State Congress Party, affiliated to the Indian National Congress,



launched a political agitation. Matters were made worse by communist groups, which had originally supported the Congress but now switched sides and began attacking Congress groups. Attempts by Mountbatten to find a negotiated solution failed and, in August, the Nizam, claiming that he feared an imminent invasion, attempted to approach the UN Security Council and the International Court of Justice. Patel now insisted that if Hyderabad was allowed to continue its independence, the prestige of the Government would be tarnished and then neither Hindus nor Muslims would feel secure in its realm.

On 13 September 1948, the Indian Army was sent into Hyderabad under Operation Polo on the grounds that the law and order situation there threatened the peace of South India. The troops met little resistance by the Razakars and between 13 and 18 September took complete control of the state. The operation led to massive communal violence with estimates of deaths ranging from the official one of 27,000–40,000 to scholarly ones of 200,000 or more. The Nizam was retained as the head of state in the same manner as the other princes who acceded to India. He thereupon disavowed the complaints that had been made to the UN and, despite vehement protests from Pakistan and strong criticism from other countries, the Security Council did not deal further with the question, and Hyderabad was absorbed into India.

Completing integration:

The Instruments of Accession were limited, transferring control of only three matters to India, and would by themselves have produced a rather loose federation, with significant differences in administration and governance across the various states. Full political integration, in contrast, would require a process whereby the political actors in the various states were "persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations, and political activities towards a new center", namely, the Republic of India. This was not an easy task. While some princely states such as Mysore had legislative systems of governance that were based on a broad franchise and not significantly different from those of British India, in others, political decision-making took place in small, limited aristocratic circles and governance was, as a result, at best paternalistic and at worst the result of courtly intrigue. Having secured the accession of the princely states, the Government of India between 1948 and 1950 turned to the task of welding the states and the former British provinces into one polity under a single republican constitution.



Fast-track integration:

The first step in this process carried out between 1949 and 1950, was to merge the smaller states that were not seen by the Government of India to be viable administrative units either into neighbouring provinces, or with other princely states to create a "princely union". This policy was contentious since it involved the dissolution of the very states whose existence India had only recently guaranteed in the Instruments of Accession. Patel and Menon emphasised that without integration, the economies of states would collapse, and anarchy would arise if the princes were unable to provide democracy and govern properly. They pointed out that many of the smaller states were very small and lacked resources to sustain their economies and support their growing populations. Many also imposed tax rules and other restrictions impeding free trade, which had to be dismantled in a united India.

Given that the merger involved the breach of guarantees personally given by Mountbatten, initially, Patel and Nehru intended to wait until after his term as Governor-General ended. An adivasi uprising in Orissa in late 1947, however, forced their hand. In December 1947, princes from the Eastern India Agency and Chhattisgarh Agency were summoned to an all-night meeting with Menon, where they were persuaded to sign Merger Agreements integrating their states into Orissa, the Central Provinces and Bihar with effect from 1 January 1948. Later that year, 66 states in Gujarat and the Deccan were merged into Bombay, including the large states of Kolhapur and Baroda. Other small states were merged into Madras, East Punjab, West Bengal, the United Provinces and Assam. Not all states that signed Merger Agreements were integrated into provinces, however. Thirty states of the former Punjab Hill States Agency which lay near the international border and had signed Merger Agreements were integrated into Himachal Pradesh, a distinct entity that was administered directly by the centre as a Chief Commissioner's Province, for reasons of security.

The Merger Agreements required rulers to cede "full and exclusive jurisdiction and powers for and in relation to governance" of their state to the Dominion of India. In return for their agreement to entirely cede their states, it gave princes many guarantees. Princes would receive an annual payment from the Indian government in the form of a privy purse as compensation for the surrender of their powers and the dissolution of their states. While state



property would be taken over, their private property would be protected, as would all personal privileges, dignities and titles. Succession was also guaranteed according to custom. In addition, the provincial administration was obliged to take on the staff of the princely states with guarantees of equal pay and treatment.

A second kind of 'merger' agreement was demanded from larger states along sensitive border areas: Kutch in western India, and Tripura and Manipur in Northeast India. They were not merged into other forms but retained as Chief Commissioners' Provinces under central government control. Bhopal, whose ruler was proud of the efficiency of his administration and feared that it would lose its identity if merged with the Maratha states that were its neighbours, also became a directly administered Chief Commissioner's Province, as did Bilaspur, much of which was likely to be flooded on completion of the Bhakra dam.

Four-step integration:

Merger:

The bulk of the larger states, and some groups of small states, were integrated through a different, four-step process. The first step in this process was to convince adjacent large states and a large number of adjacent small states to combine to form a "princely union" through the execution by their rulers of Covenants of Merger. Under the Covenants of Merger, all rulers lost their ruling powers, save one who became the Rajpramukh of the new union. The other rulers were associated with two bodies—the council of rulers, whose members were the rulers of salute states, and a presidium, one or more of whose members were elected by the rulers of non-salute states, with the rest elected by the council. The Rajpramukh and his deputy *Uprajpramukh* were chosen by the council from among the members of the presidium. The Covenants made provision for the creation of a constituent assembly for the new union which would be charged with framing its constitution. In return for agreeing to the extinction of their states as discrete entities, the rulers were given a privy purse and guarantees similar to those provided under the Merger Agreements.

Through this process, Patel obtained the unification of 222 states in the Kathiawar peninsula of his native Gujarat into the princely union of Saurashtra in January



1948, with six more states joining the union the following year. Madhya Bharat emerged on 28 May 1948 from a union of Gwalior, Indore and eighteen smaller states. In Punjab, the Patiala and East Punjab States Union was formed on 15 July 1948 from Patiala, Kapurthala, Jind, Nabha, Faridkot, Malerkotla, Nalargarh, and Kalsia. The United State of Rajasthan was formed as the result of a series of mergers, the last of which was completed on 15 May 1949. Travancore and Cochin were merged in the middle of 1949 to form the princely union of Travancore-Cochin. The only princely states which signed neither Covenants of Merger nor Merger Agreements were Kashmir, Mysore and Hyderabad

Democratisation:

Merging the administrative machineries of each state and integrating them into one political and administrative entity was not easy, particularly as many of the merged states had a history of rivalry. In the former Central India Agency, whose princely states had initially been merged into a princely union called Vindhya Pradesh, the rivalry between two groups of states became so bad that the Government of India persuaded the rulers to sign a Merger Agreement abrogating the old Covenants of Merger, and took direct control of the state as a Chief Commissioner's State.^[110] As such, the mergers did not meet the expectations of the Government of India or the States Department. In December 1947, Menon suggested requiring the rulers of states to take "practical steps towards the establishment of popular government". The States Department accepted his suggestion, and implemented it through a special covenant signed by the rajpramukhs of the merged princely unions, binding them to act as constitutional monarchs. This meant that their powers were *de facto* no different from those of the Governors of the former British provinces, thus giving the people of their territories the same measure of responsible government as the people of the rest of India.

The result of this process has been described as being, in effect, an assertion of paramountcy by the Government of India over the states in a more pervasive form. While this contradicted the British statement that paramountcy would lapse on the transfer of power, the Congress position had always been that independent India would inherit the position of being the paramount power.



Centralisation and constitutionalisation:

Democratisation still left open one important distinction between the former princely states and the former British provinces, namely, that since the princely states had signed limited Instruments of Accession covering only three subjects, they were insulated from government policies in other areas. The Congress viewed this as hampering its ability to frame policies that brought about social justice and national development. Consequently, they sought to secure to the central government the same degree of powers over the former princely states as it had over the former British provinces. In May 1948, at the initiative of V. P. Menon, a meeting was held in Delhi between the Rajpramukhs of the princely unions and the States Department, at the end of which the Rajpramukhs signed new Instruments of Accession which gave the Government of India the power to pass laws in respect of all matters that fell within the seventh schedule of the Government of India Act 1935. Subsequently, each of the princely unions, as well as Mysore and Hyderabad, agreed to adopt the Constitution of India as the constitution of that state, thus ensuring that they were placed in exactly the same legal position vis-à-vis the central government as the former British provinces. The only exception was Kashmir, whose relationship with India continued to be governed by the original Instrument of Accession, and the constitution produced by the state's Constituent Assembly

Effective from 1950, the Constitution of India classified the constituent units of India into three classes—Part A, B, and C states. The former British provinces, together with the princely states that had been merged into them, were the Part A states. The princely unions, plus Mysore and Hyderabad, were the Part B states. The former Chief Commissioners' Provinces and other centrally administered areas, except the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, were the Part C states. The only practical difference between the Part A states and the Part B states was that the constitutional heads of the Part B states were the Rajpramukhs appointed under the terms of the Covenants of Merger, rather than Governors appointed by the central government. In addition, Constitution gave the central government a significant range of powers over the former princely states, providing amongst other things that "their governance shall be under the general control of, and comply with such particular directions, if any, as may from time to time be given by, the President". Apart from that, the form of government in both was identical.



Reorganisation

The distinction between Part A and Part B states was only intended to last for a brief, transitional period. In 1956, the States Reorganisation Act reorganised the former British provinces and princely states on the basis of language. Simultaneously, the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution removed the distinction between Part A and Part B states, both of which were now treated only as "states", with Part C states being renamed "union territories". The Rajpramukhs lost their authority, and were replaced as the constitutional heads of state by Governors, who were appointed by the central government. These changes finally brought the princely order to an end. In both legal and practical terms, the territories that had been part of the princely states were now fully integrated into India and did not differ in any way from those that had been part of British India. The personal privileges of the princes—the privy purse, the exemption from customs duty, and customary dignities—survived, only to be abolished in 1971.

Although the progressive integration of the princely states into India was largely peaceful, not all princes were happy with the outcome. Many had expected the Instruments of Accession to be permanent, and were unhappy about losing the autonomy and the guaranteed continued existence of their states they had expected to gain. Some felt uneasy about the disappearance of states that generations of their family had controlled, while others were unhappy about the disappearance of administrative structures they had worked hard to build up and which they believed to be efficient. The majority, however, despite the "strain and tension" of adapting to life as private citizens, were content to retire on the generous pension provided by the privy purse. Several took advantage of their eligibility to hold public offices under the central government. The Maharaja of Bhavnagar, Col. Krishna Kumarasingh Bhavasingh Gohil, for example, became the Governor of Madras State, and several others were appointed to diplomatic posts overseas.

Colonial enclaves

The integration of the princely states raised the question of the future of the remaining colonial enclaves in India. At independence, the regions of Pondicherry, Karaikal, Yanam, Mahe and Chandernagore were still colonies of France, and Daman and Diu, Dadra and



Nagar Haveli and Goa remained colonies of Portugal.^[121] An agreement between France and India in 1948 provided for an election in France's remaining Indian possessions to choose their political future. A plebiscite held in Chandernagore on 19 June 1949 resulted in a vote of 7,463 to 114 in favour of being integrated with India. It was ceded to India on a *de facto* basis on 14 August 1949 and *de jure* on 2 May 1950. In the other enclaves, however, the pro-French camp, led by Edouard Goubert, used the administrative machinery to suppress the pro-merger groups. Popular discontent rose, and in 1954 demonstrations in Yanam and Mahe resulted in pro-merger groups assuming power. A referendum in Pondicherry and Karaikal in October 1954 resulted in a vote in favour of merger, and on 1 November 1954, *de facto* control over all four enclaves was transferred to the Republic of India. A treaty of cession was signed in May 1956, and following ratification by the French National Assembly in May 1962, *de jure* control of the enclaves was also transferred.

Portugal, in contrast, resisted diplomatic solutions. It viewed its continued possession of its Indian enclaves as a matter of national pride and, in 1951, it amended its constitution to convert its possessions in India into Portuguese provinces. In July 1954, an uprising in Dadra and Nagar Haveli threw off Portuguese rule. The Portuguese attempted to send forces from Daman to reoccupy the enclaves, but were prevented from doing so by Indian troops. Portugal initiated proceedings before the International Court of Justice to compel India to allow its troops access to the enclave, but the Court rejected its complaint in 1960, holding that India was within its rights in denying Portugal military access. In 1961, the Constitution of India was amended to incorporate Dadra and Nagar Haveli into India as a Union Territory.

Goa, Daman and Diu remained an outstanding issue. On 15 August 1955, five thousand non-violent demonstrators marched against the Portuguese at the border, and were met with gunfire, killing 22. In December 1960, the United Nations General Assembly rejected Portugal's contention that its overseas possessions were provinces, and formally listed them as "non-self-governing territories". Although Nehru continued to favour a negotiated solution, the Portuguese suppression of a revolt in Angola in 1961 radicalised Indian public opinion, and increased the pressure on the Government of India to take military action. African leaders, too, put pressure on Nehru to take action in Goa, which they argued would save Africa from further horrors. On 18



December 1961, following the collapse of an American attempt to find a negotiated solution, the Indian Army entered Portuguese India and defeated the Portuguese garrisons there. The Portuguese took the matter to the Security Council but a resolution calling on India to withdraw its troops immediately was defeated by the USSR's veto. Portugal surrendered on 19 December. This take-over ended the last of the European colonies in India. Goa was incorporated into India as a centrally administered union territory and, in 1987, became a state.

Sikkim

Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim were Himalayan states bordering India. Nepal had been recognised by the British by Nepal–Britain Treaty of 1923 as being *de jure* independent and not a princely state. Bhutan had in the British period been considered a protectorate outside the international frontier of India.^[121] The Government of India entered into a treaty with Bhutan in 1949 continuing this arrangement, and providing that Bhutan would abide by the advice of the Government of India in the conduct of its external affairs. After 1947, India signed new treaties with Nepal and Bhutan

Historically, Sikkim was a British dependency, with a status similar to that of the other princely states, and was therefore considered to be within the frontiers of India in the colonial period. On independence, however, the Chogyal of Sikkim resisted full integration into India. Given the region's strategic importance to India, the Government of India signed first a Standstill Agreement and then in 1950 a full treaty with the Chogyal of Sikkim which in effect made it a protectorate which was no longer part of India. India had responsibility for defence, external affairs and communications, and ultimate responsibility for law and order, but Sikkim was otherwise given full internal autonomy. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Chogyal Palden Thondup Namgyal, supported by the minority Bhutia and Lepcha upper classes, attempted to negotiate greater powers, particularly over external affairs, to give Sikkim more of an international personality. These policies were opposed by Kazi Lhendup Dorji and the Sikkim State Congress, who represented the ethnic Nepali middle classes and took a more pro-Indian view.



In April 1973, anti-Chogyal agitation broke out and protestors demanded popular elections. The Sikkim police were unable to control the demonstrations, and Dorji asked India to exercise its responsibility for law and order and intervene. India facilitated negotiations between the Chogyal and Dorji, and produced an agreement, which envisaged the reduction of the Chogyal to the role of a constitutional monarch and the holding of elections based on a new ethnic power-sharing formula. The Chogyal's opponents won an overwhelming victory, and a new Constitution was drafted providing for Sikkim to be associated with the Republic of India. On 10 April 1975, the Sikkim Assembly passed a resolution calling for the state to be fully integrated into India. This resolution was endorsed by 97 percent of the vote in a referendum held on 14 April 1975, following which the Indian Parliament amended the constitution to admit Sikkim into India as its 22nd state.

Secessionism and sub-nationalism:

While the majority of princely states absorbed into India have been fully integrated, a few outstanding issues remain. The most prominent of these is in relation to Jammu and Kashmir, where a secessionist insurgency has been raging since 1989

Some academics suggest that the insurgency is at least partly a result of the manner in which it was integrated into India. Kashmir, uniquely amongst princely states, was not required to sign either a Merger Agreement or a revised Instrument of Accession giving India control over a larger number of issues than the three originally provided for. Instead, the power to make laws relating to Kashmir was granted to the Government of India by Article 5 of the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir and was, under Article 370 of the Constitution of India, somewhat more restricted than in relation to other states. Widmalm argues that during the 1980s, a number of Kashmiri youth began to feel that the Indian government was increasingly interfering in the politics of Jammu and Kashmir. The elections of 1987 caused them to lose faith in the political process and begin the violent insurgency which is still ongoing. Similarly, Ganguly suggests that the policies of the Indian government towards Kashmir meant that the state, unlike other parts of India, never developed the solid political institutions associated with a modern multi-ethnic democracy. As a result, the growing dissatisfaction with the *status quo* felt by an



increasingly politically aware youth was expressed through non-political channels which Pakistan, seeking to weaken India's hold over Kashmir, transformed into an active insurgency.

Separatist movements also exist in two other former princely states located in Northeast India— Tripura and Manipur, though insurgency in Tripura has been crushed and Manipur has also been peaceful. However, these separatist movements are generally treated by scholars as being part of the broader problem of insurgencies in North-east India, rather being a result of specific problems in integrating the princely states into India, as the Kashmir problem is and, in particular, to reflect the failure of the Government of India to adequately address the aspirations of tribal groups in the Northeast, or to tackle the tensions arising from the immigration of people from other parts of India to the north-eastern areas. The integration of former princely states with other provinces to form new states has also given rise to some issues. The Telangana region, comprising the Telugu-speaking districts of the former Hyderabad State, were in many ways different from the Telugu-speaking areas of British India with which they were merged. In recognition of these differences, the States Reorganisation Commission originally recommended that Telangana be created as a separate state, rather than as part of a broader Telugu-speaking entity. This recommendation was rejected by the Government of India, and Telangana was merged into Andhra Pradesh. The result was the emergence in the 1960s of a movement demanding a separate Telangana state. The demand has been accepted by the Union Government, leading to formation of Telangana as the 29th state of India in June 2014. A similar movement, although less strong, exists in the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra, which consists of the former Nagpur state and the Berar region of the former Hyderabad state.

The integration process repeatedly brought Indian and Pakistani leaders into conflict. During negotiations, Jinnah, representing the Muslim League, strongly supported the right of the princely states to remain independent, joining neither India nor Pakistan, an attitude which was diametrically opposed to the stance taken by Nehru and the Congress and which was reflected in Pakistan's support of Hyderabad's bid to stay independent. Post-partition, the Government of Pakistan accused India of hypocrisy on the ground that there was little difference between the accession of the ruler of Junagadh to Pakistan—which India refused to recognise—and the



accession of the Maharajah of Kashmir to India, and for several years refused to recognise the legality of India's incorporation of Junagadh, treating it as *de jure* Pakistani territory.

Different theories have been proposed to explain the designs of Indian and Pakistani leaders in this period. Rajmohan Gandhi postulates that an ideal deal working in the mind of Patel was that if Muhammad Ali Jinnah let India have Junagadh and Hyderabad, Patel would not object to Kashmir acceding to Pakistan. In his book *Patel: A Life*, Gandhi asserts that Jinnah sought to engage the questions of Junagadh and Hyderabad in the same battle. It is suggested that he wanted India to ask for a plebiscite in Junagadh and Hyderabad, knowing thus that the principle then would have to be applied to Kashmir, where the Muslim-majority would, he believed, vote for Pakistan. A speech by Patel at the Bahauddin College in Junagadh following the latter's take-over, where he said that "we would agree to Kashmir if they agreed to Hyderabad", suggests that he may have been amenable to this idea.^[147] Although Patel's opinions were not India's policy, nor were they shared by Nehru, both leaders were angered at Jinnah's courting the princes of Jodhpur, Bhopal and Indore, leading them to take a harder stance on a possible deal with Pakistan.

Modern historians have also re-examined the role of the States Department and Lord Mountbatten during the accession process. Ian Copland argues that the Congress leaders did not intend the settlement contained in the Instruments of Accession to be permanent even when they were signed, and at all times privately contemplated a complete integration of the sort that ensued between 1948 and 1950. He points out that the mergers and cession of powers to the Government of India between 1948 and 1950 contravened the terms of the Instruments of Accession, and were incompatible with the express assurances of internal autonomy and preservation of the princely states which Mountbatten had given the princes. Menon in his memoirs stated that the changes to the initial terms of accession were in every instance freely consented to by the princes with no element of coercion. Copland disagrees, on the basis that foreign diplomats at the time believed that the princes had been given no choice but to sign, and that a few princes expressed their unhappiness with the arrangements. He also criticises Mountbatten's role, saying that while he stayed within the letter of the law, he was at least under a moral obligation to do something for the princes when it became apparent that the Government



of India was going to alter the terms on which accession took place, and that he should never have lent his support to the bargain given that it could not be guaranteed after independence. Both Copland and Ramusack argue that, in the ultimate analysis, one of the reasons why the princes consented to the demise of their states was that they felt abandoned by the British, and saw themselves as having little other option. Older historians such as Lumby, in contrast, take the view that the princely states could not have survived as independent entities after the transfer of power, and that their demise was inevitable. They therefore view successful integration of all princely states into India as a triumph for the Government of India and Lord Mountbatten, and as a tribute to the sagacity of the majority of princes, who jointly achieved in a few months what the Empire had attempted, unsuccessfully, to do for over a century—unite all of India under one rule.

States Reorganisation Act, 1956

The States Reorganisation Act, 1956 was a major reform of the boundaries of India's states and territories, organising them along linguistic lines. Although additional changes to India's state boundaries have been made since 1956, the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 remains the most extensive change in state boundaries after the independence of India. The Act came into effect at the same time as the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956, which (among other things) restructured the constitutional framework for India's existing states and the requirements to pass the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 under the provisions of Part I of the Constitution of India, Article 3.

Political integration independence:

British India, which included present-day India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar, was divided into two types of territories: the Provinces of British India, which were governed directly by British officials responsible to the Governor-General of India; and the Indian States, under the rule of local hereditary rulers who recognized British suzerainty in return for continued authority over their own realms, in most cases as established by treaty. As a result of the reforms of the early 20th century, most of the British provinces had directly elected legislatures as well as governors, although some of the smaller provinces were governed by a chief commissioner



appointed by the Governor-General. Major reforms put forward by the British in the 1930s also recognized the principle of federalism, which was carried forward into the governance of independent India.

On 15 August 1947, British India was granted independence as the separate dominions of India and Pakistan. The British dissolved their treaty relations with more than five hundred princely states, who were encouraged to accede to either India or Pakistan, while under no compulsion to do so. Most of the states acceded to India, and a few to Pakistan. Bhutan, Hyderabad and Kashmir opted for independence; Bhutan remains independent, but Hyderabad was annexed by India, and the status of Kashmir became the subject of conflict between India and Pakistan.

Between 1947 and about 1950, the territories of the princely states were politically integrated into the Indian Union. Several states were merged into existing provinces; others were organized into unions, such as Rajputana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, and Vindhya Pradesh, made up of multiple princely states; a few, including Mysore, Hyderabad, Bhopal, and Bilaspur, remained separate states. The Government of India Act 1935 remained the constitutional law of India pending adoption of a new Constitution.

The new Constitution of India, which came into force on 26 January 1950, made India a sovereign democratic republic. The new republic was also declared to be a "Union of States". The constitution of 1950 distinguished between three main types of states and a class of territories:

Part A states – which were the former governors' provinces of British India, were ruled by a governor appointed by the president and an elected state legislature. The nine Part A states were Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (formerly Central Provinces and Berar), Madras, Orissa, Punjab (formerly East Punjab), Uttar Pradesh (formerly the United Provinces), and West Bengal.

Part B states – which were former princely states or unions of princely states, governed by a rajpramukh, who was usually the ruler of a constituent state, and an elected legislature. The



raj Pramukh was appointed by the President of India. The eight Part B states were Hyderabad, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Bharat, Mysore, Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU), Rajasthan, Saurashtra, and Travancore-Cochin.

Part C states – included both the former chief commissioners' provinces and some princely states, and each was governed by a chief commissioner appointed by the President of India. The ten Part C states were Ajmer, Bhopal, Bilaspur, Coorg, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Cutch, Manipur, Tripura, and Vindhya Pradesh.

The sole **Part D** territory – was the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, which was administered by a lieutenant governor appointed by the central government.

In this classifications, Part A states had a *Governor*, Part B states had a *Rajpramukh* and Part C states had a *commissioner*.

Movement for linguistic states:

The demand for states to be organized on a linguistic basis was developed even before India achieved independence from British rule. A first-of-its-kind linguistic movement started in 1895, in what is now Odisha. The movement gained momentum in later years with the demand for a separate Orissa Province to be formed by bifurcating the existing Bihar and Orissa Province.^{[6][7]} Due to the efforts of Madhusudan Das, the Father of Odia nationalism, the movement eventually achieved its objective in 1936, when Orissa Province became the first Indian state (pre-independence) to be organized on the basis of common languages.

The post-independence period saw the ascent of political movements for the creation of new states developed on linguistic lines. The movement to create a Telugu-speaking state out of the northern portion of Madras State gathered strength in the years after independence, and in 1953, the sixteen northern Telugu-speaking districts of Madras State became the new State of Andhra.

During the 1950–1956 period, other small changes were made to state boundaries: the small state of Bilaspur was merged with Himachal Pradesh on 1 July 1954; and Chandernagore, a former enclave of French India, was incorporated into West Bengal in 1955.



States Reorganisation Commission:

The States Reorganisation Commission was preceded by the Linguistic Provinces Commission (aka Dhar Commission), which was set up in June 1948. It rejected language as a parameter for dividing states. Later, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru appointed the States Reorganisation Commission in December 1953, with the remit to reorganise the Indian states. The new commission was headed by the retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Fazal Ali; its other two members were H. N. Kunzru and K. M. Panikkar. The efforts of the commission were overseen by Govind Ballabh Pant, who served as the Home Minister from December 1954.

The States Reorganisation Commission submitted a report on September 30, 1955, with recommendations for the reorganisation of India's states, which was then debated by the Indian parliament. Subsequently, bills were passed to make changes to the constitution and to administer the reorganisation of the states.

Related changes by other legislation:

The States Reorganisation Act was enacted on 31 August 1956. Before it came into effect on 1 November, an important amendment was made to the Constitution of India. Under the Seventh Amendment, the existing terminology of Part A, Part B, Part C, and Part D states was altered. The distinction between Part A and Part B states was removed, becoming known simply as "states". A new type of entity, the Union Territory, replaced the classification as a Part C or Part D state.

A further Act also came into effect on 1 November, transferring certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal.

Effect of the Changes:

The States Reorganisation Act of 1956 was a major step towards dividing India into states and Union Territories. The following list sets out the states and union territories of India as reorganised on 1 November 1956:



States

1. Andhra Pradesh: formed by the merger of Andhra State (1953–56) with the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad State (1948–56).
2. Assam: The adjoining map depicts the scenario according to States Reorganisation Act of 1956. However, the state of Assam has been further divided into Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Nagaland, Meghalaya (not in chronological order) in subsequent years.
3. Bihar: reduced slightly by the transfer of minor territories to West Bengal (Purulia from Manbhum district, Islampur from Purnea district).
4. Bombay State: the state was enlarged by the addition of Saurashtra State and Kutch State, the Marathi-speaking districts of Berar Division and Nagpur Division of Central Province and Berar and Marathwada region of Hyderabad State. The southernmost districts of the Bombay Presidency were transferred to Mysore State.
5. Jammu and Kashmir: No change of boundary in 1956.
6. Kerala: formed by the merger of Travancore-Cochin state with the Malabar district and Kasaragod taluk of South Canara district of the Madras Presidency. The southern part of Travancore-Cochin, Kanyakumari district, along with Sengottai Taluk, was transferred to Madras State. The Laccadive and Minicoy Islands were separated from Malabar District to form a new Union Territory namely Laccadive, Amindivi, and Minicoy Islands.^[10]
7. Madhya Pradesh: Madhya Bharat, Vindhya Pradesh, and Bhopal State were merged into Madhya Pradesh; the Marathi-speaking districts of Nagpur Division were transferred to Bombay State.
8. Madras State: Malabar District was transferred to the new state of Kerala, South Canara district was bifurcated and transferred to Mysore State and to Kerala and a new Union Territory, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, was created. The southern part of Travancore-Cochin - Kanyakumari district, along with Sengottai Taluk was added to Madras State.



9. Mysore State: enlarged by the addition of Coorg State and the Kannada speaking districts from western Madras Presidency, southern Bombay Presidency and western Hyderabad State.
10. Orissa: No change of boundary in 1956.
11. Punjab: enlarged by addition of the Patiala and East Punjab States Union.
12. Rajasthan: enlarged by the addition of Ajmer state and parts of Bombay and Madhya Bharat states.
13. Uttar Pradesh: No change of boundary in 1956.
14. West Bengal: enlarged by addition of Purulia district, previously part of Bihar.

Union territories:

The Part C and Part D territories that weren't merged into other states, were converted into Union Territories:

1. Andaman and Nicobar Islands
2. Delhi
3. Manipur
4. Tripura
5. Himachal Pradesh
6. Laccadive, Minicoy & Amindivi Islands



Unit-II

Prime ministers of India

Chief Executive:

The prime minister of India is the chief executive of the Government of India. Although the president of India is the constitutional, nominal, and ceremonial head of state, in practice and ordinarily, the executive authority is vested in the prime minister and their chosen Council of Ministers. The prime minister is the leader elected by the party with a majority in the lower house of the Indian parliament, the Lok Sabha, which is the main legislative body in the Republic of India. The prime minister and their cabinet are at all times responsible to the Lok Sabha. The prime minister can be a member of the Lok Sabha or of the Rajya Sabha, the upper house of the parliament. The prime minister ranks third in the order of precedence.

The prime minister is appointed by the president of India; however, the prime minister has to enjoy the confidence of the majority of Lok Sabha members, who are directly elected every five years, unless a prime minister resigns. The prime minister is the presiding member of the Council of Ministers of the Union government. The prime minister unilaterally controls the selection and dismissal of members of the Council; and allocation of posts to members within the government. This Council, which is collectively responsible to the Lok Sabha as per Article 75(3), assists the president regarding the operations under the latter's powers; however, by the virtue of Article 74 of the Constitution, such 'aid and advice' tendered by the Council is binding.

Since 1947, India has had 14 prime ministers. Jawaharlal Nehru was India's first prime minister, serving as prime minister of the Dominion of India from 15 August 1947 until 26 January 1950, and thereafter of the Republic of India until his death in May 1964. (India conducted its first post-independence general elections in 1952). Earlier, Nehru had served as prime minister of the Interim Government of India during the British Raj from 2 September 1946 until 14 August 1947, his party, the Indian National Congress having won the 1946 Indian provincial elections.) Nehru was succeeded by Lal Bahadur Shastri, whose 1 year 7-month term ended in his death in Tashkent, then in the USSR, where he had signed the Tashkent



Declaration between India and Pakistan. Indira Gandhi, Nehru's daughter, succeeded Shastri in 1966 to become the country's first female prime minister. Eleven years later, her party the Indian National Congress lost the 1977 Indian general election to the Janata Party, whose leader Morarji Desai became the first non-Congress prime minister. After Desai resigned in 1979, his former associate Charan Singh briefly held office until the Congress won the 1980 Indian general election and Indira Gandhi returned as prime minister. Her second term as prime minister ended five years later on 31 October 1984, when she was assassinated by her bodyguards. Her son Rajiv Gandhi was sworn in as India's youngest premier. Members of Nehru–Gandhi family have been prime minister for approximately 38 years.

After a general election loss, Rajiv Gandhi's five-year term ended; his former cabinet colleague, Vishwanath Pratap Singh of the Janata Dal, formed the year-long National Front coalition government in 1989. A seven-month interlude under prime minister Chandra Shekhar followed, after which the Congress party returned to power, forming the government under P. V. Narasimha Rao in June 1991, Rajiv Gandhi having been assassinated earlier that year. Rao's five-year term was succeeded by four short-lived governments—Atal Bihari Vajpayee from the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) for 13 days in 1996, a year each under United Front prime ministers H. D. Deve Gowda and Inder Kumar Gujral, and Vajpayee again for 19 months in 1998–1999. In 1998, Vajpayee's National Democratic Alliance (NDA) won the general election, the first non-Congress alliance to do so, and he served a full five-year term as prime minister. The Congress, and its United Progressive Alliance won the general elections in 2004 and 2009, Manmohan Singh serving as prime minister between 2004 and 2014. The BJP won the 2014 Indian general election, and its parliamentary leader Narendra Modi formed the first non-Congress single party majority government. Modi has served as prime minister since, his party winning the 2014 Indian general election.

Jawaharlal Nehru:

Jawaharlal Nehru is considered to be the architect of modern India. Apart from his careful handling of India's tumultuous domestic situation in the years immediately after the Independence, Nehru's major contribution lies in the field of foreign policies. In fact, Nehru determined India's international profile to a great degree in the post-independence years, in his



capacity as the foreign minister of India. Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy has been made subject to much controversy and debate, like his economic policies. However, taken in the context of India's newly found status as a democratic republic, Nehru's foreign affairs policies seem to be extremely apt.

Socialism can be said to be one of the greatest international influences on Nehru, but Gandhi's ideals of Satyagraha also influenced him to a great degree. But he committed himself to neither point of view in framing his foreign policy. Nehru's foreign policies were characterized by two major ideological aspects. First, he wanted India to have an identity that would be independent of any form of overt commitment to either power bloc, the USA or the Soviet. Secondly, he had an unshaken faith in goodwill and honesty in matters of international affairs. The first policy led ultimately to the founding of the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM). His second faith was terribly shaken by the Chinese attack of 1962, openly disobeying all the clauses of the Panchsheel or five-point agreement of 1954 between New Delhi and Peking. This breach of faith was a major psychological shock for Nehru, and was partially the reason for his death.

The Founding Principles of Nehru's Foreign Policy:

Nehru saw war and violent insurgency from very close quarters as a freedom fighter, and he believed in neither. In his foreign policies, Nehru tried to guide India in such a way, so as to steer clear from any form of violence and militarism. He rightly believed that a newly decolonized nation must invest all its economic and logistic resources towards development and not defense and armament. Just like his economic policies, which were non-committal towards any ideological position, Nehru wanted to bring in a healthy level of pragmatism in his dealings of India's foreign affairs as well. He understood that overt commitment to any of the two major power blocs to emerge in the aftermath of World War II, would not serve India's path. He therefore wanted to tread a third path, which was not necessarily the middle path. It should be remembered that this dogged non-commitment of Nehru was not seen sympathetically by any of the super powers of either East or West at its initial stage. It was frequently termed as a kind of international opportunism and was accused of 'neutralism' - a stance reckoned to be not only dangerous but also equally immoral in the world of International



politics. However, the increasing popularity of NAM among various Asian and African countries and Nehru's growing stature as a statesman situation changed their views. India too benefited from this position, as it managed to secure rebuilding grants from member countries of either bloc. After Nehru's successful mediation in the Korean War and the Congo problem, putting an end to a long and violent struggle, his status as a commendable and efficient statesman reached new heights. Jawaharlal Nehru's theory of ideological non-commitment in a world that was rendered dangerous by the Cold War was appreciated by one and all.

Nehru and the Non-Alignment Movement:

The greatest success of Jawaharlal Nehru's non-committal international politics was the formation of the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM). Nehru found allies in Tito, Nasser, Soekarno, U Nu and Nkrumah at a later stage in his formation of this new alliance. An alliance of newly independent and long colonized nations was not taken seriously in the beginning, either by the Eastern or the Western bloc. However, the importance of the alliance was soon felt, and initially led to a great degree of international pressure from both parts of the globe. However, Nehru proceeded with his mission undaunted. It was great test for his courage and it was soon found out that the NAM was not merely a passive platform of neutral and inactive nations. It had clear objectives that included the gradual decolonization of the world, and a strong statement that the member countries were not party to the ever escalating tension of the Cold War. The favored process of decolonization as adopted by the NAM member countries was one of discussion and peaceful agreement. On many occasions, NAM met with success, often under the leadership of Nehru. Whoever supported its cause was an ally and a friend. Nehru preached a policy of issue based alliance and not one based on political and economic dogmas. He was proud of being an Asian, and wanted Asian nations to be the primary determinants of their political fate, not always guided by Western forces.

Nehru's unshaken belief in the force of international brotherhood was attested with his decision to continue with India's Commonwealth status. He was made subject to much criticism back home because of the support he extended towards the Commonwealth, particularly after the complication of the independence issue by the British government in the post World War II



years, leading to the unwanted partition. However Nehru, always the believer in peaceful alliances and solution of international affairs based on discussions, went on with his ideals.

Nehru and the Kashmir Problem:

Nehru's Foreign policies did not augur well when it came to deal with the neighbors. Kashmir was a perpetual problem, and he failed to reach any successful negotiation regarding Kashmir with the neighbor Pakistan. Nehru had an innate belief in honest fellow-feeling and political generosity. He tried to force a negotiation with the Pakistani government through the United Nations. But the Pakistani military rulers denied any peaceful agreement. The offer of a possible plebiscite was also taken off in 1950. After India's dogged denial of the two-nation theory, a result in favor of Kashmir in the Muslim dominated Kashmir would be a strategic disaster for India. The Kashmir problem remained unresolved, and not even Nehru's diplomatic expertise could give any positive direction to the problem. It still continues to be the one of the key international problems in South Asia.

Nehru and the China Crisis:

Nehru's foreign policies concerning China have been made subject to much criticism. However, even in this case, it was Nehru's faith in transparency in the handling of International relations that is seen to be the root of all problems. Nehru was intent on a very warm and mutually beneficial relationship between India and China. The five-point agreement or the Panchsheel between New Delhi and Peking initiated in 1954 was a result of these negotiations. However, China started patrolling certain parts of the Indian border from 1955 onwards. Delhi started negotiations to solve the problem in a peaceful way. India, under the leadership of Nehru wanted to take one issue at a time and begin the discussions. The Chinese government, under Chou En-lai wanted to treat the border issue in its entirety at one go. It was gross violation of the five-point agreement. The Chinese denial for the arbitration from the International Court of Justice complicated the problem.



Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri:

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was born on October 2, 1904 at Mughalsarai, a small railway town seven miles from Varanasi in Uttar Pradesh. His father was a school teacher who died when Lal Bahadur Shastri was only a year and half old. His mother, still in her twenties, took her three children to her father's house and settled down there.

Lal Bahadur's small town schooling was not remarkable in any way but he had a happy enough childhood despite the poverty that dogged him. He was sent to live with an uncle in Varanasi so that he could go to high school. Nanhe, or 'little one' as he was called at home, walked many miles to school without shoes, even when the streets burned in the summer's heat.

As he grew up, Lal Bahadur Shastri became more and more interested in the country's struggle for freedom from foreign yoke. He was greatly impressed by Mahatma Gandhi's denunciation of Indian Princes for their support of British rule in India. Lal Bahadur Shastri was only eleven at the time, but the process that was end day to catapult him to the national stage had already begun in his mind.

Lal Bahadur Shastri was sixteen when Gandhiji called upon his countrymen to join the Non-Cooperation Movement. He decided at once to give up his studies in response to the Mahatma's call. The decision shattered his mother's hopes. The family could not dissuade him from what they thought was a disastrous course of action. But Lal Bahadur had made up his mind. All those who were close to him knew that he would never change his mind once it was made up, for behind his soft exterior was the firmness of a rock.

Lal Bahadur Shastri joined the Kashi Vidya Peeth in Varanasi, one of the many national institutions set up in defiance of the British rule. There, he came under the influence of the greatest intellectuals, and nationalists of the country. 'Shastri' was the bachelor's degree awarded to him by the Vidya Peeth but has stuck in the minds of the people as part of his name.

In 1927, he got married. His wife, Lalita Devi, came from Mirzapur, near his home town. The wedding was traditional in all senses but one. A spinning wheel and a few yards of handspun cloth was all the dowry. The bridegroom would accept nothing more.



In 1930, Mahatma Gandhi marched to the sea beach at Dandi and broke the imperial salt law. The symbolic gesture set the whole country ablaze. Lal Bahadur Shastri threw himself into the struggle for freedom with feverish energy. He led many defiant campaigns and spent a total of seven years in British jails. It was in the fire of this struggle that his steel was tempered and he grew into maturity.

When the Congress came to power after Independence, the sterling worth of the apparently meek and unassuming Lal Bahadur Shastri had already been recognised by the leader of the national struggle. When the Congress Government was formed in 1946, this ‘little dynamo of a man’ was called upon to play a constructive role in the governance of the country. He was appointed Parliamentary Secretary in his home State of Uttar Pradesh and soon rose to the position of Home Minister. His capacity for hard work and his efficiency became a byword in Uttar Pradesh. He moved to New Delhi in 1951 and held several portfolios in the Union Cabinet – Minister for Railways; Minister for Transport and Communications; Minister for Commerce and Industry; Home Minister; and during Nehru’s illness Minister without portfolio. He was growing in stature constantly. He resigned his post as Minister for Railways because he felt responsible for a railway accident in which many lives were lost. The unprecedented gesture was greatly appreciated by Parliament and the country. The then Prime Minister, Pt. Nehru, speaking in Parliament on the incident, extolled Lal Bahadur Shastri’s integrity and high ideals. He said he was accepting the resignation because it would set an example in constitutional propriety and not because Lal Bahadur Shastri was in any way responsible for what had happened. Replying to the long debate on the Railway accident, Lal Bahadur Shastri said; “Perhaps due to my being small in size and soft of tongue, people are apt to believe that I am not able to be very firm. Though not physically strong, I think I am internally not so weak.”

In between his Ministerial assignments, he continued to lavish his organising abilities on the affairs of the Congress Party. The landslide successes of the Party in the General Elections of 1952, 1957 and 1962 were in a very large measure the result of his complete identification with the cause and his organisational genius.

More than thirty years of dedicated service were behind Lal Bahadur Shastri. In the course of this period, he came to be known as a man of great integrity and competence. Humble, tolerant, with great inner strength and resoluteness, he was a man of the people who understood their



language. He was also a man of vision who led the country towards progress. Lal Bahadur Shastri was deeply influenced by the political teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. "Hard work is equal to prayer," he once said, in accents profoundly reminiscent of his Master. In the direct tradition of Mahatma Gandhi, Lal Bahadur Shastri represented the best in Indian culture.

The Emergency (India):

The Emergency in India was a 21-month period from 1975 to 1977 when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had a state of emergency declared across the country.

Officially issued by President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed under Article 352 of the Constitution because of prevailing "internal disturbance", the Emergency was in effect from 25 June 1975 and ended on 21 March 1977. The order bestowed upon the prime minister the authority to rule by decree, allowing elections to be cancelled and civil liberties to be suspended. For much of the Emergency, most of Gandhi's political opponents were imprisoned and the press was censored. Several other human rights violations were reported from the time, including a mass campaign for vasectomy spearheaded by her son Sanjay Gandhi. The Emergency is one of the most controversial periods of Indian history since its independence. The final decision to impose an emergency was proposed by Indira Gandhi, agreed upon by the President of India, and ratified by the Cabinet and the Parliament from July to August 1975. It was based on the rationale that there were imminent internal and external threats to the Indian state.

Rise of Indira Gandhi:

Between 1967 and 1971, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi came to obtain near-absolute control over the government and the Indian National Congress party, as well as a huge majority in Parliament. The first was achieved by concentrating the central government's power within the Prime Minister's Secretariat, rather than the Cabinet, whose elected members she saw as a threat and distrusted. For this, she relied on her principal secretary, P. N. Haksar, a central figure in Indira's inner circle of advisors. Further, Haksar promoted the idea of a "committed bureaucracy" that required hitherto-impartial government officials to be "committed" to the ideology of the ruling party of the day.



Within the Congress, Indira ruthlessly outmaneuvered her rivals forcing the party to split in 1969—into the Congress (O) (comprising the old-guard known as the "Syndicate") and her Congress (R). A majority of the All-India Congress Committee and Congress MPs sided with the prime minister. Indira's party was of a different breed from the Congress of old, which had been a robust institution with traditions of internal democracy. In the Congress (R), on the other hand, members quickly realized that their progress within the ranks depended solely on their loyalty to Indira Gandhi and her family, and ostentatious displays of sycophancy became routine. In the coming years, Indira's influence was such that she could install hand-picked loyalists as chief ministers of states, rather than their being elected by the Congress legislative party.

Indira's ascent was backed by her charismatic appeal among the masses that was aided by her government's near-radical leftward turns. These included the July 1969 nationalization of several major banks and the September 1970 abolition of the privy purse; these changes were often done suddenly, via ordinance, to the shock of her opponents. She had strong support in the disadvantaged sections—the poor, Dalits, women and minorities. Indira was seen as "standing for socialism in economics and secularism in matters of religion, as being pro-poor and for the development of the nation as a whole."

In the 1971 general elections, the people rallied behind Indira's populist slogan of Garibi Hatao! (abolish poverty!) to award her a huge majority (352 seats out of 518). "By the margin of its victory," historian Ramachandra Guha later wrote, Congress (R) came to be known as the real Congress, "requiring no qualifying suffix." In December 1971, under her proactive war leadership, India routed arch-enemy Pakistan in a war that led to the independence of Bangladesh, formerly East Pakistan. Awarded the Bharat Ratna the next month, she was at her greatest peak; for her biographer Inder Malhotra, "The Economist's description of her as the 'Empress of India' seemed apt." Even opposition leaders, who routinely accused her of being a dictator and of fostering a personality cult, referred to her as Durga, a Hindu goddess.

control of the judiciary

In 1967's Golaknath case, the Supreme Court said that the Constitution could not be amended by Parliament if the changes affect basic issues such as fundamental rights. To nullify



this judgement, Parliament dominated by the Indira Gandhi Congress, passed the 24th Amendment in 1971. Similarly, after the government lost a Supreme Court case for withdrawing the privy purse given to erstwhile princes, Parliament passed the 26th Amendment. This gave constitutional validity to the government's abolition of the privy purse and nullified the Supreme Court's order.

This judiciary–executive battle would continue in the landmark Kesavananda Bharati Case, where the 24th Amendment was called into question. With a wafer-thin majority of 7 to 6, the bench of the Supreme Court restricted Parliament's amendment power by stating it could not be used to alter the "basic structure" of the Constitution. Subsequently, Prime Minister Gandhi made A. N. Ray—the senior-most judge amongst those in the minority in Kesavananda Bharati—Chief Justice of India. Ray superseded three judges more senior to him—J. M. Shelat, K. S. Hegde and Grover—all members of the majority in Kesavananda Bharati. Indira Gandhi's tendency to control the judiciary met with severe criticism, both from the press and political opponents such as Jayaprakash Narayan ("JP").

Political unrest:

This led some Congress party leaders to demand a move towards a presidential system emergency declaration with a more powerful directly elected executive. The most significant of the initial such movement was the Nav Nirman movement in Gujarat, between December 1973 and March 1974. Student unrest against the state's education minister ultimately forced the central government to dissolve the state legislature, leading to the resignation of the chief minister, Chimanbhai Patel, and the imposition of President's rule. Meanwhile, there were assassination attempts on public leaders as well as the assassination of the railway minister Lalit Narayan Mishra by a bomb. All of these indicated a growing law and order problem in the entire country, which Mrs. Gandhi's advisors warned her of for months.

In March–April 1974, a student agitation by the Bihar Chatra Sangharsh Samiti received the support of Gandhian socialist Jayaprakash Narayan, referred to as JP, against the Bihar government. In April 1974, in Patna, JP called for "total revolution," asking students, peasants, and labor unions to non-violently transform Indian society. He also demanded the dissolution of



the state government, but this was not accepted by the center. A month later, the railway-employees union, the largest union in the country, went on a nationwide railways strike. This strike was led by the firebrand trade union leader George Fernandes who was the President of the All India Railwaymen's Federation. He was also the President of the Socialist Party. The strike was brutally suppressed by the Indira Gandhi government, which arrested thousands of employees and drove their families out of their quarters.

Raj Narain verdict:

Raj Narain, who had been defeated in the 1971 parliamentary election by Indira Gandhi, lodged cases of election fraud and use of state machinery for election purposes against her in the Allahabad High Court. Shanti Bhushan fought the case for Narain (Nani Palkhivala fought the case for Indira). Indira Gandhi was also cross-examined in the High Court which was the first such instance for an Indian Prime Minister (Indira Gandhi had to present herself for 5 hours in front of judge).

On 12 June 1975, Justice Jagmohanlal Sinha of the Allahabad High Court found the prime minister guilty on the charge of misuse of government machinery for her election campaign. The court declared her election null and void and unseated her from her seat in the Lok Sabha. The court also banned her from contesting any election for an additional six years. Serious charges such as bribing voters and election malpractices were dropped and she was held responsible for misusing government machinery and found guilty on charges such as using the state police to build a dais, availing herself of the services of a government officer, Yashpal Kapoor, during the elections before he had resigned from his position, and use of electricity from the state electricity department. Her supporters organised mass pro-Indira demonstrations in the streets of Delhi close to the Prime Minister's residence. The persistent efforts of Narain were praised worldwide as it took over four years for Justice Sinha to pass judgement against the prime minister

Indira Gandhi challenged the High Court's decision in the Supreme Court. Justice V. R. Krishna Iyer, on 24 June 1975, upheld the High Court judgement and ordered all privileges Gandhi received as an MP be stopped, and that she be debarred from voting. However, she was



allowed to continue as Prime Minister pending the resolution of her appeal. Jayaprakash Narayan and Morarji Desai called for daily anti-government protests. The next day, Jayaprakash Narayan organised a large rally in Delhi, where he said that a police officer must reject the orders of government if the order is immoral and unethical as this was Mahatma Gandhi's motto during the freedom struggle. Such a statement was taken as a sign of inciting rebellion in the country. Later that day, Indira Gandhi requested a compliant President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to proclaim a state of emergency. Within three hours, the electricity to all major newspapers was cut and the political opposition arrested. The proposal was sent without discussion with the Union Cabinet, who only learnt of it and ratified it the next morning.

Preventive detention laws:

Before the emergency, the Indira Gandhi government passed draconian laws which would be used to arrest political opponents before and during emergency. One of these was the Maintenance of Internal Security Act (MISA), 1971, which was passed in May 1971 despite criticism from prominent opposition figures across partisan lines such as CPI(M)'s Jyotirmoy Basu, Jana Sangh's Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and the Anglo-Indian nominated MP Frank Anthony. The Indira government also renewed the Defence of India rules, which was withdrawn in 1967, Defence of India rules were given an expanded mandate 5 days into the emergency and renamed as Defence and Internal Security of India Rules. Another law, Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act passed in December 1974, was also frequently used to target political opponents.

Proclamation of the Emergency:

The Government cited threats to national security, as a war with Pakistan had recently been concluded. Due to the war and additional challenges of drought and the 1973 oil crisis, the economy was in poor condition. The Government claimed that the strikes and protests had paralysed the government and hurt the economy of the country greatly. In the face of massive political opposition, desertion and disorder across the country and the party, Gandhi stuck to the advice of a few loyalists and her younger son Sanjay Gandhi, whose own power had grown considerably over the last few years to become an "extra-constitutional authority". Siddhartha



Shankar Ray, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, proposed to the prime minister to impose an "internal emergency". He drafted a letter for the President to issue the proclamation based on information Indira had received that "there is an imminent danger to the security of India being threatened by internal disturbances". He showed how democratic freedom could be suspended while remaining within the ambit of the Constitution.

After resolving a procedural matter, President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed declared a state of internal emergency upon the prime minister's advice on the night of 25 June 1975, just a few minutes before the clock struck midnight. As the constitution requires, Mrs. Gandhi advised and President Ahmed approved the continuation of Emergency over every six months until she decided to hold elections in 1977. In 1976, Parliament voted to delay elections, something it could only do with the Constitution suspended by the Emergency.

Administration:

Indira Gandhi devised a '20-point' economic programme to increase agricultural and industrial production, improve public services and fight poverty and illiteracy, through "the discipline of the graveyard". In addition to the official twenty points, Sanjay Gandhi declared his five-point programme promoting literacy, family planning, tree planting, the eradication of casteism and the abolition of dowry. Later during the Emergency, the two projects merged into a twenty-five-point programme.

Arrests

Invoking articles 352 and 356 of the Indian Constitution, Indira Gandhi granted herself extraordinary powers and launched a massive crackdown on civil rights and political opposition. The Government used police forces across the country to place thousands of protestors and strike leaders under preventive detention. Vijayaraje Scindia, Jayaprakash Narayan, Mulayam Singh Yadav, Raj Narain, Morarji Desai, Charan Singh, Jivatram Kripalani, George Fernandes, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Lal Krishna Advani, Arun Jaitley, Jai Kishan Gupta Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Gayatri Devi, the dowager queen of Jaipur, and other protest leaders were immediately arrested. Organisations like the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and Jamaat-e-Islami, along with some political parties, were banned. CPI(M) leaders V.S. Achuthanandan and Jyotirmoy



Basu were arrested along with many others involved with their party. Congress leaders who dissented against the Emergency declaration and amendment to the constitution, such as Mohan Dharia and Chandra Shekhar, resigned their government and party positions and were thereafter arrested and placed under detention. Members of regional opposition parties such as DMK also found themselves arrested.

Most of these arrests happened under laws such as MISA, DISIR, and COFEPOSA. During the emergency 34,988 people were arrested under MISA, and 75,818 people were arrested under DISIR. This included both political prisoners and ordinary criminals. Most states classified those arrested under MISA into multiple categories. For instance in Andhra Pradesh they were classified into three categories- Class A, Class B, and Class C. Class A prisoners included prominent political leaders, members of parliament, and members of the legislative assembly. Class B prisoners included less prominent political prisoners. Class C included those detained for "economic offences" and other offences. Class A and B prisoners were treated better and received better amenities in prison than other categories of prisoners. Those arrested under COFEPOSA and DISR, depending on the state, found themselves detained with ordinary criminals, as Class C prisoners, or their own separate category. Cases like the Baroda dynamite case and the Rajan case became exceptional examples of atrocities committed against civilians in independent India.

Laws, human rights and elections:

Elections for the Parliament and state governments were postponed. Gandhi and her parliamentary majorities could rewrite the nation's laws since her Congress party had the required mandate to do so – a two-thirds majority in the Parliament. And when she felt the existing laws were 'too slow', she got the President to issue 'Ordinances' – a law-making power in times of urgency, invoked sparingly – completely bypassing the Parliament, allowing her to rule by decree. Also, she had little trouble amending the Constitution that exonerated her from any culpability in her election-fraud case, imposing President's Rule in Gujarat and Tamil Nadu, where anti-Indira parties ruled (state legislatures were thereby dissolved and suspended indefinitely), and jailing thousands of opponents. The 42nd Amendment, which brought about



extensive changes to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, is one of the lasting legacies of the Emergency. In the conclusion of his Making of India's Constitution, Justice Khanna writes.

If the Indian constitution is our heritage bequeathed to us by our founding fathers, no less are we, the people of India, the trustees, and custodians of the values which pulsate within its provisions! A constitution is not a parchment of paper, it is a way of life and has to be lived up to. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and in the final analysis, its only keepers are the people. The imbecility of men, history teaches us, always invites the impudence of power.

A fallout of the Emergency era was the Supreme Court laid down that, although the Constitution is amenable to amendments (as abused by Indira Gandhi), changes that tinker with its basic structure cannot be made by the Parliament. (see *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*). In the Rajan case, P. Rajan of the Regional Engineering College, Calicut, was arrested by the police in Kerala on 1 March 1976, tortured in custody until he died and then his body was disposed of and was never recovered. The facts of this incident came out owing to a habeas corpus suit filed in the Kerala High Court. Many cases where teens were arrested and imprisoned have come to light, one such example is of Dilip Sharma who aged 16 was arrested and imprisoned for over 11 months. He was released based on Patna High Court's judgment on 29 July 1976.

Economics:

Christophe Jaffrelot considers the economic policy of the emergency regime to be corporatist, five programs in the 20 point program were aimed at benefiting the middle classes and industrialists, these included- liberalizing investment procedures, introducing new schemes for workers' associations in the industry, implementing a national permit scheme for road transport, tax breaks to the middle class by exempting anyone earning under Rs. 8,000 from income taxes, and an austerity program to reduce public spending.

Trade unions and worker's rights:

The emergency regime cracked down on trade unionism, banned strikes, imposed wage freezes, and phased out wage bonuses. The largest trade unions in the country at the time such as the Congress' INTUC, CPI's AITUC, and Socialist affiliated HMS were made to comply with the



new regime, while the CPI(M)'s CITU continued its opposition for which it had 20 of its leaders arrested. State governments were asked to form bipartite councils composed of representatives of the workers and the management for firms having more than 500 employees, similar apex bipartite committees were formed by the Centre for major public sector industries, while a National Apex Board was set up for the private industries. These were meant to give a veneer of worker participation in decision making but were in reality stacked in favor of the management, and tasked with increasing "productivity" by cutting holidays (including Sundays), bonuses, agreeing to wage freeze, and allowing layoffs.

Worker demonstrations during the emergency were subject to heavy state repression, such as when the AITUC organized a one-day strike to protest the slashing of bonuses in January 1976, to which the state responded by arresting 30,000-40,000 workers. In another such instance, the 8,000 workers of the Indian Telephone Industries (a Bangalore-based state-owned company) took part in a peaceful sit-in protest in response to the management renegeing its promise of a 20% bonus to just 8%, they found themselves lathi-charged by the police who also arrested a few hundred of them.

Coal miners were forced to work in abysmal conditions with irregular pay, collieries were made to run for all seven days a week, and complaints of workers and unions about the abysmal and dangerous working conditions were ignored and met with state repression. These terrible workplace conditions led to the deadliest mining disaster in Indian history on 27 December 1975, at Chasnala coal mine near Dhanbad which claimed the lives of 375 miners due to more than 100 million gallons of water flooding the mine. This was the 222nd such accident that year, the previous incidents having claimed 288 lives.

Inflation and price control:

The emergency government enjoyed a degree of popular support due to lower prices of goods and services at least during 1975. This was due to many reasons such as RBI's policy of putting in place a 6 percent ceiling on annual money supply growth months before the emergency, record monsoon in the year of 1975 leading to record harvest of foodgrains which led to food prices declining, increased import of grains, and reduced demand due to cutting of



worker's wages and bonuses. In addition to this half of the dearness allowance of workers was withheld as part of the Wage Freeze act as compulsory deposits to combat inflation. However, these reduced prices only lasted till March 1976 when the prices of commodities started to go up again, on account of foodgrain production declining by 7.9%. Between 1 April and 6 October 1976 the wholesale price index rose by 10%, in which the price of rice rose by 8.3%, groundnut oil rose by 48%, while the prices of industrial raw materials as a group rose by 29.3%.

Tax policy

The emergency regime exempted those earning between Rs 6,000-8,000 from taxation, provided tax breaks for those earning between Rs 8,000-15,000 in the range of Rs 45-264. There were only 3.8 million (38 lakh) taxpayers in the country at the time. Wealth taxes were also cut from 8% to 2.5% while the income taxes on those earning more than Rs 100,000 were reduced from 77% to 66%. This was expected to lower the government's revenue by Rs 3.08-3.25 billion. To compensate for this indirect taxes grew, the ratio of indirect taxes to direct taxes was at 5.31 in 1976. Despite this there was a loss in revenue of Rs 400 million (40 crores), to compensate for this the Indira Gandhi government decided to cut spending in education and social welfare.

Forced sterilization:

In September 1976, Sanjay Gandhi initiated a widespread compulsory sterilization program to limit population growth. The exact extent of Sanjay Gandhi's role in the implementation of the program is disputed, with some writers holding Gandhi directly responsible for his authoritarianism, and other writers blaming the officials who implemented the programme rather than Gandhi himself. It is clear that international pressure from the United States, United Nations, and World Bank played a role in the implementation of these population control measures. Rukhsana Sultana was a socialite known for being one of Sanjay Gandhi's close associates^[45] and she gained a lot of notoriety in leading Sanjay Gandhi's sterilization campaign in Muslim areas of old Delhi. The campaign primarily involved getting males to undergo vasectomy. Quotas were set up that enthusiastic supporters and government officials worked hard to achieve. There were allegations of coercion of unwilling candidates too. In 1976–1977, the program led to 8.3 million sterilizations, most of them forced, up from 2.7 million the



previous year. The bad publicity led many 1977 governments to stress that family planning is entirely voluntary.

Kartar, a cobbler, was taken to a block development office by six policemen, where he was asked how many children he had. He was forcefully taken for sterilization in a jeep. En route, the police forced a man on a bicycle into the jeep because he was not sterilized. Kartar had an infection and pain because of the procedure and could not work for months

Shahu Ghalake, a peasant from Barsi in Maharashtra, was taken for sterilization. After mentioning that he was already sterilized, he was beaten. A sterilization procedure was undertaken on him for a second time. Hawa Singh, a young widower, from Pipli was taken from the bus against his will and sterilized. The ensuing infection took his life. Harijan, a 70-year-old with no teeth and bad eyesight, was sterilized forcefully.

Ottawa, a village 80 kilometers south of Delhi, woke up to the police loudspeakers at 03:00. Police gathered 400 men at the bus stop. In the process of finding more villagers, police broke into homes and looted. A total of 800 forced sterilizations were done.

In Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh, on 18 October 1976, police picked up 17 people, of which two were over 75 and two under 18. Hundreds of people surrounded the police station demanding they free captives. The police refused to release them and used tear gas shells. The crowd retaliated by throwing stones and to control the situation, the police fired on the crowd. 30 people died as a result.

Demolitions:

Demolitions in Delhi:

Delhi served as the epicenter of Sanjay Gandhi's "urban renewal" program, aided in large part by DDA vice president Jagmohan Malhotra who himself had a desire to "beautify" the city. During the emergency Jagmohan emerged as the single most powerful person in the DDA, and went to extraordinary lengths to do the bidding of Sanjay Gandhi, as the Shah commission notes- "Shri Jagmohan during the emergency, became a law unto himself and went about doing the



biddings of Shri Sanjay Gandhi without care or concern for the miseries of the people affected thereby". In total, 700,000 people in Delhi were displaced due to the demolitions carried out in Delhi.

Demolitions outside Delhi:

During the Emergency, various state governments also carried out demolitions to clear "encroachments", undertaken to please Sanjay Gandhi. In many of these cases, residents were given very short notices, state governments like those of Bihar and Haryana avoided giving official notices to the residents of "encroachments" to avoid a case in a civil court, instead, they notified them through public channels, or in the case of Haryana through drum beats, and in some cases gave no prior information. States passed various laws to aid them in this process such as Maharashtra Vacant Land Act 1975, Bihar Public Encroachment Act 1975, and Madhya Pradesh Land Revenue Code (Amendment) Act. These demolitions were often accompanied by the police to threaten the residents with arrest under MISA or DIR. In Maharashtra, Mumbai alone saw demolitions of 12,000 huts, while Pune saw demolitions of 1285 huts and 29 shops.

Elections of 1977:

On 18 January 1977, Gandhi called fresh elections for March and released several opposition leaders; however, many others remained in prison even after she left office, despite the Emergency officially ending on 21 March 1977. The opposition Janata movement's campaign warned Indians that the elections might be their last chance to choose between "democracy and dictatorship".

The Indian general election of 1977 was held from 16 to 20 March, and resulted in a landslide victory for the Janata Party and the CFD, securing 298 seats in the Lok Sabha, whereas the ruling Indian National Congress only managed to win 154—a decrease of 198 as compared to the previous election. Indira Gandhi herself was voted out of office in the Rae Bareilly constituency, losing to electoral rival Raj Narain by a margin of over 55,000 votes. INC candidates failed to win a single seat in the constituencies of several northern states, such as Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The Janata Party's 298 seats were further augmented by an additional



47 seats won by its various political allies, thereby giving them a two-thirds supermajority. Morarji Desai became the first non-Congress Prime Minister of India.

Voters in the electorally largest state of Uttar Pradesh, historically a Congress stronghold, turned against Gandhi and her party failed to win a single seat in the state. Dhanagare says the structural reasons behind the discontent against the Government included the emergence of the strong and united opposition, disunity and weariness inside Congress, an effective underground opposition, and the ineffectiveness of Gandhi's control of the mass media, which had lost much credibility. The structural factors allowed voters to express their grievances, notably their resentment of the emergency and its authoritarian and repressive policies. One grievance often mentioned was the 'nasbandi' (vasectomy) campaign in rural areas. The middle classes also emphasized the curbing of freedom throughout the state and India. Meanwhile, Congress hit an all-time low in West Bengal because of the poor discipline and factionalism among Congress activists as well as the numerous defections that weakened the party. Opponents emphasized the issues of corruption in Congress and appealed to a deep desire by the voters for fresh leadership.

The tribunal:

The efforts of the Janata administration to get government officials and Congress politicians tried for Emergency-era abuses and crimes were largely unsuccessful due to a disorganized, over-complex, and politically motivated process of litigation. The Thirty-eighth Amendment of the Constitution of India, put in place shortly after the outset of the Emergency and which among other things prohibited judicial reviews of states of emergencies and actions taken during them, also likely played a role in this lack of success. Although special tribunals were organized and scores of senior Congress Party and government officials arrested and charged, including Mrs. Gandhi and Sanjay Gandhi, police were unable to submit sufficient evidence for most cases, and only a few low-level officials were convicted of any abuses.

Legacy:

The Emergency lasted 21 months, and its legacy remains intensely controversial. A few days after the Emergency was imposed, the Bombay edition of *The Times of India* carried an obituary that read Democracy, beloved husband of Truth, loving father of Liberty, brother of Faith, Hope



and Justice, expired on June 26. A few days later censorship was imposed on newspapers. The Delhi edition of the *Indian Express* on 28 June, carried a blank editorial, while the *Financial Express* reproduced in large type Rabindranath Tagore's poem "Where the mind is without fear". However, the Emergency also received support from several sections. It was endorsed by social reformer Vinoba Bhave (who called it *Anushasan Parva*, a time for discipline), industrialist J. R. D. Tata, writer Khushwant Singh, and Indira Gandhi's close friend and Odisha Chief Minister Nandini Satpathy. However, Tata and Satpathy later regretted that they spoke in favour of the Emergency.

In the book *JP Movement and the Emergency*, historian, Bipan Chandra wrote, "Sanjay Gandhi and his cronies like Bansi Lal, Minister of Defence at the time, were keen on postponing elections and prolonging the emergency by several years. In October–November 1976, an effort was made to change the basic civil libertarian structure of the Indian Constitution through the 42nd amendment to it. ... The most important changes were designed to strengthen the executive at the cost of the judiciary, and thus disturb the carefully crafted system of Constitutional checks and balance between the three organs of the government."

The birth of Bangladesh:

Bangladesh appeared ON the world map as an independent country in 1971 after a nine-month war of liberation in which nearly one million people died. The civil war in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) started when the Pakistani army launched a military offensive against the protesting Bengali people in March 1971. The war and subsequent independence of East Pakistan was the direct result of the policies adopted by the establishment based in West Pakistan and the treatment it meted out to the Bengali population.

There was a strong perception that Bengalis were the second-class citizens of Pakistan, and that the ruling elite in West Pakistan would not give them their rightful share. Economic underdevelopment, increasing poverty and unemployment existed alongside the denial of basic democratic and human rights. Combined with the economic, political, social and cultural dominance of the ruling elite of West Pakistan, this gave rise to the nationalist sentiments and mood among the masses of East Pakistan. This peaked when the West Pakistan establishment



refused to recognise the parliamentary majority won in East Pakistan and their right to head the federal government.

Following the end of British direct colonial rule, India was partitioned and the independent states of India and Pakistan were created in 1947. The region of Bengal was divided along religious lines. The predominantly Muslim eastern half became the East Bengal state (later renamed East Pakistan) of Pakistan, and the predominantly Hindu western part became the West Bengal state of India.

Pakistan, itself, was made up of two areas, East and West, which were separated by more than 1,000 miles of Indian territory. While the West contained a minority of Pakistan's total population, it had the largest share of revenue allocation, and industrial, agricultural and infrastructure development. The Punjabis, Muhajirs and Pashtuns dominated the military and civil bureaucracy, the real power in the country which took full advantage of the weak political leadership and capitalist class. Bengalis were underrepresented in the state structures. Only one regiment in the Pakistani army was Bengali. And many Bengalis felt that the bitter dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir left East Pakistan increasingly vulnerable and threatened.

Political instability and economic difficulties marked Pakistan's history from its formation. In 1956, a constitution was finally adopted, describing the country as an 'Islamic republic within the Commonwealth'. The political musical chairs continued until the imposition of martial law in 1958 by General Ayub Khan. This was maintained until 1962, when Khan declared himself president (and field marshal) – he stood down in March 1969. Martial law was again imposed between 1969, when General Yahya Khan took over, and 1971. Prolonged military rule further alienated the Bengali population. Not only did the gulf between rich and poor reach unprecedented levels, exacerbating class tensions, but the disparity between West and East Pakistan also reached new heights.



The language movement:

IN 1948, The government of Pakistan ordained Urdu as the sole national language, sparking extensive protests among the Bengali-speaking majority of East Pakistan. Facing rising sectarian tensions and mass discontent, the government outlawed public meetings and rallies. Students at the University of Dhaka and other political activists defied the law, organising a protest on 21 February 1952, when a number of students were killed by the police.

The deaths provoked widespread civil unrest led by the Awami Muslim League, later renamed the Awami League. After years of conflict, the central government relented and granted official status to the Bengali language in 1956. The language movement was the catalyst for the assertion of Bengali national identity, the forerunner of the nationalist movements – including the six-point movement of the Awami League, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, which called for a federal government with a high level of autonomy – and the liberation war itself.

The first election for the East Bengal provincial assembly was held from 8-12 March 1954. The Awami Muslim League, Krishak-Sramik party and Nezam-e-Islam formed the United Front, which won 215 of the 237 Muslim seats. The ruling Muslim League got only nine seats, the Khilafat-E-Rabbani party got one, while independents took twelve. Later, seven independents joined the United Front and one joined the Muslim League. The Muslim League had provoked anger for opposing the demand for the recognition of Bangla as one of the state languages, and by ordering the massacre of 1952, key reasons for the collapse in its support.

This cabinet lasted for only 14 days. The Muslim League did all it could to undermine the United Front. In the third week of May, there were bloody riots between Bengali and non-Bengali workers in mills and factories of East Bengal. The United Front was blamed for failing to control the situation. The federal administration sacked the United Front government, paving the way for direct federal government rule of East Bengal from the federal capital, further fuelling nationalist sentiments.



The rise of the Awami League:

The Awami League had been formed in 1955 when the Awami Muslim League split into a pro-establishment right wing and an anti-establishment, left-leaning, radical nationalist group, which became a mass force in the late 1960s. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman emerged as its main leader.

The revolutionary uprising of the working masses shook the military regime of Ayub Khan, who was replaced by General Yahya Khan in March 1969. The situation was ripe for a socialist revolution led by the workers. The workers, peasants, urban poor, students, layers of the urban and rural middle classes, and youth showed their determination, courage and power and continued their struggle to overthrow capitalism and feudalism. The ideas of socialism spread like wildfire. The gigantic general strike and mass demonstrations paralysed the state apparatus for more than a month, in the East and West.

In the absence of a genuine socialist revolutionary party and leadership, however, the Stalinist and Maoist left failed to build a working-class alternative. Instead, they blindly followed the reactionary and bankrupt Stalinist idea of the stages theory which held that, following national 'liberation', an indefinite period of capitalist economic growth and parliamentary rule was necessary before it was possible to move on to transform society on a socialist basis.

Fearing that they were about to completely lose control of the situation, the ruling class and military establishment announced the first general elections in the country, in 1970, in an attempt to defuse the situation and divert the attention of the working masses.

The ruling elite were also struck by the effects of the Bhola cyclone, which made landfall on the East Pakistan coastline during the evening of 12 November 1970. Coinciding with the local high tide, it wrought massive devastation, killing 300,000 to 500,000 people. Though the exact death toll is not known, it is considered to be the deadliest tropical cyclone on record. A week later, Yahya Khan conceded that his government had made 'mistakes' in its handling of the relief effort, due to its underestimation of the magnitude of the disaster.



A statement released by eleven political leaders in East Pakistan ten days after the cyclone hit charged the government with "gross neglect, callous and utter indifference". On 19 November, students held a march in the provincial capital, Dhaka, protesting the slowness of the government response. Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhashani, peasant leader of the radical, left-wing National Awami Party (NAP), addressed a rally of 50,000 people on 24 November, where he demanded the president's resignation.

The results of the general election clearly reflected the mood and consciousness in society. Both the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), led by Zulfikur Ali Bhutto, and the Awami League emerged as the leading parties on slogans based around socialism, secularism and democracy. The working masses had rejected the vicious propaganda against socialism and had voted overwhelmingly for social change. All the religious and pro-establishment parties were routed.

The Awami League also used nationalism as a main slogan, cleverly mixing this with the class issues to gain the support of the radicalised workers, students and youth. The Awami League won 165 of the 167 national assembly seats reserved for East Pakistan. The two other seats were won by independents. The PPP won 81 of the seats in West Pakistan to become the leading force there. On a national level, the Awami League was also the single largest party in the 313-seat parliament.

The election results shocked the establishment. Yahya Khan, the interim military ruler/president, refused to convene parliament. Instead, talks were brokered on constitutional questions about the division of power between the central government and the provinces, as well as on the possibility of forming a national government headed by the Awami League. The talks proved unsuccessful. On 1 March 1971, Khan indefinitely postponed the pending parliamentary session, precipitating massive civil disobedience in East Pakistan.

Bhutto proclaimed his support for 'bread, cloth and shelter' for the poor masses and an end to the capitalist system. But he completely opposed the right of self-determination for the Bengalis of East Pakistan. Bhutto would not agree to Mujibur Rahman taking over the federal government, even though the Awami League had won an overall majority, and he was opposed



to genuine autonomy for the East. As events unfolded, Bhutto gave his support to Yahya Khan and the generals in their determination to crush the independence movement, then took over as president and martial law administrator in December 1971.

Beginning the liberation struggle

As the conflict between East and West Pakistan developed in March, the Dhaka offices of the two government organisations directly involved in the Bhola cyclone relief effort were closed for at least two weeks, first by a general strike and then by a ban on government work in East Pakistan imposed by the Awami League. With this increase in tension, foreign personnel were evacuated over fears of violence. Relief work continued in the field, but long-term planning was curtailed. This conflict widened into the Bangladesh liberation war and concluded with the creation of Bangladesh.

On 2 March 1971, a group of students, led by ASM Abdur Rob, vice-president of the Dhaka University Central Students Union and well-known left-wing leader, raised the new (proposed) flag of Bangladesh under the direction of the Swadhin Bangla Nucleus, an underground organisation in the leadership of the liberation struggle. The following day, student leader, Sahjahan Siraj, read the declaration of independence (sadhinotar ishtehar) at Paltan Maidan, at a public meeting, again organised by the Swadhin Bangla Nucleus.

On 7 March, there was a historical public gathering in Paltan Maidan to hear Mujibur Rahman outline the need for revolution and independence. Although he avoided a direct call for independence, as talks were still underway, the speech is considered to be a key moment in the preparation for war. It is remembered for Rahman's call: "This time the revolution is for freedom. This time, the revolution is for liberation". (Ebarer shongram muktir shongram. Ebarer shongram shadhinotar shongram.)

On the evening of 25 March 1971, the rising political discontent and cultural nationalism in East Pakistan was met by brutal repression from the ruling elite of the West Pakistan establishment, codenamed Operation Searchlight.



Rahman was arrested and the political leaders dispersed, mostly fleeing to neighbouring India where, subsequently, they organised a provisional government. Before being held by the army, Rahman passed on a handwritten note of the declaration of independence and it was circulated among the people. Bengali army major, Ziarur Rahman, captured Kalurghat radio station in Chittagong and read out the declaration proclaiming the independence of Bangladesh.

Operation searchlight

The Aim OF Operation Searchlight was to crush the Bengali nationalist movement by taking control of the major cities and then eliminating all opposition, political or military, within a month. Before the start of the operation, all foreign journalists were systematically deported from East Pakistan. The main phase of the operation ended with the fall of the last major town in Bengali hands in mid-May.

Atrocities were committed. These systematic killings served only to enrage the Bengalis – and, ultimately, resulted in the secession of East Pakistan later in the same year. International media and reference books have published casualty figures which vary greatly – from 5,000 to 35,000 in Dhaka; and 200,000 to three million for Bangladesh as a whole. The atrocities have been referred to as acts of genocide. According to the Asia Times, at a meeting of the military top brass, Yahya Khan declared: "Kill three million of them and the rest will eat out of our hands". Fighters were disarmed and killed, students and the intelligentsia systematically liquidated, and able-bodied Bengali males singled out and gunned down.

Although the violence focused on Dhaka, it affected all parts of East Pakistan. The residential halls of the University of Dhaka were particularly targeted. The only Hindu residential hall – Jagannath Hall – was destroyed by the Pakistani armed forces, and an estimated 600-700 of its residents were murdered. The army denies any cold-blooded killings at the university, though the Hamood-ur-Rehman commission in Pakistan concluded that overwhelming force was used there. These events have been corroborated by a videotape filmed secretly by Professor Nurul Ullah of the East Pakistan Engineering University, whose residence was directly opposite the student dormitories.



At first, resistance was spontaneous and disorganised. But, as the crackdown intensified, resistance grew. The Mukti Bahini freedom fighters became increasingly active. Increasing numbers of Bengali soldiers defected to this underground Bangladesh army, bolstering their weaponry with supplies from India. Pakistan responded by airlifting in two infantry divisions and reorganising its forces. It also raised paramilitary forces of Razakars, Al-Badr and Al-Shams – mostly members of the Jamati Islami (the main religious fundamentalist organisation) and other Islamist groups – as well as other Bengalis who opposed independence, and Bihari Muslims who had settled during the time of partition.

On 17 April, a provisional government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh was formed in Meherpur (later renamed Mujibnagar), in western Bangladesh bordering India. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who was in prison in Pakistan, was named as president, Syed Nazrul Islam, acting president, Tajuddin Ahmed, prime minister, and General Muhammad Ataul Ghani Osmani, commander-in-chief.

Indian intervention

The war led to a sea of refugees – estimated at the time to be about ten million – flooding into the eastern Indian provinces of Assam and West Bengal. Facing a mounting humanitarian and economic crisis – and seeking to keep influence over an increasingly radicalized liberation movement – India started to actively aid and organise the Mukti Bahini, and sent in troops in December 1971.

West Pakistan's ruling elite correctly feared that India's entry into the war spelled certain defeat. So it launched a pre-emptive strike on Indian air force bases on 3 December – modelled on the Israeli air force's Operation Focus during the 1967 six-day war – which was intended to neutralise Indian planes on the ground. The plan failed to achieve the desired effect since India had anticipated such an action. It was seen by India, however, as an open act of unprovoked aggression and marked the official start of the Indo-Pakistan war.

Pakistan's regime made urgent appeals to the United Nations to intervene and force India to agree to a ceasefire. The UN Security Council assembled on 4 December 1971 to discuss the



situation. After lengthy discussions, on 7 December, the United States put forward a resolution for an "immediate ceasefire and withdrawal of troops". Stalinist Russia vetoed the resolution twice. In light of the Pakistani atrocities, Britain and France abstained.

Three Indian corps were involved in the invasion of East Pakistan. They were supported by nearly three brigades of Mukti Bahini, with many more fighting irregularly. This was far superior to Pakistan's 90,000 troops. India's external intelligence agency, RAW, mobilised the largest covert operation in the history of South Asia, providing crucial logistical support to the Mukti Bahini during the initial stages of the war.

The Indian army quickly overran the country, selectively engaging or bypassing heavily defended strongholds. Pakistani forces were unable to effectively counter the onslaught, as they had been deployed in small units around the border to counter guerrilla attacks by the Mukti Bahini. Unable to defend Dhaka, the Pakistanis surrendered on 16 December 1971, the largest surrender since the second world war. Bangladesh sought admission to the UN with most voting in its favour, but China vetoed this as Pakistan was its key ally, as was the United States, which was one of the last nations to accord Bangladesh recognition.

The geopolitical stage

Although US President Richard Nixon claimed that he would not get involved in the situation, saying that it was an internal matter of Pakistan, his administration provided political and material support to Yahya Khan throughout the turmoil. Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger, feared the expansion of Russian influence into South and Southeast Asia. Pakistan was a close ally of Maoist China, with whom Nixon had been negotiating a rapprochement and which he intended to visit in February 1972.

The US administration feared that an Indian invasion of West Pakistan would mean the domination of the region by Stalinist Russia. That, in turn, would seriously undermine the global position of the US and the regional position of America's new tacit ally, China. In order to demonstrate to China the reliability of the US as an ally, and in direct violation of the US



Congress-imposed sanctions on Pakistan, Nixon sent military supplies to Pakistan, routing them through Jordan and Iran. China was encouraged to increase arms supplies to Pakistan.

The Nixon administration ignored the reports it received of the genocidal activities of the Pakistani army in East Pakistan, most notably in the infamous 'Blood telegram'. This had been sent by US diplomat, Archer Blood, on 6 April 1971 and had highlighted atrocities during the liberation war.

Stalinist Russia supported the Indian army and Mukti Bahini during the war, recognising that the independence of Bangladesh would weaken the position of its global and regional rivals. It gave assurances to India that, if a confrontation with the US or China developed, Russia would take countermeasures. This was enshrined in the Indo-Soviet friendship treaty signed in August 1971.

When Pakistan's defeat seemed certain, Nixon sent the aircraft carrier, USS Enterprise, to the Bay of Bengal, a move which ratcheted up nuclear tensions in the region. USS Enterprise arrived on station on 11 December 1971. On 6 and 13 December, the Russian navy dispatched two groups of ships, armed with nuclear missiles, from Vladivostok. They trailed the US task force in the Indian ocean from 18 December until 7 January 1972.

At the end of the war, the Warsaw Pact countries of Central and Eastern Europe were among the first to recognise Bangladesh. Stalinist Russia accorded recognition to Bangladesh on 25 January 1972. The United States eventually did so in April. On 2 July 1972, the Simla accord was signed between India and Pakistan, the stated aim being to normalise relations between India and Pakistan, including the return of Pakistani prisoners of war. Pakistan officially recognised Bangladesh in 1974.

Armed resistance

The Mukti Bahini was formed to fight off the military crackdown by the Pakistan army on 25 March 1971, and as part of the final push of the Bangladesh freedom movement. Ever since the anti-Ayub uprising in 1969 and during the height of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's six-



points campaign, however, there had been a growing movement for Bengali independence in East Pakistan, driven by the nationalists, radicals and leftists.

Apart from the Mukti Bahini, there were independent guerrilla groups led by individual leaders which successfully controlled a number of areas. The regular forces, later called Niomita Bahini, were drawn from members of the East Bengal Regiments, East Pakistan Rifles, the police, other paramilitary forces and those in the general population who were led by the army commanders in Bangladesh's eleven sectors. Three major forces – Z-Force, under Major Ziarur Rahman, K-Force, under Major Khaled Mosharraf, and S-Force, under Major KM Shafiullah – were established later.

The irregular forces, generally called Gono Bahini (people's army), were those who were trained more in guerrilla warfare than conventional combat. They consisted of students, peasants, workers and political activists. Other armed groups were based around organised local struggle, the youth and student wings of the Awami League, the National Awami Party (NAP), Leftist-Communist parties and radical groups.

The Mukti Bahini had several factions. The foremost one was organised by the members of the regular armed forces. The Bangladesh Liberation Forces were led by four youth leaders of the political wing of the Awami League. The Special Guerrilla Forces were led by the Communist Party of Bangladesh, NAP, and the Bangladesh Students Union.

In addition, there were other independent forces that fought in various regions of Bangladesh and liberated many areas. Among others, Siraj Sikder raised a strong guerrilla force which fought several battles with the Pakistani soldiers in Payarabagan, Barisal. And the Mujib Bahini was organised in India by Major General Oban of the Indian Army and a number of Student League leaders.

Many of the individuals and leaders of Mukti Bahini were deeply influenced by left-wing ideology in general. Clearly, there were deep-seated conflicts among the communist parties – most notably, split into pro-Russia and pro-China factions, and bitter disputes within the pro-Chinese faction. In spite of this, many actively participated in the liberation war around the main



nucleus of the Mukti Bahini. Indeed, the Indian authorities and members of the Awami League-led provisional government had grave concerns that they could lose control of the liberation war to the leftists.

After independence:

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was a national hero, immensely popular among the masses. He became prime minister of independent Bangladesh after his release from a Pakistani prison. Rahman made many promises to the masses during the course of the 1970 election campaign. There were high hopes that everything would improve quickly. Rahman's administration introduced reforms, including nationalisation. A new constitution was adopted on the basic principles of nationalism, socialism, secularism and democracy.

More than a third of Bangladesh had been destroyed by civil war or the devastating cyclone. The rebuilding process began but proceeded at a very slow pace. The new government failed to control rising food prices. Serious allegations were made of rampant corruption against cabinet members and senior state officials. Corruption, nepotism and mismanagement were rife. Rahman tried to appease the people by sacking a few ministers but this half-hearted move failed to pacify the mounting anger and discontent.

The first parliamentary elections were held in March 1973, with the Awami League winning a massive majority, 307 out of 315 national assembly seats. But it was losing popularity in the army, with only 20% of the vote in the military areas. In December 1974, in the face of continuing economic deterioration and mounting civil disorder, Rahman proclaimed a state of emergency, limited the powers of the legislative and judicial branches, and banned all newspapers except four government-supported papers. He introduced a one-party system, banning all the other parties.

Rahman's government tried to silence every dissenting voice. The opposition was crushed. But he had not delivered what he had promised to the masses. The project of nation building on a capitalist basis failed. Support from the army was evaporating rapidly with a strong



and rising resentment among middle-ranking officers at the increasing influence of the Indian security forces.



UNIT – III

PRIME MINISTERS OF INDIA

Shri Rajiv Gandhi

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was the youngest Prime Minister of India, perhaps even one of the youngest elected heads of Government in the world. His mother, Smt. Indira Gandhi, was eight years older when she first became Prime Minister in 1966. His illustrious grandfather, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, was 58 when he started the long innings of 17 years as free India's first Prime Minister.

As the harbinger of a generational change in the country, Shri Gandhi received the biggest mandate in the nation's history. He ordered elections to the Lok Sabha, the directly elected house of the Indian Parliament, as soon as mourning for his slain mother was over. In that election, the Congress, got a much higher proportion of the popular vote than in the preceding seven elections and captured a record 401 seats out of 508.

Such an impressive start as the leader of 700 million Indians would have been remarkable under any circumstance. What makes it even more unique is that Shri Gandhi was a late and reluctant entrant into politics even though he belonged to an intensely political family that had served India for four generations – both during the freedom struggle and afterwards.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi was born on August 20, 1944, in Bombay. He was just three when India became independent and his grandfather became Prime Minister. His parents moved to New Delhi from Lucknow. His father, Feroze Gandhi, became an M.P., and earned a reputation as a fearless and hard-working Parliamentarian.

Rajiv Gandhi spent his early childhood with his grandfather in the Teen Murti House, where Indira Gandhi served as the Prime Minister's hostess. He briefly went to school at Welham Prep in Dehra Dun but soon moved to the residential Doon School in the Himalayan foothills. There he made many lifelong friendships and was also joined by his younger brother, Sanjay.



After leaving school, Shri Gandhi went to Trinity College, Cambridge, but soon shifted to the Imperial College (London). He did a course in mechanical engineering. He really was not interested in ‘mugging for his exams’, as went on to admit later.

It was clear that politics did not interest him as a career. According to his classmates, his bookshelves were lined with volumes on science and engineering, not works on philosophy, politics or history. Music, however, had a pride of place in his interests. He liked Western and Hindustani classical, as well as modern music. Other interests included photography and amateur radio. His greatest passion, however, was flying. No wonder then, that on returning home from England, he passed the entrance examination to the Delhi Flying Club, and went to obtain a commercial pilot’s licence. Soon, he became a pilot with Indian Airlines, the domestic national carrier.

While at Cambridge, he had met Sonia Maino, an Italian who was studying English. They were married in New Delhi in 1968. They stayed in Smt. Indira Gandhi’s residence in New Delhi with their two children, Rahul and Priyanka. Theirs was a very private life despite the surrounding din and bustle of political activity.

But his brother Sanjay’s death in an air crash in 1980 changed that. Pressures on Shri Gandhi to enter politics and help his mother, then besieged by many internal and external challenges, grew. He resisted these pressures at first, but later bowed to their logic. He won the by-election to the Parliament, caused by his brother’s death, from Amethi in U.P.

In November 1982, when India hosted the Asian Games, the commitment made years earlier to build the stadia and other infrastructure was fulfilled. Shri Gandhi was entrusted with the task of getting all the work completed on time and ensuring that the games themselves were conducted without any hitches or flaws. In fulfilling this challenging task, he first displayed his flair for quiet efficiency and smooth coordination. At the same time, as General Secretary of the Congress, he started streamlining and energising the party organisation with equal diligence. All these qualities came to the fore later in far more testing and trying times.



For no one could have ascended to power – becoming both Prime Minister and Congress President – in more tragic and tormenting circumstances than Shri Gandhi did in the wake of his mother's brutal assassination on 31 October, 1984. But he bore the awesome burden of personal grief and national responsibility with remarkable poise, dignity and restraint.

During the month long election campaign, Shri Gandhi travelled tirelessly from one part of the country to the other, covering a distance equal to one and a half times the earth's circumference, speaking at 250 meetings in as many places and meeting millions face to face. A modern-minded, decisive but undemonstrative man, Shri Gandhi was at home in the world of high technology. And, as he repeatedly said, one of his main objectives, besides preserving India's unity, was to propel it into the twenty-first century.

On 31 October 1984 Indira Gandhi was assassinated by her bodyguards. Within hours of the assassination Rajiv Gandhi emerged as new Prime Minister of India. The Parliament was dissolved and Fresh elections held which gave a landslide victory to Congress. During his tenure, India's Despite initial disturbances, Indo-US relations interchanged in almost every field-political, economic, cultural and social. The economic ties remained particularly strong. He prioritised India's policy towards his neighbours particularly Sri Lanka and Pakistan. Taking note of Pakistan's growing nuclear capability Rajiv Gandhi signed a significant agreement with Zia-ul- Haq as a confidence building measure, by which the two countries agreed not to attack the nuclear installations of each other. A spirit of optimism marked Indo-Pak relations during Rajiv Gandhi- Benazir Bhutto era. However, in reality Benazir Bhutto was not free to take decisions on her own because the army was Pakistan's de facto ruler. Besides, Pakistan's growing nuclear capability continued as an irritant in India-Pakistan relations.

Turning to Sri Lanka, its deteriorating ethnic situation was accelerating passions of Indian Tamils. Being pressurised by the spiralling passions in Tamil Nadu to help Tamil brethren in distress in Sri Lanka, the Rajiv Gandhi government decided to airlift supplies of essential commodities for the people in Jaffna. This was counted by Sri Lanka as an encroachment of its sovereignty over its airspace. However, it induced rethinking in Colombo and brought the India-Sri Lanka Accord in August, 1987. Under the Accord Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) was



sent to Sri Lanka to supervise the cease fire, the surrender of arms and the peace arrangements in the Tamil areas in the North and the East was envisaged.

However, the Sinhalese nationalists had no intention to abide by Accord because they could not accept the presence of Indian troops on Sri Lankan soil. Premadasa's call for the withdrawal of the Indian troops led to recapturing by the LTTE of the areas restored by IPKF to Colombo's rules. The hallmark of Rajiv Gandhi's foreign policy was improvement of Indo-Sino relations. He equally concentrated on the two superpowers USA and Soviet Union. India signed with United States an agreement in March, 1988, for the transfer of high technology and subsequent acquisition of Super Computers Both India and USA chose to expand their relations through the expansion of exchanges and promotion of trade. The United States though tried to extract most of the growing Indian market, but at the same time preserved its strong military relations with Pakistan.

During Rajiv Gandhi's term Indo-Soviet friendship came to be embedded During Rajiv Gandhi's term Indo-Soviet friendship came to be embedded in public consciousness. It helped India to ward off many hostile challenges from China, from Pakistan, from the West in the form of support to Pakistan. It was beneficial for Soviet Union as well as it enabled it to contend with the isolation, which the West tried to impose on it. Rajiv Gandhi's first visit abroad as Prime Minister was to Moscow from 21st-26th May, 1985, which symbolise healthy Indo-Soviet relations.

The Delhi Declaration the joint-statement by Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi, which came during Gorbachev's India visit in November, 1986, endorsed Gandhian philosophy of non-violence as the guiding principle in international relations. New agreements were signed between India and the USSR on economic and technical cooperation. These cooperation centred around technologies of nuclear power, space technologies and high temperature physics.

Afghanistan's geopolitical importance made India set-up support for Dr Najibullah who overcame the Saur revolution and came at the helm. India even urged Soviet Union to continue tangible support to Najib and his party. Rajiv Gandhi expressed solidarity with Africa in India's full diplomatic recognition of South-West African People's Organisation and his fight against



racialism. He also expressed solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people for a homeland. Indian foreign policy under Rajiv Gandhi not only affirmed India's tradition, but also reoriented foreign policy in the spirit of enlightened self interest to meet the changing needs of time.

Pre 1989 Coalition: Third Front

Third Front in Indian politics refers to various alliances formed by smaller parties at various points of time since 1989 to offer a third option to Indian voters, challenging the Indian National Congress (INC) and Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). V.P. Singh, who had served as the Finance Minister first and then as the Defence Minister in the Rajiv Gandhi government, resigned from the post of Defence Minister after fall out with Rajiv Gandhi over an enquiry into HDW submarine (these submarines had been bought in 1981 when Mrs. Indira Gandhi was both the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister of the Country) scandal, which had broken out in 1987. After his resignation, the Bofors scandal broke out. V .P. Singh, then, left the Congress party and used both these scandals to led a crusade against corruption and the Congress party. In the same year V.P. Singh along with his associates formed Jan Morcha, which along with BJP and left parties began forming anti-congress political bloc . Thereafter he formed the National Front (NF), along with some regional parties in August 1988.

On 11 October 1988, Janata dal was formed with the merger of Jan Morcha, Congress(s), Janta and Lok Dal to contest elections against Congress. An agreement was reached between BJP and V.P. Singh led NF, according to which both BJP and NF agreed not to contest each other in around 85% of seats, and a similar arrangement was made with communist parties for a smaller number of seats. The collaboration between various parties, however, was not on ideological front but on anti-Congress stance and this reason hampered the smooth running of coalition , which formed the government after the elections of 1989.

Election of 1989

Year of 1989 marks the end of Congress domination in Indian political system. Congress failed to get majority in general elections of 1989 and it was the first elections to the Lok Sabha



since independence in which no single party won a majority. The Congress, despite being the single largest party in the elections of 1989, restrained from forming a coalition government and chose to sit as an opposition party in the parliament. V.P. Singh was sworn in as head of National Front government, with the outside support of Left and BJP. It was the second non-Congress government after independence.

Beginning of Coalition Government

Although the first coalition government was formed by Morarji Desai in 1977, the elections of 1989 marked the beginning of multi-party era in Indian politics which continued till 2014, when Narendra Modi led BJP secured the majority of seats. The multi-party era, which dominated the Indian politics thereafter, was a result of emergence of several parties and decline of the Congress in such a way that one or two parties did not get most of the votes. An important feature of the period from 1989 to 2014 was the crucial role played by the regional parties in forming and sustaining the ruling alliances at the centre.

Events during the National Front Government

The running of government was not smooth as a large part of the time and energy was spent on resolving internal differences amongst the coalition partners. The ideological differences and conflicting ambitions amongst the members of the coalition came to the forefront from the beginning. Chandra Shekhar opposed the appointment of V.P. Singh as Prime Minister. Devi Lai who was sworn as Deputy Prime Minister, was disliked by most party members. Later, Devi Lai was dismissed and he gave a call for a big peasant rally on 9th August 1990, to show his political strength. Rattled by this threat and aiming to divert attention, on 7th August 1990, V.P. Singh announced the implementation of recommendations of the Mandal commission in the Parliament.

The government was unable to bring any change in the conditions in Punjab and situation in Kashmir deteriorated with time. Advani's declaration of his plans for rath yatra inflamed the communal passions and set the tone for future communal tensions to follow. He started rath yatra



from Somnath to Ayodhya to lay the foundation stone for Ram Mandir but was arrested at Samastipur in Bihar, which led to withdrawal of BJP support to the central government.

Mandal Commission

Central government in 1978, set up a committee under Bindeshwari Prasad Mandal to look into and recommend ways to identify the 'backward classes' and end their backwardness. This was the second time since independence that the government had appointed such a commission. The commission undertook surveys and finally submitted a report in 1980, but its recommendations could not be implemented as the Janta government had fallen by that time.

Recommendation

The commission advised that "backward classes" should be understood to mean "backward castes". This suggestion was based on the assumption that backward classes belonged to the lower strata in caste hierarchy. Commission in the course of its survey, also found that backward classes had very low presence in public services and educational institutes.

Thus, it recommended 27 percent of seats in educational institutions and government jobs for backward classes. It also made other recommendations like land reforms to improve conditions of Other Backward Classes (OBCs). National front government, in 1990, decided to implement one of the recommendations of Mandal commission pertaining to reservations for OBCs in jobs in the central government and its undertakings. The government's decision to implement one of the recommendations, led to widespread dismay and protests from political parties as well as by public, as unlike in the case of SCs and STs, there were no conclusive proofs of backwardness of OBCs. The scheme of caste based reservation was rejected by protesting students. CPM instead advocated economic criteria. Rajiv Goswami, a student of Delhi University self-immolated himself in protest of the government action.

Consequences

Many forward castes formed caste based associations and caste identities came to fore once again. It was a socially divisive decision which pitted one caste against the other in the



name of social justice. Intense debates on the reservation to the OBCs made people from those communities, included as OBCs, more conscious of their identity. This helped those who wanted to mobilize these groups in politics. Many caste based groups emerged which sought better opportunities for the OBCs in both education and employment arena. After the acceptance of this recommendation of Mandal commission, the overall quota increased to 49.5 percent. Later, it was challenged in Supreme Court, which upheld the decision to implement recommendation in the “Indira Sawhney case” as known by the name of one of the litigants in the case. V.P. Singh government failed to get any political advantage from this move and next year, it lost its majority in the parliament after BJP withdrew its support on Ayodhya issue.

Analysis

The controversy generated by the recommendations of the Mandal commission has obfuscated many issues which need a deeper analysis. There is no doubt that the main recommendations and the demand for their implementation must be supported from the view point of democratisation of Indian society. These recommendations, however, have been criticised for the use of the caste/community criteria to analyse backwardness. The backward people are closely tied into the caste or community that they were born into, connected to the work they do and the cultural and traditional practices which they still follow in a structure that has passed down for centuries. This aspect of reality is forgotten by those who put forward a more progressive sounding argument – that only economic criteria should be used for reservations. On one hand are the critics who are against caste as a criterion. On the other, are those who voice an unqualified support for the commission’s recommendations as being revolutionary in their sweep. Somehow, both fail to observe the real base and limitations of the commission’s approach and recommendations. The undemocratic nature of Indian society lies not merely in the restrictions on our Fundamental Rights or their nonimplementation, but is connected to the economic and political structure of our society. For, without basic amenities to a decent life, the Fundamental Rights themselves cannot be enjoyed. In India, land is concentrated in a few hands. Industry too is highly concentrated in the hands of the top business houses. The caste system operates in a way that social and economic power is monopolised by a small proportion of the population. Scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and



OBCs live mainly in villages, owning none or little land. Many of them are forced to sell their labour in order to survive. Some of them carry out their traditional occupations still in conditions of servitude to the rich. They command no social prestige, nor do they have a political voice except as vote banks. In the cities, most of them are found in the unorganised sector working as labourers in petty trades, or carrying out their traditional occupations, while the well-paid, secure, government jobs and other professions are the monopoly of higher castes.

It is in the context of this structure of our society that we have to evaluate the recommendations and accept their limitations. The recommendations centre around reservation of 27% of all central government jobs for OBCs. The campaigns for the implementation of the Mandal commission recommendations have also focussed only on this demand. Therefore, though there are other recommendations in the report, for instance, land reforms, cooperatives for artisans, etc. they have not been discussed much and the main debate, of both proponents and opponents, has centred around the reservation of jobs and seats in educational institutions. But the implementation of these recommendations does not tackle the roots of backwardness in our society. The very criteria, which were used to define backwardness, like high incidence of manual labour, illiteracy, lack of drinking water sources, etc. are real problems and they cannot be resolved through the implementation of job reservations. The backwardness of these castes and communities, as pointed out before, is rooted in the very socio-economic structure of hierarchical relationships at the village level. Without addressing those, backwardness and poverty cannot be eliminated.

The implementation of radical land reforms requires the participation and mobilization of people themselves. A mobilization that cuts across caste lines to include the vast majority of the scheduled castes, tribes and others. Without this mobilization such recommendations, implemented from above can (as has been so far) only be distorted to benefit a few; thus, negating the very process of democratization. Reservations, though necessary, can help only a few members of the backward castes. However, reservations were important to counter the upper caste monopoly of high status, white collar jobs and professions, and the competition that the backward castes had to face from these better off communities/groups. Moreover, reservation of jobs has given a thrust to those, who have already passed school education and aspire to study



further as reservations for scheduled castes has done. But limited expansion of these jobs due to the slow growth of our economy, shall limit the chances of even a majority of the educated, getting them. The wider task of fighting backwardness still remains. It includes social and economic aspects and only through the peoples struggles to solve these basic questions can the true democratization of our society be completed.

National Commission for Backward Classes

Pursuant to the directions of Supreme Court, the government of India enacted the National Commission for Backward Classes Act, 1993 (Act No. 27 of 1993) for setting up a Commission at national level viz. “National Commission for Backward Classes” as a permanent body. This Commission had the responsibility and the power to consider requests for inclusion in the lists of backward classes , and complaints of over-inclusion or underinclusion. In the process, some of the communities that were in one list, and not in the other, were not included. Those who were in neither list, also came up. A number of them were rejected. The Commission advises the government and the government invariably complies with the Commission’s advice, because the law says that the advice of the Commission is ordinarily binding on the government, which is what the Supreme Court, also laid down. Recently, the Union Cabinet ‘s decision followed demands for constitutional status for the National Commission for Backward Classes, in order to allow it to hear the grievances of OBCs in the manner in which the National Commission for Scheduled Castes and National Commission for Scheduled Tribes do. The latter two are already Constitutional bodies and not statutory entities unlike national commission for backward classes.

P.V Narasimha Rao

P.V. Narasimha Rao, in full Pamulaparti Venkata Narasimha Rao, (born June 28, 1921, near Karimnagar, India—died December 23, 2004, New Delhi), leader of the Congress (I) Party faction of the Indian National Congress (Congress Party) and prime minister of India from 1991 to 1996.



Rao was born in a small village near Karimnagar (now in Telangana, India). He studied at Fergusson College in Pune and at the Universities of Bombay (now Mumbai) and Nagpur, eventually receiving a law degree from the latter institution. He entered politics as a Congress Party activist working for independence from Britain. He served in the Andhra Pradesh state legislative assembly from 1957 to 1977, supporting Indira Gandhi in her split from the Congress Party organization in 1969; initially called the New Congress Party, the splinter group took the name Congress (I) Party in 1978. He held various ministerial positions in the Andhra Pradesh government from 1962 to 1973, including that of chief minister (head of government) from 1971.

In that latter post he implemented a revolutionary land-reform policy and secured political participation for the lower castes. He was elected to represent Andhra Pradesh districts in the Lok Sabha (lower chamber of the Indian parliament) in 1972 and, under Gandhi and her son and successor, Rajiv Gandhi, served in various ministries, notably as foreign minister (1980–84, 1988–89). Besides his political career, Rao was known as a distinguished scholar-intellectual who once was chairman of the Telugu Academy in Andhra Pradesh (1968–74). He was fluent in six languages, translated Hindi verses and books, and wrote fiction in Hindi, Marathi, and Telegu.

After Rajiv Gandhi's assassination in May 1991, the Congress (I) Party chose Rao as its leader, and he became India's 10th prime minister after the general elections in June. Rao almost immediately began efforts to restructure India's economy by converting the inefficient quasi-socialist structure left by Jawaharlal Nehru and the Gandhis into a free-market system. His program involved cutting government regulations and red tape, abandoning subsidies and fixed prices, and privatizing state-run industries. Those efforts to liberalize the economy spurred industrial growth and foreign investment, but they also resulted in rising budget and trade deficits and heightened inflation. During Rao's tenure, Hindu fundamentalism became a significant force in national politics for the first time, as manifested in the growing electoral strength of the Bharatiya Janata Party and other right-wing political groupings. In 1992 Hindu nationalists destroyed a mosque, leading to sectarian violence between Hindus and Muslims that persisted throughout Rao's term as prime minister. Corruption scandals rocked the Congress (I)



Party, which continued its long decline in popularity and lost control of several major state governments to opposition parties in 1995.

Rao stepped down as prime minister in May 1996 after the Congress Party—the “(I)” designation had been dropped by then—was soundly defeated in parliamentary elections in which it garnered an all-time low share of the popular vote. Rao resigned as party chief that September, and the following year he was charged with corruption and bribery in an alleged vote-buying scheme dating from 1993. Rao, the first Indian prime minister (in or out of office) to face trial on criminal charges, was found guilty in 2000, but his conviction was later overturned.

Atal Bihari Vajpayee

Atal Bihari Vajpayee was an Indian politician who served three terms as the 10th Prime Minister of India, first for a term of 13 days in 1996, then for a period of 13 months from 1998 to 1999, followed by a full term from 1999 to 2004. Vajpayee was one of the co-founders and a senior leader of the BJP. He was a member of the RSS, a Hindu nationalist volunteer organisation. He was the first Indian prime minister not of the INC to serve a full term in office. He was also a renowned poet and a writer.

He was a member of the Indian Parliament for over five decades, having been elected ten times to the Lok Sabha, the lower house, and twice to the Rajya Sabha, the upper house. He served as the MP (LS) for Lucknow, retiring from active politics in 2009 due to health concerns. He was among the founding members of the BJS, of which he was president from 1968 to 1972. The BJS merged with several other parties to form the JP, which won the 1977 general election. In March 1977, Vajpayee became the Minister of External Affairs in the cabinet of Prime Minister Morarji Desai. He resigned in 1979, and the Janata alliance collapsed soon after. Former members of the BJS formed the BJP in 1980, with Vajpayee its first president.

During his tenure as prime minister, India carried out the Pokhran-II nuclear tests in 1998. Vajpayee sought to improve diplomatic relations with Pakistan, travelling to Lahore by bus to meet with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. After the 1999 Kargil War with Pakistan, he



sought to restore relations through engagement with President Pervez Musharraf, inviting him to India for a summit at Agra. Vajpayee's government introduced many domestic economic and infrastructural reforms, including encouraging the private sector and foreign investments, reducing governmental waste, encouraging research and development and privatisation of some government owned corporations. Among Vajpayee's projects were the National Highways Development Project, Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana and the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan campaign, aimed at improving the quality of education in primary and secondary schools.

Vajpayee is considered one of the most respected prime ministers of India, receiving praise from the opposition as well. He scores high on India's top ranked prime ministers and is regarded as one of the best prime ministers in Indian history. The administration of Narendra Modi declared in 2014 that Vajpayee's birthday, 25 December, would be marked as Good Governance Day. In 2015, he was conferred India's highest civilian honour, the Bharat Ratna, by the president of India, Pranab Mukherjee. He died in 2018 of age-related illness.

Early life and education

Vajpayee was born into a Hindu Brahmin family on 25 December 1924 in Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh. His mother was Krishna Devi and his father was Krishna Bihari Vajpayee. His father was a school teacher in their home town. His grandfather, Shyam Lal Vajpayee, had migrated to Morena near Gwalior from his ancestral village of Bateshwar in the Agra district of Uttar Pradesh.

Vajpayee did his schooling at the Saraswati Shishu Mandir in Gwalior. In 1934, he was admitted to the Anglo-Vernacular Middle (AVM) School in Barnagar, Ujjain district, after his father joined as headmaster. He subsequently attended Gwalior's Victoria College, Agra University (now Maharani Laxmi Bai Govt. College of Excellence) where he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Hindi, English and Sanskrit. He completed his post-graduation with a Master of Arts in political science from DAV College, Kanpur, Agra University.



Early works as activist

His activism started in Gwalior with Arya Kumar Sabha, the youth wing of the Arya Samaj movement, of which he became the general secretary in 1944. He also joined the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) in 1939 as a swayamsevak, or volunteer. Influenced by Babasaheb Apte, he attended the Officers Training Camp of the RSS during 1940 to 1944, becoming a pracharak (RSS terminology for a full-time worker) in 1947. He gave up studying law due to the partition riots. He was sent to Uttar Pradesh as a vistarak (a probationary pracharak) and soon began working for the newspapers of Deendayal Upadhyaya: Rashtradharm (a Hindi monthly), Panchjanya (a Hindi weekly), and the dailies Swadesh and Veer Arjun.

By 1942, at the age of 16 years, Vajpayee became an active member of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). Although the RSS had chosen not to participate in the Quit India Movement, in August 1942, Vajpayee and his elder brother Prem were arrested for 24 days during the Quit India Movement. He was released after giving a written statement that while he was a part of the crowd, he did not participate in the militant events in Bateshwar on 27 August 1942. Throughout his life, including after he became prime minister, Vajpayee has labelled the allegation of participation in the Quit India Movement to be a false rumour.

Early political career (1947–1975)

In 1951, Vajpayee was seconded by the RSS, along with Deendayal Upadhyaya, to work for the newly formed Bharatiya Jana Sangh, a Hindu right-wing political party associated with the RSS. He was appointed as a national secretary of the party in charge of the Northern region, based in Delhi. He soon became a follower and aide of party leader Syama Prasad Mukherjee. In the 1957 Indian general election, Vajpayee contested elections to the Lok Sabha, the lower house of the Indian Parliament. He lost to Raja Mahendra Pratap in Mathura, but was elected from Balrampur. In the Lok Sabha his oratorical skills so impressed Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that he predicted that Vajpayee would someday become the prime minister of India.



Vajpayee's oratorical skills won him the reputation of being the most eloquent defender of the Jana Sangh's policies. After the death of Deendayal Upadhyaya, the leadership of the Jana Sangh passed to Vajpayee. He became the national president of the Jana Sangh in 1968, running the party along with Nanaji Deshmukh, Balraj Madhok, and L. K. Advani.

Janata and the BJP (1975–1995)

Vajpayee was arrested along with several other opposition leaders during the Internal Emergency imposed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in 1975. Initially interned in Bangalore, Vajpayee appealed his imprisonment on the grounds of bad health, and was moved to a hospital in Delhi. In December 1976, Vajpayee ordered the student activists of the ABVP to tender an unconditional apology to Indira Gandhi for perpetrating violence and disorder. The ABVP student leaders refused to obey his order.

Gandhi ended the state of emergency in 1977. A coalition of parties, including the BJS, came together to form the Janata Party, which won the 1977 general elections. Morarji Desai, the chosen leader of the alliance, became the prime minister. Vajpayee served as the minister of external affairs, or foreign minister, in Desai's cabinet. As foreign minister, Vajpayee became the first person in 1977 to deliver a speech to the United Nations General Assembly in Hindi. Foreign Minister Vajpayee (far right) and Prime Minister Morarji Desai (third from right, front row) with US President Jimmy Carter during his 1978 visit to India. In 1979, Desai and Vajpayee resigned, triggering the collapse of the Janata Party. The erstwhile members of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh came together to form the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in 1980, with Vajpayee as its first President.

Leading up to Operation Bluestar, there were several protests by Sangh Parivar, including a march led by LK Advani and Vajpayee of the Bhartiya Janta Party to protest against the lack of government action and to demand that the Indian Army be sent into the Golden Temple. The 1984 general elections were held in the wake of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's assassination by her Sikh bodyguards. While he had won the 1977 and the 1980 elections from New Delhi, Vajpayee shifted to his home town Gwalior for the election. Vidya Razdan was initially tipped to be the Congress (I) candidate. Instead, Madhavrao Scindia, scion of the Gwalior royal family,



was brought in on the last day of filing nominations. Vajpayee lost to Scindia, managing to secure only 29% of the votes.

Under Vajpayee, the BJP moderated the Hindu-nationalist position of the Jana Sangh, emphasising its connection to the Janata Party and expressing support for Gandhian Socialism. The ideological shift did not bring it success: Indira Gandhi's assassination generated sympathy for the Congress, leading to a massive victory at the polls. The BJP won only two seats in parliament. Vajpayee offered to quit as party president following BJP's dismal performance in the election, but stayed in the post until 1986. He was elected to the Rajya Sabha in 1986 from Madhya Pradesh, and was briefly the leader of the BJP in Parliament.

In 1986, L. K. Advani took office as president of the BJP. Under him, the BJP returned to a policy of hardline Hindu nationalism. It became the political voice of the Ram Janmabhoomi Mandir Movement, which sought to build a temple dedicated to the Hindu deity Rama in Ayodhya. The temple would be built at a site believed to be the birthplace of Rama after demolishing a 16th-century mosque, called the Babri Masjid, which then stood there. The strategy paid off for the BJP; it won 86 seats in the Lok Sabha in the 1989 general election, making its support crucial to the government of V. P. Singh. In December 1992, a group of religious volunteers led by members of the BJP, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), tore down the mosque.

He served as Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha, for various terms starting at Balrampur from 1957–1962. He served again from Balrampur from 1967–1971, then from Gwalior from 1971–1977, and then from New Delhi from 1977–1984. Finally, he served from Lucknow from 1991–2009.

Prime Minister

During a BJP conference in Mumbai in November 1995, BJP President Advani declared that Vajpayee would be the party's prime ministerial candidate in the forthcoming elections. Vajpayee himself was reported to be unhappy with the announcement, responding by saying that the party needed to win the election first. The BJP became the single largest party in Parliament



in the 1996 general election, helped by religious polarisation across the country as a result of the demolition of the Babri Masjid. Indian president Shankar Dayal Sharma invited Vajpayee to form the government. Vajpayee was sworn in as the 10th prime minister of India, but the BJP failed to muster a majority among members of the Lok Sabha. Vajpayee resigned after 16 days, when it became clear that he did not have enough support to form a government. In this short period, he also created and administered the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution.

Second term: 1998–1999

After the fall of the two United Front governments between 1996 and 1998, the Lok Sabha was dissolved and fresh elections were held. The 1998 general elections again put the BJP ahead of others. A number of political parties joined the BJP to form the National Democratic Alliance (NDA), and Vajpayee was sworn in as the prime minister. The coalition was an uneasy one, as apart from the Shiv Sena, none of the other parties espoused the BJP's Hindu-nationalist ideology. Vajpayee has been credited for managing this coalition successfully, while facing ideological pressure from the hardline wing of the party and from the RSS. Vajpayee's government lasted 13 months until mid-1999 when the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) under J. Jayalalithaa withdrew its support. The government lost the ensuing vote of confidence motion in the Lok Sabha by a single vote on 17 April 1999. As the opposition was unable to come up with the numbers to form the new government, the Lok Sabha was again dissolved and fresh elections were held.

Nuclear tests

In May 1998, India conducted five underground nuclear tests in the Pokhran desert in Rajasthan, 24 years after its first nuclear test (Smiling Buddha) in 1974. Two weeks later, Pakistan responded with its own nuclear tests making it the newest nation with declared nuclear capability. While some nations, such as France, endorsed India's right to defensive nuclear power, others including the United States, Canada, Japan, Britain and the European Union imposed sanctions on information, resources and technology to India. In spite of intense international criticism and steady decline in foreign investment and trade, the nuclear tests were



popular domestically. In effect, the international sanctions imposed failed to sway India from weaponising its nuclear capability. US sanctions against India and Pakistan were eventually lifted after just six months.

Lahore summit

In late 1998 and early 1999, Vajpayee began a push for a full-scale diplomatic peace process with Pakistan. With the historic inauguration of the Delhi-Lahore bus service in February 1999, Vajpayee initiated a new peace process aimed towards permanently resolving the Kashmir dispute and other conflicts with Pakistan. The resultant Lahore Declaration espoused a commitment to dialogue, expanded trade relations and mutual friendship and envisaged a goal of denuclearised South Asia. This eased the tension created by the 1998 nuclear tests, not only within the two nations but also in South Asia and the rest of the world.

AIADMK's withdrawal from coalition

The AIADMK had continually threatened to withdraw from the coalition and national leaders repeatedly flew down from Delhi to Chennai to pacify the AIADMK general secretary J. Jayalalithaa. However, in May 1999, the AIADMK did pull the plug on the NDA, and the Vajpayee administration was reduced to a caretaker status pending fresh elections scheduled for October 1999.

Kargil War

In May 1999 some Kashmiri shepherds discovered the presence of militants and non-uniformed Pakistani soldiers (many with official identifications and Pakistan Army's custom weaponry) in the Kashmir Valley, where they had taken control of border hilltops and unmanned border posts. The incursion was centred around the town of Kargil, but also included the Batalik and Akhnoor sectors and artillery exchanges at the Siachen Glacier.

The Indian army responded with Operation Vijay, which launched on 26 May 1999. This saw the Indian military fighting thousands of militants and soldiers in the midst of heavy artillery shelling and while facing extremely cold weather, snow and treacherous terrain at the high



altitude. Over 500 Indian soldiers were killed in the three-month-long Kargil War, and it is estimated around 600–4,000 Pakistani militants and soldiers died as well. India pushed back the Pakistani militants and Northern Light Infantry soldiers. Almost 70% of the territory was recaptured by India. Vajpayee sent a "secret letter" to U.S. President Bill Clinton that if Pakistani infiltrators did not withdraw from the Indian territory, "we will get them out, one way or the other" - meaning he did not rule out crossing the Line of Control (LoC), or was the use of nuclear weapons.

After Pakistan suffered heavy losses, and with both the United States and China refusing to condone the incursion or threaten India to stop its military operations, General Pervez Musharraf was recalcitrant and Nawaz Sharif asked the remaining militants to stop and withdraw to positions along the LoC. The militants were not willing to accept orders from Sharif but the NLI soldiers withdrew. The militants were killed by the Indian army or forced to withdraw in skirmishes which continued even after the announcement of withdrawal by Pakistan.

Third term: 1999–2004

The 1999 general elections were held in the aftermath of the Kargil operations. The BJP-led NDA won 303 seats out of the 543 seats in the Lok Sabha, securing a comfortable and stable majority. On 13 October 1999, Vajpayee took oath as the prime minister of India for the third time.

A national crisis emerged in December 1999, when Indian Airlines flight IC 814 from Kathmandu to New Delhi was hijacked by five terrorists and flown to Taliban-ruled Afghanistan. The hijackers made several demands including the release of certain terrorists like Masood Azhar from prison. Under pressure, the government ultimately caved in. Jaswant Singh, the minister of external affairs at the time, flew with the terrorists to Afghanistan and exchanged them for the passengers.

In March 2000, Bill Clinton, the President of the United States, paid a state visit to India. This was the first state visit to India by a U.S. president in 22 years, since President Jimmy Carter's visit in 1978. President Clinton's visit was hailed as a significant milestone in relations



between the two nations. Vajpayee and Clinton had wide-ranging discussions on bilateral, regional and international developments. The visit led to expansion in trade and economic ties between India and the United States. A vision document on the future course of Indo-U.S. relations was signed during the visit.

Domestically, the BJP-led government was influenced by the RSS, but owing to its dependence on coalition support, it was impossible for the BJP to push items like building the Ram Janmabhoomi temple in Ayodhya, repealing Article 370 which gave a special status to the state of Kashmir, or enacting a uniform civil code applicable to adherents of all religions. On 17 January 2000, there were reports of the RSS and some BJP hard-liners threatening to restart the Jan Sangh, the precursor to the BJP, because of their discontent over Vajpayee's rule. Former president of the Jan Sangh Balraj Madhok had written a letter to the then-RSS chief Rajendra Singh for support. The BJP was, however, accused of "saffronising" the official state education curriculum and apparatus, saffron being the colour of the RSS flag of the RSS, and a symbol of the Hindu nationalism movement. Home Minister L. K. Advani and the Human Resource Development Minister (now called Education Minister) Murli Manohar Joshi were indicted in the 1992 Babri Mosque demolition case for inciting a mob of activists. Vajpayee himself came under public scrutiny owing to his controversial speech one day prior to the mosque demolition.

These years were accompanied by infighting in the administration and confusion regarding the direction of government. Vajpayee's weakening health was also a subject of public interest, and he underwent a major knee-replacement surgery at the Breach Candy Hospital in Mumbai to relieve intense pressure upon his legs. In March 2001, the Tehelka group released a sting operation video named Operation West End which showed BJP president Bangaru Laxman, senior army officers and NDA members accepting bribes from journalists posing as agents and businessmen. The Defence Minister George Fernandes was forced to resign following the Barak Missile scandal involving the botched supplies of coffins for the soldiers killed in Kargil, and the findings of an inquiry commission that the government could have prevented the Kargil invasion.



Vajpayee initiated talks with Pakistan, and invited Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf to Agra for a joint summit. President Musharraf was believed to be the principal architect of the Kargil War in India. By accepting him as the President of Pakistan, Vajpayee chose to move forward leaving behind the Kargil War. But after three days of much fanfare, which included Musharraf visiting his birthplace in Delhi, the summit failed to achieve a breakthrough as President Musharraf declined to leave aside the issue of Kashmir.

2001 attack on Parliament

On 13 December 2001, a group of masked, armed men with fake IDs stormed Parliament House in Delhi. The terrorists managed to kill several security guards, but the building was sealed off swiftly and security forces cornered and killed the men who were later proven to be Pakistan nationals. Vajpayee ordered Indian troops to mobilise for war, leading to an estimated 500,000 to 750,000 Indian soldiers positioned along the international border between India and Pakistan. Pakistan responded by mobilising its own troops along the border. A terrorist attack on an army garrison in Kashmir in May 2002 further escalated the situation. As the threat of war between two nuclear capable countries and the consequent possibility of a nuclear exchange loomed large, international diplomatic mediation focused on defusing the situation.[99] In October 2002, both India and Pakistan announced that they would withdraw their troops from the border.

The Vajpayee administration brought in the Prevention of Terrorism Act in 2002. The act was aimed at curbing terrorist threats by strengthening powers of government authorities to investigate and act against suspects. It was passed in a joint session of the parliament, amidst concerns that the law would be misused. Another political disaster hit his government between December 2001 and March 2002: the VHP held the Government hostage in a major standoff in Ayodhya over the Ram temple. On the 10th anniversary of the destruction of the Babri mosque, the VHP wanted to perform a shila daan, or a ceremony laying the foundation stone of the cherished temple at the disputed site. Thousands of VHP activists amassed and threatened to overrun the site and forcibly perform the ceremony. A grave threat of not only communal violence, but an outright breakdown of law and order owing to the defiance of the government



by a religious organisation hung over the nation. The incident, however, ended peacefully with a symbolic handover of a stone at a different location 1 km away from the disputed site.

2002 Gujarat violence

In February 2002, a train filled with Hindu pilgrims returning to Gujarat from Ayodhya stopped in the town of Godhra. A scuffle broke out between Hindu activists and Muslim residents, and the train was set on fire, leading to the deaths of 59 people. The charred bodies of the victims were displayed in public in the city of Ahmedabad, and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad called for a statewide strike in Gujarat. These decisions stoked anti-Muslim sentiments. Blaming Muslims for the deaths, rampaging Hindu mobs killed thousands of Muslim men and women, destroying Muslim homes and places of worship. The violence raged for more than two months, and more than 1,000 people died. Gujarat was being ruled by a BJP government, with Narendra Modi as the chief minister. The state government was criticised for mishandling the situation. It was accused of doing little to stop the violence, and even being complicit in encouraging it.

Vajpayee reportedly wanted to remove Modi, but was eventually prevailed upon by party members to not act against him. He travelled to Gujarat, visiting Godhra, and Ahmedabad, the site of the most violent riots. He announced financial aid for victims, and urged an end to the violence. While he condemned the violence, he did not chastise Modi directly in public. When asked as to what would be his message to the chief minister in the event of the riots having taken place, Vajpayee responded that Modi must follow raj dharma, Hindi for ethical governance.

At the meeting of the BJP national executive in Goa in April 2002, Vajpayee's speech generated controversy for its contents which included him saying: "Wherever Muslims live, they don't like to live in co-existence with others." The Prime Minister's Office stated that these remarks had been taken out of context. Vajpayee was accused of doing nothing to stop the violence, and later admitted mistakes in handling the events. K. R. Narayanan, then president of India, also blamed Vajpayee's government for failing to quell the violence. After the BJP's defeat in the 2004 general elections, Vajpayee admitted that not removing Modi had been a mistake.



Economic Reforms : 2002-2004

In late 2002 and 2003 the government pushed through economic reforms. The country's GDP growth exceeded 7% every year from 2003 to 2007, following three years of sub-5% growth. Increasing foreign investment, modernisation of public and industrial infrastructure, the creation of jobs, a rising high-tech and IT industry and urban modernisation and expansion improved the nation's international image. Good crop harvests and strong industrial expansion also helped the economy.

In May 2003, he announced before the parliament that he would make one last effort to achieve peace with Pakistan. The announcement ended a period of 16 months, following the 2001 attack on the Indian parliament, during which India had severed diplomatic ties with Pakistan. Although diplomatic relations did not pick up immediately, visits were exchanged by high-level officials and the military standoff ended. The Pakistani President and Pakistani politicians, civil and religious leaders hailed this initiative as did the leaders of the United States, Europe and much of the world. In July 2003, Prime Minister Vajpayee visited China, and met with various Chinese leaders. He recognised Tibet as a part of China, which was welcomed by the Chinese leadership, and which, in the following year, recognised Sikkim as part of India. China–India relations improved greatly in the following years.

Policies

Vajpayee's government introduced many domestic economic and infrastructural reforms, including encouraging the private sector and foreign investments, reducing governmental waste, encouraging research and development and privatisation of some government owned corporations.[126] Among Vajpayee's projects were the National Highways Development Project and Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana. In 2001, the Vajpayee government launched the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan campaign, aimed at improving the quality of education in primary and secondary schools.



2004 general election

In 2003, news reports suggested a tussle within the BJP with regard to sharing of leadership between Vajpayee and Deputy Prime Minister LK Advani. BJP president Venkaiah Naidu had suggested that Advani must lead the party politically at the 2004 general elections, referring to Vajpayee as vikas purush, Hindi for development man, and Advani as loh purush, iron man. When Vajpayee subsequently threatened retirement, Naidu backtracked, announcing that the party would contest the elections under the twin leadership of Vajpayee and Advani.

The NDA was widely expected to retain power after the 2004 general election. It announced elections six months ahead of schedule, hoping to capitalise on economic growth, and Vajpayee's peace initiative with Pakistan. The 13th Lok Sabha was dissolved before the completion of its term. The BJP hoped to capitalise on a perceived 'feel-good factor' and BJP's recent successes in the Assembly elections in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. Under the "India Shining" campaign, it released ads proclaiming the economic growth of the nation under the government.

However, the BJP could only win 138 seats in the 543-seat parliament, with several prominent cabinet ministers being defeated. The NDA coalition won 185 seats. The Indian National Congress, led by Sonia Gandhi, emerged as the single largest party, winning 145 seats in the election. The Congress and its allies, comprising many smaller parties, formed the United Progressive Alliance, accounting for 220 seats in the parliament. Vajpayee resigned as prime minister. The UPA, with the outside support of communist parties, formed the next government with Manmohan Singh as the prime minister.

Post-premiership

In December 2005, Vajpayee announced his retirement from active politics, declaring that he would not contest in the next general election. In a famous statement at the BJP's silver jubilee rally at Mumbai's Shivaji Park, Vajpayee announced that "Henceforth, Lal Krishna Advani and Pramod Mahajan will be the Ram-Lakshman [the two godly brothers much revered and worshipped by Hindus] of the BJP."



Vajpayee was referred to as the Bhishma Pitamah of Indian politics by former prime minister Manmohan Singh during a speech in the Rajya Sabha, a reference to the character in the Hindu epic Mahabharata who was held in respect by two warring sides.

Vajpayee was hospitalised at All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Delhi (AIIMS) for a chest infection and fever on 6 February 2009. He was put on ventilator support as his condition worsened but he eventually recuperated and was later discharged. Unable to participate in the campaign for the 2009 general election due to his poor health, he wrote a letter urging voters to back the BJP. His protegee Lalji Tandon was able to retain the Lucknow seat in that election even though the NDA suffered electoral reverses all over the country. It was speculated that Vajpayee's non-partisan appeal contributed to Lalji's success in Lucknow in contrast to that BJP's poor performance elsewhere in Uttar Pradesh.

Vajpayee had a stroke in 2009 which impaired his speech. His health had been a major source of concern; reports said he was reliant on a wheelchair and failed to recognise people. He also had dementia and long-term diabetes. For many years, he had not attended any public engagements and rarely ventured out of the house, except for checkups at the All India Institutes of Medical Sciences.

On 11 June 2018, Vajpayee was admitted to AIIMS in critical condition following a kidney infection. He was officially declared dead there at 5:05 pm IST on 16 August 2018 at the age of 93. Some sources claim that he had died on the previous day. On the morning of 17 August, Vajpayee's body, draped with the Indian flag, was taken to the Bharatiya Janata Party headquarters where party workers paid their tributes until 1 pm. Later that afternoon at 4 pm, Vajpayee was cremated with full state honours at Rashtriya Smriti Sthal near Raj Ghat, and his pyre was lit by his foster daughter Namita Kaul Bhattacharya. Thousands of people and many dignitaries attended his funeral procession, including Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Ram Nath Kovind. On 19 August, his ashes were immersed in Ganga river at Haridwar by Kaul.



UNIT – IV

PEASANT STRUGGLE

Peasant movement

A peasant movement is a social movement involved with the agricultural policy, which claims peasants rights. Peasant movements have a long history that can be traced to the numerous peasant uprisings that occurred in various regions of the world throughout human history. Early peasant movements were usually the feudal and semi-feudal societies, and resulted in violent uprisings. More recent movements, fitting the definitions of social movements, are usually much less violent, and their demands are centered on better prices for agricultural produce, better wages and working conditions for the agricultural laborers, and increasing the agricultural production.

In Colonial India, the economic policies of European merchants and planters during the period Company rule adversely affected the peasant class, protecting the landlords and money lenders while they exploited the peasants. The peasants rose in revolt against economic on many occasions. The peasants in Bengal formed a trade union and revolted against the compulsion of cultivating indigo. Anthony Pereira, a political scientist, has defined a peasant movement as a "social movement made up of peasants (small landholders or farm workers on large farms), usually inspired by the goal of improving the situation of peasants in a nation or territory".

Several peasant movement in India arose during the colonial era, when economic policies by various British colonial administrations led to the decline of traditional handicraft industries. These policies lead to change of ownership in lands, land overcrowding, increased debt among the peasant classes of India. This led to peasant uprisings during the colonial period, and development of peasant movements in the post-colonial period. The Kisan (farmer) Sabha movement started in Bihar under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, who formed the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha (BPKS) in 1929 to mobilise peasant grievances against the zamindari attacks on their occupancy rights. In 1938, the crops in Eastern Khandesh were destroyed due to heavy rains. The peasants were ruined. In order to get the land revenue waived,



Sane Guruji organized meetings and processions in many places and took out marches to the Collector's office. The peasants joined the revolutionary movement of 1942 in great numbers. Gradually the peasant movement intensified and spread across the rest of India. All these radical developments on the peasant front culminated in the formation of the All India Kisan Sabha (AIKS) at the Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress in April 1936 with Swami Sahajanand Saraswati elected as its first President. In the subsequent years, the movement was increasingly dominated by Socialists and Communists as it moved away from the Congress, by 1938 Haripura session of the Congress, under the presidency of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, the rift became evident, and by May 1942, the Communist Party of India, which was finally legalised by the then government in July 1942, had taken over AIKS, all across India including Bengal where its membership grew considerably.

Terrorism in Punjab

The genesis of the terrorist movement in Punjab was rooted in a long and continuous process of decline in which intricate and often unscrupulous political manoeuvres systematically undermined democratic processes in the State. After Independence and the tragedy of Partition, political parties in Punjab continued to pursue a divisive politics that laid inordinate emphasis on the separation of communal identities, and that resulted in the 'reorganisation' of the Punjab State on 'linguistic' lines. This meant its trifurcation in 1966 into a Sikh majority Punjab and Hindu majority Harayana and Himachal Pradesh. The 'reorganisation', however, failed to create the necessary basis for a communal vote, and the share of the 'Sikh parties', specifically the Akali Dal, remained well below 30 per cent through the late Sixties and the Seventies, with more than half the Sikh population unequivocally rejecting their ideology and methods of communal mobilisation. The Akalis were, consequently, never able to do better than to cobble together unstable coalitions in Punjab. At the same time, the 'secular' formations, including prominently, the Congress (I), also adopted the politics of alternating communal incitement and appeasement, as they made a bid not only for the popular vote, but equally for the control of the religious affairs of the Sikhs through the Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee (SGPC), the body that administered Sikh religious affairs and places of worship. This incendiary mix of unprincipled politics and the manipulation of religious identities and institutions gradually



brought the lunatic fringe of the Sikh far right to the centre stage of the State's politics, pushing it into the spiral of violence that was to consume 21,469 lives in a little over a decade of strife, before the movement for 'Khalistan' was comprehensively defeated in 1993.

The incident to which the genesis of the terrorist movement in Punjab is traced, occurred in April 1978. The 13th of April marks the birth of the Sikh Khalsa, and had been chosen in that year by the Nirankari sect to hold its annual convention at Amritsar. The Nirankaris are accused of apostasy by the Akalis and by other fundamentalist Sikh groupings. A gang of a few hundred members of the Akhand Kirtani Jatha led by Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale and Fauja Singh attacked the Nirankari convention. There was a long history of such clashes, but on this occasion, 13 Sikhs were killed, including Fauja Singh, along with three Nirankaris. Over the next six years, until his death in June 1984, Bhindranwale was to propagate a creed of unadulterated hate, mobilising the political frustrations of the Sikhs from a fundamentalist religious platform. Despite his virulence, he was propped up by the 'secular' Congress (I) in the SGPC elections of 1979, though only 4 of his 40 candidates won. He also canvassed for Congress (I) candidates in the General Elections of 1980.

In the meanwhile, the 62 Nirankaris, including the head of the sect, Baba Gurbachan Singh, charged in connection with the killing of 13 Sikhs in the 1978 clash had faced trial and were acquitted on the grounds that they had acted in self defence. This was evidently an unsatisfactory resolution of the issue, and in April 1980, Baba Gurbachan Singh was shot dead in Delhi. The first information report (FIR) named twenty persons for the murder, including several known associates of Bhindranwale. With the government failing to act against Bhindranwale, his killer squads struck again, this time claiming the life of another proclaimed 'enemy of the Sikh Panth', Lala Jagat Narain, the proprietor of the Hind Samachar Group, publishers of the popular daily, Punjab Kesri, and a bitter critic of Bhindranwale. This resulted in a flurry of deceptive moves, apparently to arrest Bhindranwale, countered by a succession of manoeuvres to help him escape the consequences of his actions. Eventually, however, he barricaded himself inside the heavily fortified Gurudwara Gurdarshan Parkash at Chowk Mehta. What followed was a farce that made the a laughing stock of the Punjab Police and transformed Bhindranwale into a veritable icon



among the Sikhs. The Gurudwara was surrounded by the police, but no attempt was made to arrest Bhindranwale. Instead, senior officials went in to 'negotiate a surrender', and Bhindranwale declared that he would 'offer himself for arrest at 1:00 pm on September 20, 1982, after addressing a 'religious congregation'. His terms were meekly accepted. At the appointed hour, he emerged to harangue a large crowd of his followers armed with spears, swords and a number of firearms. Among those present were a prominent Akali leaders. Having aroused the rabble to a pitch, Bhindranwale 'surrendered' to the police. Even as he was taken away, the mob opened fire on the police, a pitched battle ensued, and 11 persons were killed.

The very same day, three motorcycle-borne 'storm troopers' opened fire in a market in Jalandhar, killing four Hindus and injuring twelve. The next day, one Hindu was killed and thirteen people injured in Tarn Taran. For 25 days, violence exploded all over Punjab, while Bhindranwale was held in custody, not in jail, but in the ample comfort of a government circuit house. These incidents included the hijacking of an Indian Airlines plane to Lahore. On October 15, Bhindranwale was a free man again, after the then Home Minister, without the benefit of any inquiry or judicial process, announced to Parliament that Bhindranwale was not involved in the murder of Lala Jagat Narain.

Bhindranwale now appeared invincible. With truckloads of men armed with sophisticated automatic weapons, he stormed across the Punjab, and even through the nation's capital, with impunity. When the government hesitantly arrested one of his close associates, Amrik Singh, the President of the All India Sikh Students Federation (AISSF), on July 19, 1982, Bhindranwale decided to move into sanctuary of the Golden Temple complex. What followed was a continuous sequence of sacrilege and desecration, as the holiest shrine of the Sikhs became the centre of terror in Punjab.

It was not Bhindranwale alone who operated out of the Golden Temple. Bibi Amarjit Kaur, the widow of Fauja Singh who had died in the 1978 clash with the Nirankaris, had at that time itself entered the Temple with another member of the Akhand Kirtani Jatha, and had created a terrorist group, the Babbar Khalsa, who were responsible responsible for a multitude of heinous crimes over the next decade and a half. These



crimes included, according to the boast of the Babbar Khalsa's chief assassin, the murder of 35 Nirankaris. A troubled entente existed between the Babbars and Bhindranwale's forces. A third armed group had come into existence in the Golden Temple complex around the faction-ridden offices of the SGPC in Guru Nanak Niwas.

Between 1981 and 1983, the terrorists had killed 101 civilians, with 75 of these killed in 1983 itself. They included A.S. Atwal, a Deputy Inspector General of Police, who was killed in broad daylight at the main gate of the Golden Temple complex in April 1983. His body guards simply fled in the face of the attack, and a police post nearby was abandoned. The killers danced a celebratory bhangra over the dead body, and then sauntered back into the Temple. A steady stream of tortured and mutilated bodies began to appear in the gutters behind the Guru Nanak Niwas – Bhindranwale's 'temporary residence'. Fearing an attempt by the government to arrest him, Bhindranwale then moved into the Akal Takht, and began fortifications. Between January 1, 1984, and June 3, 1984, the terrorists killed 298 persons on commands that emanated from the headquarters that had been established in the Golden Temple. On June 3, 1984, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi ordered the Army to clear the Temple, and the hastily executed Operation Bluestar virtually destroyed the Akal Takht and damaged many other revered buildings within the complex. More than a hundred Army officers and men died in the Operation, and over 550 innocent civilians were killed in the cross fire. The damage Bluestar did was incalculable, and it was compounded by Operation Woodrose, the Army's 'mopping up' exercise all over Punjab, intended to clear extremist elements from all Gurudwaras in the State. Mistrustful of the State Police, and lacking credible intelligence sources, the indiscriminate sweep of Woodrose pushed many young men across the border into the arms of welcoming Pakistani handlers. And then, even as Woodrose drew to an end, the evil was incalculably compounded by the pitiless massacre of Sikhs in what were perceived to be Congress-I government-sponsored riots of November 1984 in the wake of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's assassination by two of her own Sikh security guards.

After the army, it was the turn of the 'political solution'. The Rajiv Gandhi government, having, in its first days, remained a mute spectator to the anti-Sikh riots, decided to force the ravaged State through a hasty and ill-timed election. Negotiations were initiated by the central



government in mid-1985. The Akalis, led by Harchand Singh Longowal, assisted by S. S. Barnala and Balwant Singh (of whom Longowal and Balwant Singh later fell to assassins), showed great eagerness to reclaim their hold on events in the State. But the Centre's 'strategy' went well beyond the 'moderates' in the Akali Dal, and the government also initiated a dialogue with representatives of the All India Sikh Students Federation (AISSF), at that time a frontline terrorist grouping. The talks with the AISSF, however, broke down on trivial differences, mainly because of the Centre's inclination in favour of the Akalis. However, the elections eventually took place – but only after Longowal's assassination on August 20, 1985. Sympathy and the lack of any serious opposition in the September elections brought the Akali's to power, now led by Barnala, with a sweeping majority (73 out of 117 seats).

Basis Committee

One of the first acts of the Barnala government was the appointment of the Bains Committee, which released, en masse, over 2000 extremists at that time under detention. The impact on terrorist violence was palpable – not only because those who were released simply resumed their activities, but also because others saw in this act a restoration of the immunity they had enjoyed in the pre-Bluestar phase. 1985 had seen a total of 63 civilians and eight policemen killed by militants. As the Bains committee began its work, in just the first three months of 1986, 102 civilians and 10 security men fell to the terror.

Barnala also surrendered the Golden Temple to the terrorists once again. The shrine was restored to the Akali controlled Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee (SGPC) on January 22, 1986. In less than a month, the terrorists, led by the Damdami Taksal, were in complete control. By the end of April, a 'Panthic Committee' had been constituted to coordinate all terrorist activities, and a 'Declaration of Khalistan' was issued by the Committee from the Golden Temple (April 29, 1986). A day later, the Barnala government ordered a mock search in the Temple with ample advance notice. Not unexpectedly, "no one of note was caught", but the incident was sufficient to provoke a split in the Akali Dal, and, from that point onwards, Barnala's existence was entirely dependant on the Congress-I's support. During Barnala's tenure



of a little over 19 months, the lives of 783 civilians and 71 security men were lost to terrorist violence.

The violence escalated continuously as both the political and the police leadership failed consistently to define an unambiguous response to terrorism. The sophisticated Kalashnikov assault rifle [the AK-47], supplied by Pakistan's covert agencies, was introduced into the terrorist armory in May 1987, and terrorism entered a completely new and deadlier phase. The impact was immediate and dramatic. The scale of killing was directly connected with the gun-power available to the terrorists – and did not recede to the pre-1987 level until the terrorists were finally crushed towards the end of 1992. By comparison, the Police were poorly equipped with World War II vintage .303 rifles, or the equally obsolete bolt-action 7.62s. The Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) was marginally better off, with 175 Self Loading Rifles [SLRs] per battalion. But even the SLR was no match for the sheer lethality of the Kalashnikov.

Nevertheless, the police had begun to commit itself for the first time in this long-drawn war. Between May 1987 and April 1988 terrorists killed 1533 people in Punjab (a monthly average of over 127), including 109 policemen. In turn, 364 terrorists were also killed. But the vacillating and directionless policies of the government, and the complete inability, indeed visible reluctance, of the State to impose the rule of law – even in cases of the worst acts of terrorism and where the perpetrators were apprehended by the police – swelled the ranks of terrorist forces. Terrorism, which had, in the past, largely been restricted to the districts of Amritsar and Gurdaspur, now had another four districts – Hoshiarpur, Jalandhar, Ludhiana and Faridkot – firmly in its clutches.

The government, however, persisted in its opportunistic quest for just any kind of deal with the terrorists to the very end. On March 4, 1988, 40 high profile prisoners – the Jodhpur Detenués, including Jasbir Singh Rode – were released in a 'goodwill gesture' as part of a compromise with terrorists. They simply walked into the Golden Temple, where Rode was installed as the Jathedar (head priest) of the Akal Takht and the terrorists began to build up internal defences within the Temple around the parikarma. The terrorist response to the



Government's 'goodwill gesture' was unequivocal. An unprecedented 288 people – including 25 policemen – were killed in March and another 259 [including 25 policemen] in April.

With nothing left to trade, and 2866 lives [2207 civilians, 177 policemen, 482 terrorists] lost to between October 1985 and April 1988, the Centre decided that it was finally time to enforce the laws of the land. This time, however, it was not the army that was called in. Operation Black Thunder was executed squarely under the charge of the Punjab Police – backed up by the elite anti-terrorist force, the National Security Guard [NSG] and para-military forces. Its objective was identical to that of Operation Bluestar – to clear the Golden Temple of the entrenched terrorist forces. Unlike Bluestar, however, this was achieved in a clean, economical and near-bloodless action, executed under the fullest glare of the media – both national and international – within a week between May 11 and May 18, 1988.

Though only a fraction of the terrorists operating in the State were apprehended during Black Thunder, the Operation generated crucial structural transformations in the terrorist movement. After the macabre exposures relating to the activities of the extremists in the Temple, the movement for Khalistan could never recover the facade of religiosity that had attended it in its early years, and became increasingly and manifestly criminalised. Moreover, the Gurudwara as sanctuary and safe-house for terrorists and their leaders ceased to exist. Divested of the sanctuary of the Golden Temple and the Gurudwaras, the leadership was forced to live life as fugitives in the Punjab countryside; on the one hand, their own deeds exposed them, and on the other, the deeds of their followers compromised them even further, since they were now believed to be condoned, even encouraged, by these leaders.

Immediately after Black Thunder, an enormous exercise to reorganise the Punjab Police was carried out, transforming a force that was widely perceived as demoralised, cowardly and incompetent, into the spearhead of the successful counterterrorism campaign that was to follow.

In the days following Black Thunder, however, the terrorists ravaged Punjab. 343 civilians were slaughtered in May alone. They included 30 migrant labourers working on the Sutlej-Yamuna canal in Ropar district; another 45 migrant workers gunned down in Punjab and Himachal Pradesh; and 20 killed in a bomb blast outside a temple in Amritsar. These reprisal



killings were a demonstration that Black Thunder had not decimated their numbers in significant measure, nor undermined their capacity to strike at will.

But the police made demonstrations of its own. The swift redeployment and reorientation of forces bore immediate results, and the civilian casualty rate fell rapidly. The first six months of 1988 had seen 1266 civilians killed – an average of 211 casualties a month; in the second half of 1988, 688 civilians were killed – a high figure, but nevertheless a radical improvement – with the monthly average down to 114. The terrorists, moreover, began paying a heavy price. On July 12, ‘General’ Labh Singh, the head of the Khalistan Commando Force (KCF), at that time one of the most active terrorist gangs, died in an exchange of fire with the police. Avtar Singh Brahma, another dreaded terrorist, was among the 68 terrorists killed that month.

By January 1989, the terrorists had been pushed into a thin strip along the border, with over 70 per cent of their strikes restricted to just three of the twelve districts in Punjab – Gurdaspur, Amritsar and Ferozepur. This proportion was to remain a constant throughout 1989 and well into 1990.

It was only natural to focus attention on this area. In March 1989 a massive composite Special Operation – bringing together the forces of the Punjab Police, the CRPF and the Border Security Force (BSF) – was launched in the entire Mand area (a patch of marshland primarily lying in the Amritsar and Ferozepur districts, but flowing over into Kapurthala and Jalandhar as well), Ajnala, Jandiala, Tarn Taran and Batala (along the river Beas). Cordon-and-search combing operations became a regular feature in this terrorist heartland, yielding a steady stream of arrests and seizures of arms, ammunition and explosives, and mounting pressures on the extremists that they found it progressively harder to bear. The impact was compounded by highly focused intelligence-based operations, as well as by the effective use of ‘spotters’ – captured terrorists who helped identify former associates. By May 1989, the anti-terrorist drive had completely blunted the capabilities of leading terrorist groups to strike at soft targets. The organisations that had been reduced to a negligible presence included the Khalistan Liberation Organisation (KLO), the Bhindranwale Tiger Force of Khalistan (BTFK) and the



Babbar Khalsa, the last of which had perhaps the most dedicated and resourceful, and the most dreaded, cadres.

Panthic Committees

The top terrorist leadership – the two ‘Panthic Committees’, one that was eventually headed by Dr. Sohan Singh [Panthic Committee (SS)], and the other dominated by Gurbachan Singh Manochahal and Wassan Singh Zaffarwal [Panthic Committee (M)] – was by now based entirely in Pakistan, and exercised only loose control over their increasingly criminalised ‘followers’. Beyond making various ‘statements’ to cadres in India and issuing exaggerated threats of reprisal against those who were ‘defaming’ the movement through acts of extortion, rape and the murder of innocents, this leadership in exile did nothing about the wave of extortion and crime that was unleashed against the civilian population in the State by the proliferating gangs claiming allegiance to them. Violent turf wars broke also out between various gangs. There was already a deep and basic difference at the highest level of leadership, divided as it was between two irreconcilable ‘Panthic Committees’ (a third ‘Panthic Committee’, propped up by the Damdami Taksal, was also to emerge later, in September 1989). Pakistani handlers had made repeated attempts to mediate in order to bring about some sort of rapprochement between these groupings, but were entirely unsuccessful. The basic conflict, however, centered around control over the narcotics trade and gun-running.

The terror in the State had, till this point, been absolute. Public cooperation with the police was meagre, and even in the case of orchestrated public executions by small terrorist gangs, there was virtually no protest or resistance from the people at large. But all this began to change towards the middle of 1989. Since at least some of the police weaponry had been upgraded after Black Thunder, there were a substantial number of discarded .303 rifles available in police armouries. A Village Defence Scheme (VDS), and a system of appointing Special Police Officers (SPOs) was devised to arm and train volunteers in vulnerable villages to resist terrorist action at the local level. By April 1989, 2350 weapons had been distributed in 451 villages, and the VDS was to play a significant role to the very end of the war against terrorism.



There were other signs, small but nonetheless significant, of the turning tide. On June 6, a bus was hijacked by terrorists near village Talwandi Ghowan, PS Kathunangal, in the Majitha Police District, Amritsar. The Hindu passengers were forced off the bus and were about to be executed, when two Sikhs, Avtar Singh and Rajwant Singh, intervened to save their lives. They were shot dead, and two other passengers were seriously injured. The incident generated a great deal of revulsion against the terrorists among Sikhs in Punjab. Then again, just a month later (July 7), when a terrorist opened indiscriminate fire in the Tarn Taran bazaar, he was overpowered and beaten to death by the shopkeepers – an event virtually unimaginable even a few months earlier in this heartland of the terrorist movement.

By July, moreover, a number of hard-core and listed terrorists had moved out of the Punjab and set up operations in the Terai region of Uttar Pradesh, not as a measure to expand their areas of operation, but to escape the increasing pressures in Punjab.

The pressure also forced a change in tactics and weaponry. Militants in Punjab were advised to increasingly resort to the more surreptitious device of the timed or remote controlled plastic explosive device rather than the AK-47, which required them to be present at the moment of execution. Explosive handling became an integral part of training in the camps across the border after April, and some of the first significant seizures of plastic explosives and sophisticated timing devices were made in May 1989.

The flood of weapons in the State also assumed new and disturbing proportions. Till this point, weapons acquisition had to be financed by the terrorists themselves through extortion and narcotics smuggling. Suddenly, in July, messages were sent out that weapons "which had accumulated in Pakistan for which no payment is to be made" could be acquired by the simple expedient of sending "large numbers" of terrorists across the border.

The augmentation of the terrorist arsenal led to a substantial escalation of terrorist activities. But civilian casualties were held down throughout 1989, even as the losses inflicted on the terrorists, and by them on the police, mounted. Pakistan was strenuously and openly directing the terrorist campaign at this stage, to the extent that terrorist training camps were being organised even within 75 metres of the international border (in the Ferozepur sector). Border



crossings remained a continuous and daily occurrence along the 533 kilometre long international border Punjab shared with Pakistan, and could never really be effectively checked, despite 122 kilometres of fencing that had been erected by August 1989.

By the end of the third quarter of 1989, a fairly high rate of civilian, terrorist and police casualties notwithstanding, the militants had been pushed inexorably into a corner. Almost 76 per cent of all terrorist incidents in 1989 were contained within four police districts along the border (out of a total of 15 police districts at that time): Majitha, Tarn Taran, Batala and Ferozepur. More significantly, of the fifteen police districts in the State, 10 were only marginally affected by terrorist activities, with several months in the year passing without a single killing there. At the end of the year, four of these districts had an average civilian casualty rate of less than two a month; in another six districts, casualties ranged between 2-5 a month. It was only in the four 'core districts' that the average rate ran into the double digits.

Even within these districts, the terrorists' sway was not absolute. By the 4th quarter of 1989, just 13 police stations accounted for nearly 65 per cent of all terrorist crime [and 64 per cent of civilian casualties] in these critical districts. And out of the 217 police stations in the entire State, nearly half the killings had taken place within the jurisdiction of just these 13 police stations.

Politics, however, intervened once again. A general election was now imminent, and a deeply discredited regime at Delhi, swamped under charges of corruption and nepotism, and lacking entirely lacking in a clear perspective on Punjab, decided to press ahead for elections in the parliamentary constituencies in this State as well.

The All India Sikh Students Federation had, by now, decided to complement its underground activities with an over-ground role. It combined with Simranjit Singh Mann's pro-militant United Akali Dal [UAD], and the extremist front organisations swept the poll, with 10 of the 13 seats going to candidates backed by the alliance. Before demitting office, Rajiv Gandhi ordered the release of Simranjit Singh Mann, and of Harminder Singh Sandhu and Atindar Pal Singh of the AISSF. All cases against them were arbitrarily dropped to give expression to what



was then, perhaps, a proposition unique to Indian justice administration, that a man elected to Parliament may not be tried for any crime that he may have committed.

V.P. Singh Government

The V P Singh government that took oath of office on December 6, 1989, brought with it preconceptions, attitudes and a pervasive confusion that surrendered the initiative to the terrorists even before they engaged. The defining incident with regard to this Government's policy on terrorism occurred within the first week of its installation. The daughter of the newly appointed Home Minister was kidnapped in Kashmir (on December 11, 1989) by what was then an incipient terrorist movement in that State. The government's response was absolute capitulation – and, within days, Kashmir simply exploded into a full-blown insurgency that is yet to be brought under control. The message to extremists all over the country was abundantly clear: this government had neither the will nor the understanding to define and implement a cogent and resolute policy against terrorist violence.

After eleven months, the V P Singh government collapsed under the weight of its own internal contradictions, and the new Prime Minister, Chandrashekhar, heading a minority government with outside support from Rajiv Gandhi's Congress-I, was to preside over another vacillating regime for a further seven months.

The Army was inducted into the State in November in what was called Operation Rakshak-I, which followed the pattern of conventional Army interventions in internal disturbances, certainly exerting substantial pressure on militants in the border districts – where the bulk of deployment had occurred – but failing to alter the course of militancy in any significant measure. In fact, what Operation Rakshak-I did was to partially squeeze militancy out of the border districts and into virtually the entire State.

Chandrashekhar Government

The Chandrashekhar Government played out its final gamble in Punjab when it forced the State to join the rest of the nation in the mid-term elections slated for June 1991 (though elections were staggered in such a way that Punjab would go to the Polls after the process had



been completed in the rest of the country). In April, the government announced that elections to the parliamentary and State Assembly constituencies in Punjab would be held simultaneously. The terrorist groupings split down the middle, with those broadly owing allegiance to the Damdami Taksal deciding to participate, and the second group affiliated to the Panthic Committee (Sohan Singh) deciding in favour of enforcing a boycott.

A large number of the 2146 candidates who filed nominations for the Assembly and Lok Sabha elections were overtly or covertly supported by terrorist organisations. By the time the nominations closed, even the groups officially boycotting the elections had hedged their bets by surreptitiously putting up candidates. 211 of the candidates had clear terrorist links, and 34 were at that time behind bars. 41 candidates had 'history sheets' (police records) that enumerated offenses including political assassination, hijacking and murder; another 48 were relatives of prominent listed terrorists.

Many of the candidates had refused police protection, declaring that they would make their own arrangements for 'security'. They now began to move openly around the State with large groups of illegally armed terrorists as their 'bodyguards'. In the meanwhile, the Panthic Committee (SS) let loose a campaign of liquidation that was eventually to claim the lives of 27 candidates. On June 7, an explosion damaged the cavalcade of the Minister of State for Home at Gill Road in Ludhiana (the MoS was contesting the Ludhiana Parliamentary seat). On June 15, 74 train passengers were massacred. Despite the enveloping mayhem in the State, the Army had, inexplicably, been withdrawn from the State, and para-military force levels had been cut drastically. However, the ill-conceived gambit for elections in Punjab was abandoned after Narasimha Rao was sworn in as Prime Minister on June 21.

It was during the General Elections of 1991 that Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated. The Congress-I rode back to power on a wave of sympathy, and Narasimha Rao was sworn in as Prime Minister. But the chaos created in Punjab by the preceding 18 months could hardly be contained by an electoral victory at the Centre. The years 1990 and 1991 unambiguously belonged to the terrorists.



Almost as many civilians were killed by terrorists in these two years, as in the preceding 12 – the entire span of the terrorist movement in Punjab. Between 1978 and 1989, there were 5070 civilian casualties; in 1990 and 1991, they were 5058.

The area of conflict now covered the entire State. After Black Thunder, terrorist crime had been confined mainly to the border districts. But by the end of 1991, the ‘terrorist heartland’ had extended itself from 13 police stations in four border districts [64.6% of terrorist crime in the 4th quarter of 1989] to over 47 police stations that now accounted for 61% of the greatly enhanced terrorist crime in a widely dispersed area. Only four of the 15 police districts registered a monthly average of civilian casualties below 10. This was easily cancelled out by another four, where civilian casualties were in excess of 20 per month. In Ludhiana, this figure stood at over 44 per month.

While the levels of terrorist violence in the border districts remained high, the command centre of terrorist operations shifted gradually to the Malwa region, with Ludhiana and Sangrur as its core. The greater dispersal of terrorist activities was, in substantial measure, intensified by Operation Rakshak-I which exerted a great deal of pressure in the border areas. In the absence of a co-ordinated policy of containment, the top terrorists were gradually ‘squeezed out’ into the Malwa and Doaba belt. Four border police districts (Tarn Taran, Majitha, Batala and Ferozepur) accounted for 878 killings by terrorists in 1991, as compared to 774 in 1989; this, however, represented a significant decline as against the 1341 civilian casualties inflicted in these districts in 1990. But 1991 also saw 535 civilian killings in Ludhiana (1989: 58; 1990:161), 278 in Sangrur (1989:8; 1990:65), and a total of 2591 in the State (1989: 1168; 1990:2467). Distress migrations, which had come down to a mere trickle of ones and twos in a month in 1989, rose to 2524 families through 1990 and 1991 (averaging over 105 families per month).

Viewed in isolation, these figures may suggest that the police had, once again, withdrawn into a defensive shell in the face of this widening arc of terror. This was far from the truth. Indeed, it was a paradox of the Punjab situation at that time that, while the police (both State and central forces) engaged continually, and while terrorist casualties rose constantly, the killings of civilians also registered sustained and alarming increases. Significantly, despite the



terrorists' claim that they were fighting for the 'Sikh cause', it was overwhelmingly the Sikhs themselves (over 70 per cent of those killed by terrorists in 1990-91) who were the victims of their terror.

This was largely due to the renewed successes in terrorist recruitment, which had virtually come to an end in 1989. At that time, the strength of listed and unlisted terrorists was estimated at no more than 1,200. By the middle of 1990, this number had risen upwards of 5,000, and rose above this level throughout 1991, despite the continuous and escalating losses suffered by militant groups. In 1989, under a relatively stable political dispensation, 703 terrorists had been killed, and militancy appeared to have been on the verge of total defeat. In 1990, 1320 terrorists lost their lives, in 1991, another 2177 fell – and yet, the terrorist movement grew from strength to strength.

The successes over the preceding eighteen months had spawned dozens of new militant groups and revived many others that had long been defunct. There was an air of absolute certainty, of consummate confidence, that their 'war' against the Indian state was in its terminal stages, that their goal, 'Khalistan', was imminent. 'Governments in exile' appointed themselves in America and the UK; 'Prime Ministers' and 'Presidents' of 'Khalistan' waited in the wings for the impending victory. Brutal turf wars between terrorist groupings grew in number and intensity, keeping pace with the sweep and power of their actions against the people of Punjab and the security forces, as their final goal appeared tantalizingly within reach.

The degree to which this anarchy had fed upon the regime of political license, of submission and appeasement of the preceding dispensations became clear as soon as an unequivocal policy was enunciated and implemented on the ground.

When Narasimha Rao took over as Prime Minister, the very possibility of 'political solutions' in the Punjab had ceased to exist. The various Akali factions, including those openly sympathetic to the militant cause, had been completely marginalised during the aborted elections of June 1991, when the terrorists decided they would rather 'represent' themselves. Simranjit Singh Mann, the leading overground representative of the terrorist cause, had himself been forced out of that election, though many militant nominees were to contest under the cover of his



faction, the UAD (Mann). The other main political leader of the militant cause, Harminder Singh Sandhu of the AISSF, was long dead by this time, murdered by terrorists of the Khalistan Commando Force (KCF), an affiliate of Sohan Singh's Panthic Committee, in January 1990. The 'traditional' Akali parties had, of course, withdrawn into a shell of compliant self-preservation. In any event, with the numerous and continually multiplying factions of political and terrorist groupings in the State, there was no identifiable leadership with whom a dialogue could be initiated, even if the inclination had existed. The terrorists themselves, of course, had no reason to negotiate at this point, convinced as they were that they were poised on the very edge of victory.

An escalation of terrorist violence, at this stage, was inevitable. June itself had seen 245 civilians and 54 security men killed. July, August and September cost another 659 civilian and 123 security men. In October, the violence peaked, with 297 civilian and 53 police casualties. The political compulsions of the Rao Government made a response inevitable, with mounting pressure exerted on the Centre by the Punjab State units of the Congress-I and the Communist Party of India.

In November 1991, the Centre finally took action. The army was re-inducted in Punjab and the forces were given an unambiguous mandate – order had to be restored in the State, and grounds prepared for the election that fell due in mid-February, when the existing Parliamentary sanction for President's rule came to an end. K.P.S. Gill was transferred back to the State as DGP shortly thereafter. These steps were reinforced by the provision of adequate force in the State, backed by an uncompromising policy of political non-interference. Law and order was entrusted to the professional agencies of the state within whose constitutional mandate they fell.

What emerged now, was one of the most unique experiments in multi-force counter-terrorist strategic initiatives and integrated command structures. Unlike previous operations, the Army and the police (both State and para-military) acted in complete concert, with a clearly defined institutional structure of cooperation and consultation. An officer of the rank of Inspector General (IG) from the Punjab Police was attached to each Corps of the Army deployed in Punjab. A Superintendent of Police (SP) was assigned to each Brigade. Police contingents were



attached to every Army battalion, so that comprehensive and coordinated actions could be taken independently by each unit in all emerging circumstances, and there was total sharing of all intelligence, to the extent that police control rooms had representatives of the Army present.

The pattern of Army deployment during the run-up to the elections was also significantly innovative. Traditionally, Army commanders have preferred massive presence in specific sensitive locations. During this phase and right through the election period, however, the Army was deployed all over the State; more importantly, it was split up to section level in order to saturate the entire countryside.

Adequate force – a total of 220 para-military companies – was also provided for the protection of candidates in the elections, with an entire platoon was assigned for each candidate's security. Once again, the objective was clearly defined – the disorders and selective killings that resulted in the cancellation of the elections of June 1991 were not to be repeated. Despite the commitment of such a large force to these security duties, patrolling also had to be intensified and counter-terrorist operations were still sustained across the State.

The impact on the ground was immediate. In November itself, the number of civilians killed by terrorists fell to 154. Of these, 110 were killed in the first fortnight; the second fortnight, when the Central Government's initiatives were implemented in Punjab, saw just 44 civilian casualties. A number of major terrorist groupings immediately decided to protect their top echelons by advising them to shift outside the State, or even out of India, or to go into a temporary hibernation during which they were instructed to tone up their internal structure and improve operational capabilities.

The elections of February 1992 also forced the militant camp into innumerable strategic failures. The most monumental of these was the decision to impose a boycott on the elections. Goaded by their foreign mentors, as well as by their funding and support groups among non-resident Sikhs in USA, Canada and UK, the terrorists began to believe that if they could force another postponement on the elections, or, failing this, keep voting percentages down below 10 per cent, they would discredit India's democratic credentials. Of all the prominent militant leaders and 'ideologues', the only one to oppose this move for a boycott was – surprisingly, since



he was the strongest advocate of a boycott in June 1991 – Sohan Singh; but his position drew such violent opposition even from his own supporters that he was forced to temporarily flee his safe haven in Pakistan.

The collective impact of these initiatives was clearly evident by the time the year 1992 came to a close. The situation was so vastly different as compared to the chaos that prevailed at the end of the previous year, that it was possible to speak of a total reversal against the terrorists. The total number of civilians killed in the State in 1992 stood at 1518, as compared to 2591 in 1991, reflecting a fall from a monthly average of 216 to 127. This, however, was not all. The lowest figures in 1991, in the months of November and December, stood at 154 and 126. In 1992, if the year was split into two halves, the monthly average fell to 87 in the second half. In the last quarter, this average stood at 60. In December itself, the total civilian casualties stood at 44. They were never to rise to these levels again. Indeed, in the whole of 1993, civilian casualties totaled just 48.

A complete transformation had also taken place at the psychological level among the people. After the elections of February 1992, the terrorists had failed entirely to elicit any demonstration of support or cooperation from the people of the State. The coercion and intimidation that had resulted in the low voter turnout in the elections of February 1992 were also exposed when elections to 95 Municipal Committees in the State concluded peacefully on September 6, with a voter turnout of over 75 per cent. These trends were endorsed when Panchayat Elections were held in the State's 12,342 villages in January 1993, with a voter turnout of 82 per cent. The termination of the Village Panchayats, and their replacement by Khalsa Panchayats had been one of the critical objectives of the terrorist movement.

The transformation went far beyond the return of grassroot democracy and a refusal to cooperate with the militants, to comprehend an enveloping sense of relief. A State that had, for at least the preceding seven years, simply shut down before the sun set, was rediscovering the experiences of peace and normalcy. The markets throbbed with life in the evenings, and cultural events were organised and attended by thousands of people. Distress migrations under threat from terrorists had slowed down to a trickle even at the beginning of the year – a total of 73



families migrated during the first three quarters of 1992. In the last quarter there were no such cases of migration. More significantly, the trend was reversed as people returned to their homes even in areas such as Makhu, Zira, Jhabal, Bhikiwind and Moga, located deep in what had been, only a year ago, the terrorist heartland.

Fresh recruitment to the terrorist ranks had come virtually to an end by January 1992 itself. The police strategy, at this juncture created a 'fourth option' for the terrorists: the first three were conventional measures of response – the possibilities of arrest, flight or armed engagement. A fourth option was offered at this stage of the confrontation: the terrorists were told that, if they chose surrender, they would be welcomed and embraced with warmth. By the end of 1992, 537 terrorists had surrendered to the police, six of them hardcore. Another 379, including 11 hardcore terrorists, were to lay down arms in 1993.

All the major terrorist organisations – the KCF (Wassan Singh), the KCF (Panjwar), the Babbar Khalsa, the BTFK – had, by this time, suffered irreversible losses. The smaller organisations – Dashmesh Regiment, Khalistan Armed Force, Khalistan Guerilla Force, Khalistan National Army, Khalistan Liberation Army – had been virtually wiped out. The entire surviving terrorist leadership including Wadhawa Singh and Mehal Singh of the Babbar Khalsa, Paramjir Singh Panjwar of the KCF, Pritam Singh Sekhon of the KLF, and Narain Singh of the KLA, now fled to Pakistan to join their resident ideologues – Wassan Singh Zaffarwal of the Panthic Committee (Zaffarwal) and Dr. Sohan Singh of the Panthic Committee (SS).

Assam Struggle

With the advent of the British, the socio-economic and political condition of India had taken a new turn. They began to run the administration of the country in order to suit their colonial motives. An important impact of British rule on rural India was the changes in the agrarian structure. Since the grant of Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in 1765, the major concern of the East India Company's administration was to collect as much revenue as possible. In the late 18th and early 19th century the revenue reforms of the company's government had fundamentally affected and altered the Indian rural society. In this period high revenue demands and imposition of new taxes had so severely affected the entire rural population that all sections of



the peasantry in different parts of the country participated in a series of violent protest. It is observed that in the vast Zamindari areas the peasants were left to the tender mercies of the Zamindars who reek-rented them and compelled them to pay the illegal dues and performed beggar. In ryotwari areas, the government itself levied heavy land revenue. So they were compelled to borrow money from the moneylenders. Over large areas, the lands, crops and cattle of the peasants passed into the hands of the moneylenders, landlords and rich peasants. Some major peasant uprisings which rocked the country were such as indigo revolt of 1859-60 in Bengal, revolt 19th Century's Peasant Movements of Assam: It's Impact and Importance Shirumani Baruah of Poon and Ahmadnagar districts of Maharashtra, Mappila outbreak in Malabar, Ramosi peasant force in Maharashtra in 1879, the Kuka revolt in Punjab etc.

In Assam also a series of agrarian movements were launched by the peasants to redress their grievances. They expressed their dissatisfaction through rajmels or people's assembly. Both the Hindus and the Muslims united under the Gossains, Doloi's and village headman of their respective areas to protest against the unjustified revenue assessment of the British government. These peasant movements had a great contribution towards the growth of national consciousness in Assam in the 19th century.

The British rule brought a significant changes to the medieval Assamese society. When the British took over the charge of the province it was in a largely depopulated and impoverished. Income derived in Assam was not enough to meet the administrative expenditure. The financial difficulties forced the British government to impose different agricultural taxes which were very much oppressive for the peasants. Lands were classified into three categories, Basti, Rupit and Faringati. The rupit lands in Kamrup district in 1835 were assessed at one rupee per pura, the bao tali at 12 annas and faringati at four annas. These rates differed slightly in other districts and were gradually raised.

The peasants of Assam irrespective of caste, class and creed realised the exploitation of British colonial rule. The poor peasants demanded the reduction of land revenue and imposition of new taxes. Another important factor which brought grievances to the people was the transfer of power from the British East India Company to the crown. In order to fulfil the huge deficit



caused by the revolt the Britishers searched for new sources of revenue. So, the government imposed some new taxes. In 1858 stamp duties were introduced. In 1860 income tax was imposed which were totally unfamiliar to the people of Assam. Exise duties were leived at the Sadar Stations of Kamrup, Darrang and Nowgong. Washing of gold was also farmed out and the rights to fish in rivers and beels was offered to the highest bidder. Cutting of timber and reeds and use of grazing fields were also made taxable.

Anandaram Dhekial Phukan, one of the leading members of rising middle class in Assam in his memorandum to A. J. Mofat Mills “Observation on the Administration of the Province of Assam narrates that, a poorah of high rupit land yielding 20 or 15 maunds of rice valued at from two or three Rs in loded with a tax of one rupee and four annas . The riyots were further impoverished by the assessment of forest lands producing Som tree in which Muga worms were brought under taxation. Under the settlement rules of 1870, rupit and basti lands were settled for a period of ten years at fixed rate. The settled area in the Brahmaputra valley gradually increased by 15% between 1881-82 and 1891-1892.

Between 1826 and 1853 that the land revenue rates were enhanced on several occasions. Anandaram Dhekial Phukan observed that assessment on some of the rupit lands, he said was found to be nearly equal in value to one half of their gross produce. The total land revenue demand more than quadrupled between 1856-1866 and 1897-98, while the growth of cultivated acreage under all crops except tea remained as low as a little over 7%. Tax enhancement in 1893 was particularly objectionable in view of the black fever epidemic that had been depopulating the Assamese villages since 1888.

It was not the land revenue policy which was exploitative, the opium policy of the British government was equally destructive. In 1860, the local cultivation of opium was prohibited, but not it's trade. At first opium was used as drug and was prevalent among a few respective Assamese not by the common people. During the last days of the Ahom's rule the opium had become popular intoxicated drug. Robinson and Mill observed that about three fourths of the people of Assam to be opium addicts in the middle of the 19th centry. Inspite of high price of government opium, the number of consumers had increased gradually. In Sibsagar district as for



example, opium was sold in market at Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 per seer and the consumption rose from 52 maunds in 1852-53 to 87 maunds in 1858-59. On the other hand, lack of government steps towards the development of agriculture neglect of embankments, bunds and means of communication also severely affected the agricultural based rural economy.

The Jayantia rebellion:

The first popular rising against the new taxation measures took place in the Jayantia Hills. Mr. Allen, the Member of the Board of Revenue, who made a visit to the Khasi and Jayantia Hills argued that the Syntengs should be required to contribute something to the general revenue in acknowledgement of the supremacy of the British government. His advice was followed and in 1860 a house tax was imposed on them. 310 persons, including all leaders of the people were assessed with an aggregate tax of Rs. 1259 to levy the new income tax. In the first year it was paid without any strong opposition. The introduction of the license tax in January 1862 and attempts at confiscation of even ceremonial weapons by a police force made them angry. It resulted a more serious outburst of revolt in the same month in 1862. The police station at Jowai was burnt to the ground. To suppress the revolt, regiments of Sikhs and an elephant battery were employed. But the Syntengs with their weapons like bows and arrows fought bravely for their independence. But the British government decided to retain the house tax and steps had been undertaken to alien the Syntengs with the British rule. Some measures were also undertaken to develop their social condition. The British government gave them rights to elect their Dolois and construct panchayat for the trial of civil and criminal case.

Phulaguri Uprising:

The opium policy of the British government became very miserable for the people of Nowgong district, which occupied the highest position in poppy cultivation in Assam. In the meantime a rumour was spread that soon government imposed tax on cultivation of tamul (areca-nut) and pan (betelvine) would also be made taxable. The peasants of Phulaguri, mostly the Lalungs about 12 k.m. away from Nowgong town led a revolt in 1861. About 15000 people marched to the Sadar Court of Nowgong to protest against the ban on poppy cultivation and contemplated imposition of tax on tamul and pan. But Lt Herbert Sconce refused to hear their



complains. Then the dissatisfied peasants held a rajmels for five days from October 15 to discuss about their future plan to redress their grievances. The number of people attending the rajmel increased day by day. The police force tried to break up the gatherings but failed. On 18th October, Lt Singer, the Assistant Commissioner of Nowgong arrived at Phulaguri with a force. The people said that if he would respond their demand then they were now ready to give complaints to the higher authorities. Then angry Singer ordered to seize their bamboo lathis. He was beaten to death by the angry mob and his dead body was thrown into river Kolong. An armed force arrived in the disturbed area and began to fire to the gatherings. Several persons lost their lives and many were injured. This spontaneous uprising is known as “Phulaguri Dhawa”. Some British officials regarded it as “Opium eaters” revolt.

The Assam Riots: (1893-94):

Phulaguri uprising also could not stop the government policy of enhancement of land revenue nor the supply of government opium. In 1868-69 the government had increased the rate of land revenue on rupit and non-rupit lands in the Assam valley districts from 15 to 50%. A cadastal survey, ordered meanwhile, was completed during the years 1882-93. While the land revenue demand increased substantially because of new additions to the settled area and the detection of concealed cultivation. The conditions of peasantry worsened very much in the period 1891-1901 due to a further rise in opium rates, the devastating earthquake of 1897, which caused the deaths of more than 1500 people added to their miseries. The people particularly in the districts of Darrang, Kamrup, Nowgong protested against this step of British government through rajmels. A series of poestest broke out known as Assam Riots beginning with December, 1893. At that time, Sir William Ward, the Chief Commissioner of Assam made a new assessment and increased land revenue . The revised rates in the Brahmaputra Valley initially involvement on enhancement of 53% on average, but in many villages it was as high as 70 to 100%.

The people in Kamrup and Central Assam spontaneously organized themselves under the rajmels to decide upon a no-tax campaign. On 24 December, 1893, Rangia bazaar was looted by a crowd of 200 to 250 people mostly Kacharies. Everywhere the mels directed the people not to pay the enhanced rates. On 30 December, 3000 people demonstrated against the unpopular steps



of the British government. On 6th January, 1894, the district Magistrate Ma Cabe arrived in Rangia with an additional police force. On 8th January, he was able to arrest 15 persons. On 10th January, the people marched towards the Rangia thana to protest against the enhancement of land revenue, postponement of the collection of land revenue and release of their detained comrades. When 2000 and 3000 lathi armed people began to close the thana, he ordered a firing. According to a report published in "Hindoo Patrio" of 5th February, 1894 there was no loss of life. The government found it difficult to collect revenue in the tahsils of Patidarang, Nalbari, Barama and Bajali and in the mauzas of Upar Barbhog and Sarukhetri. At Lachima in Sarukhetri Mauza of the Kamrup district on 29th January, 1894, mouzadar and mandal were severely assaulted by the people when they were going to collect revenue from the villages. The mouzadar died a few days after the incident. 75 persons were arrested related with the incident. But about 3000 strong assembly released the arrested persons.

Patharughat Uprising:

The most severest and tragic peasant movements in the 19th century was the Patharughat peasant uprising of Mangaldai Subdivision on 28th January, 1894. Through the raijmels they protested against the increased rate of land revenue and adopted a no tax campaign. In that circumstances J. D. Anderson, the Deputy Commissioner of Darrang arrived with a military force under Lt. Berrington. About 2000 riots gathered in front of the camp of Anderson and protested against the increased rate of land revenue. The angry mob began to throw sticks and clods of earth to Anderson. Berrington ordered an open fire at last and as a result, 15 persons injured according to government report. But according to non-government report 140 persons lost their lives and 150 person injured. The Patharughat tragedy was regarded as the "Jaliwanwalabagh Massacre" of Assam.

It is seen that the peasant uprisings were the reflection of peasant discontentment in Assam. It also showed the nature and objectives of the British rule in Assam. They stood against the exploitation and extortions of the British government. Though contemporary British administrators regarded these movements as the evil result of the raij-mels but it was not true. Through these raij-mels they expressed their miserable economic condition under the British



rule. The rajmels became their platform through which they could express their grievances. There were certain features of the peasant uprisings in the 19th century. Like the peasant movements of other parts of India, in Assam also the peasants emerged as the main force in the agrarian movements. They were bounded by some particular objectives and redressal to some particular grievances. Their object did not deal with the end of colonialism, exploitation and subordination.

India's Foreign Policy Reflect Its Active National Interest

India First Policy: With 75 years of independence, the country has a greater sense of confidence and optimism in articulating an "India First" foreign policy. India decides for itself, and its independent foreign policy cannot be subject to intimidations. With one-fifth of the world's population, India has the right to have its own side and to weigh its own interests. It is certainly a basic tenet of international relations that national interests are paramount, and India too, like other nations, has pursued its interests when it comes to foreign and national security policies.

Realistic Diplomacy: Today's self-confident India has a new voice in the global firmament, rooted in its domestic realities and civilizational ethos, as well as firm in the pursuit of its vital interests. As the Indian Foreign Minister remarked at Raisina Dialogue, "It is better to engage with the world on the basis of "who we are" rather than try and please the world. India is confident about its identity and priorities, the world will engage with India on its terms.

Maintaining Balance of Power to its Advantage: From being the only global power to challenge China's Belt and Road Initiative as far back as 2014 to responding to Chinese military aggression with a strong military pushback. On the other hand, working with the US without entering the full embrace of a formal alliance and engaging the West to build domestic capacities. India has been pragmatic to the core and willing to use the extant balance of power to its advantage.

Growing Economic Ties: Since India's economic interdependence with the rest of the world deepens, it has become more observant of markets for its products, sources of raw



materials, and potential recipients of its expanding foreign aid. From the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (the Quad) to the BRICS, there is a long list of memberships that India holds.

Often this is seen as old-style meandering. India, however, is increasingly articulating and promoting its priorities in a much more direct manner. India does not believe in interference in the internal affairs of other countries. However, if an act - innocent or deliberate - by any country has the potential of impinging upon India's national interests, India does not hesitate in quick and timely intervention.

India's Foreign Policy

Panchsheel (Five Virtues): They were formally enunciated in the Agreement on Trade between the Tibet region of China and India signed on April 29, 1954 and later evolved to act as the basis of conduct of international relations globally.

These Five Principles are:

- Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty
- Mutual non-aggression
- Mutual non-interference
- Equality and mutual benefit
- Peaceful co-existence

Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam (The World is One Family): It is based on the concept of Sabka Saath, Sabka Vikas, Sabka Vishwas. In other words, India views the entire world community as a single large global family, where members live in harmony, work and grow together, and have trust in one another. India does not hesitate in promoting democracy wherever potential exists. This is done by proactively providing assistance in capacity building and strengthening the institutions of democracy, albeit with the explicit consent of the concerned Government. (Ex. Afghanistan).

Global Problem Solving Approach: India advocates a global debate and global consensus on issues of global dimensions such as world trade regime, climate change, terrorism, intellectual



property rights, global governance, health hazards. Under the Vaccine diplomacy initiative, India exported 60 million doses, half on commercial terms and 10 million as grants.

The Current Challenges to India's Foreign Policy

Russia Ukraine Issue: It is certainly a complex international political issue when countries like India find it difficult to choose between politics and moral imperative. Russia is a trade partner, and it has leverage in the Eurasian region, and by going directly against Russia, India will jeopardise its interests in the region. As realist prudence demands, India cannot simply undertake a moralist standpoint on Russia-Ukraine Conflict and ignore the dictates of politics.

Internal Challenges: A country cannot be powerful abroad if it is weak at home. India's soft power assets make sense when they are supported by its hard power. Former President of India, A. P. J. Abdul Kalam repeatedly made the case that India can play an effective role on the world stage when it is strong internally as well as externally. **Refugee Crisis:** In spite of not being a party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, India has been one of the largest recipients of refugees in the world. The challenge here is to balance protection of human rights and national interest. As the Rohingya crisis unfolds, there is still a lot that India can do to facilitate the finding of long-term solutions. These actions will be key in determining India's regional and global standing on human rights.

Collective Approach to Tackle Environmental Issues: India has the potential to take the lead in tackling global environmental challenges reflected in its goal of reaching net zero by 2070 (26th United Nations Conference on Climate Change in 2021) Environmental problems are intertwined with social processes. There is a need for achieving sustainability at social, economic as well as ecological level as highlighted in Sustainable Development Goals. **Balancing Internal and External Development:** India should look forward to creating an external environment which is conducive for an inclusive development of India so that the benefits of growth can reach the poorest of the poor in the country. And ensure that India's voice is heard on global forums and that India is able to influence world opinion on issues of global dimensions such as terrorism, climate change, disarmament, reforms of institutions of global governance. Pouring



Ethical Values in Foreign Policy: As rightly said by Mahatma Gandhi, politics without principles and ethics would be disastrous. India should move towards collective development with an ethical persuasion reclaiming its moral leadership in the world at large. Policy Evolution Along with Maintaining Basic Principles: We are living in a dynamic world. India's foreign policy is therefore geared up to be proactive, flexible as well as pragmatic so as to make quick adjustments to respond to evolving situations.

In the implementation of its foreign policy India, however, invariably adheres to a set of basic principles on which no compromise is made securing:

- National Beliefs & Values
- National Interests
- National Strategy

Shaping the Global Agenda: It is important for India to trace the role of a "leading power" in the international system, one that shapes global norms and institutional architecture, rather than these being shaped by others. To this is linked the aspiration to be a Permanent Member of the expanded UN Security Council for which a large number of countries have already pledged support. Diplomacy for Development: In order to sustain its growth trajectory, India needs substantial external inputs. To succeed, our on-going programmes such as Make in India, Skill India, Smart Cities, infrastructure development, Digital India, Clean India etc. need foreign partners, Foreign Direct Investments, financial assistance and transfer of technology. India's foreign policy should add focus on this aspect of Diplomacy For Development by integrating economic diplomacy with political diplomacy.

The Telangana movement (1946-51) was an armed revolt of peasants, under the leadership of the Communist Party of India against oppressive landlordism patronized by the autocratic rule of the Nizam of Hyderabad. It was a pivotal moment in Indian history because of its impact on the future of the communist movement in India, and its highlighting of the condition of the Indian peasantry.



Before Indian independence, Hyderabad state was a princely state within the territory of British India, comprised of three linguistic regions: the Telugu-speaking Telangana area (including the capital city, Hyderabad), the Marathi-speaking Marathwada area, and a small Kannada-speaking area. The ruling elites, including the Nizam, were Muslims, while the majority were Hindus. The nature of land ownership in the region was extremely exploitative. 40% of the land was either directly owned by the Nizam or given by the Nizam to elites in the form of jagirs (special tenures). The remaining 60% was under the government's land revenue system, which relied on powerful landlords and gave no legal rights or security from eviction to the people actually cultivating the land.

The vetti (forced labour) system consisted of work performed by lower castes at the will of the landlord. For example, each so-called "untouchable" family was required to send one man everyday to do household labour and other jobs for the landlord. The large landowners had taken over significant tracts of land, either through forced occupation or debt-sales.

In the 1920s, the suppression of languages and cultures provoked resistance, which eventually led to more wide-ranging agitations. In 1928, the Andhra Mahasabha (AMS) was organised, which later in 1934 conference demanded: reduced land revenue rates abolition of vetti, and the introduction of Telugu into the local courts. The advent of the Second World War saw the beginning of communist influence on the AMS, and in 1942, with the removal of the ban on the Communist Party of India (CPI), the communists began to grow in Hyderabad. Further, after 1944, the communists, along with AMS, began gaining ground in several districts, especially among the agricultural labourers, poor tenants and small landholders, and started forming Sanghams (village-level committees).

The Movement

Tensions mounted when a hereditary tax collector, attempted to forcibly take land belonging to a member of a village sangham. He sent a group of 100 goons and 100 servants to forcibly gather the harvest. They were resisted by the local village sangham leaders and volunteers. On July 4, 1946, a procession was organised by the villagers protesting the violence and terrorism of the landlord's goons. As they approached the landlord's house, some of



the goons opened fire on the procession, leading to the death of Doddi Komarayya, the sangham leader.

The death of Komarayya enraged the people, sparking a massive revolt amongst the Telangana peasantry, with people from neighbouring villages marching, holding meetings in front of the landlord's house, and declaring: "Sangham is organised here. No more vetti, no more illegal exactions, no evictions". By the end of July, the movement had spread to about 300-400 villages across three districts. In response, the police, with the help of landlords, conducted a series of search operations, leading villagers to arm themselves. In October 1946, the Nizam's government banned the AMS, and a spurt of arrests and military raids took place. Under these conditions of martial rule, some landlords began returning. Thus, during this first phase of the movement, the people were able, in several areas, to "put an end to vetti, illegal exactions, compulsory grain levies, and reoccupy the lands seized earlier by the landlords", while also "resisting the landlords' armed goondas" and facing "the armed police and the military forces of the Nizam"

Razzakar Terror

In August 1947, when India became independent, Hyderabad state exercised the option of remaining autonomous. The bulk of the ruling majority, including the Nizam, the nobility and the Majlis-I-Ittehad (MII), a fundamentalist Islamic organisation within Hyderabad, supported the call for Azad ("Free") Hyderabad. At this point, the MII started growing in militancy. Its paramilitary force, the Razakars, were sent in hordes to suppress the peasant insurrection. They raided and plundered the troubled villages, arrested or killed suspected and potential agitators, terrorized the innocent, and also abducted women as part of the campaign of punitive measures against the turbulent villages all over Hyderabad, but particularly in Telangana. In reaction, in February 1948, the CPI introduced a new policy aimed at encouraging guerilla offensives, largely influenced by the success of the Telangana insurrection. The village republics started redistributing land to landless agricultural labourers and evicted tenants, increasing the popularity of the movement.



On September 13, 1948, in a 'police action' aimed at countering the violence in Hyderabad, the Indian Army marched into the state. Within a week's time, the Nizam, the razakar squads and the police surrendered. In an effort to co-opt peasant support, the military administration issued the Jagir Abolition Regulation (August 1949) and set up an Agrarian Enquiry Committee to recommend comprehensive land reform legislation. At this time, a debate ensued within the CPI. Certain sections felt that giving up arms was essential. Other sections were sceptical, as they felt that giving up arms could lead to loss of gains and appear as a betrayal of the people. However, by the end of 1950, only isolated guerilla groups existed, there was little coordination among village republics, and the severe military repression had taken its toll on the population, with a huge loss of life, and the movement weakened. By early 1951, Congress government made several conciliatory gestures towards the CPI, and, after several rounds of negotiations, the CPI formally declared the struggle withdrawn on October 21, 1951.

India and the Non-Aligned Movement

For India, the concept of non-alignment began as a policy of non-participation in the military affairs of a bipolar world and in the context of colonialism aimed towards optimum involvement through multi-polar participation towards peace and security. It meant a country should be able to preserve a certain amount of freedom of action internationally. There was no set definition of non-alignment, which meant the term was interpreted differently by different politicians and governments, and varied in different contexts. The overall aims and principles found consensus among the movement members. Non-aligned countries, however, rarely attained the freedom of judgement they desired and their actual behaviour towards the movement's objectives, such as social justice and human rights, were unfulfilled in many cases. India's actions often resembled those of aligned countries. The response of the non-aligned nations during India's wars in 1962, 1965 and 1971 revealed non-aligned positions on issues such as secession. The non-aligned nations were unable to fulfil the role of peacekeepers during the Indo-China war of 1962 and the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965 despite meaningful attempts. The non-aligned response to the Bangladesh Liberation War and the following 1971 Indo-Pakistan War showed most of the non-aligned nations prioritised territorial integrity above human rights, which could be explained by the recently attained statehood for the non-aligned. During this



period, India's non-aligned stance was questioned and criticized. Jawaharlal Nehru had not wanted the formalization of non-alignment and none of the non-aligned nations had commitments to help each other. The international rise of countries such as China also decreased incentives for the non-aligned countries to stand in solidarity with India.

India played an important role in the multilateral movements of colonies and newly independent countries that wanted to participate in the Non-Aligned Movement. The country's place in national diplomacy, its significant size and its economic growth turned India into one of the leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Origin of non-alignment in India

Prior to Independence and India becoming a republic, Jawaharlal Nehru contemplated the path the country would take in world affairs. In 1946, Nehru, as a part of the cabinet of the Interim Government of India, said during a radio broadcast; "we propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale". In 1948, he made a speech to the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) titled "We Lead Ourselves" in which he said the world was going through a phase in which the foreign policies of major powers had "miserably failed". In the speech, he talked about what alignment entailed, saying:

What does joining a bloc mean? After all it can only mean one thing: give up your view about a particular question, adopt the other party's view on that question in order to please it. Our instructions to our delegates have always been first to consider each question in terms of India's interest, secondly, on its merit - I mean to say if it did not affect India, naturally on its merits and not merely to do something or to give a vote just to please this power or that power.

Some saw confusion in these speeches and the West questioned Nehru's "neutrality"; in the United States in 1949, Nehru said; "we are not blind to reality nor do we acquiesce in any challenge to man's freedom from whatever quarters it may come. Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression take place, we cannot and shall not be neutral". The term 'Non-Alignment' was used for the first time in 1950 at the United Nations when both India



and Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia rejected alignment with any side in the Korean War. Over the years, Nehru made a number of comments on non-alignment; in 1957 he said, "Non-alignment seems to me as the natural consequence of an independent nation functioning according to its own rights. After all alignment means being regimented to do something you do not like and thereby giving up certain measures of independent judgement and thinking."

Indian non-alignment was a product of the Cold War, a bipolar world and India's colonial experience and the non-violent Indian independence struggle. According to Rejaul Karim Laskar, the Non-Aligned Movement was devised by Nehru and other leaders of newly independent countries of the Third World to "guard" their independence "in face of complex international situation demanding allegiance to either of the two warring superpowers".

The term "non-alignment" was coined by V K Menon in his speech at the United Nations (UN) in 1953, which was later used by Indian Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru during his speech in 1954 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, in which he described the Panchsheel (five restraints) to be used as a guide for Sino-Indian relations, which were first put forth by Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai. These principles would later become the basis of the Non-Aligned Movement. The five principles were: mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in domestic affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful co-existence. Nehru's concept of non-alignment brought India considerable international prestige among newly independent states that shared its concerns about the military confrontation between the superpowers and the influence of the former colonial powers. By laying the foundation stone of 'Non-Alignment Movement', India was able to establish a significant role for itself as a leader of the newly independent world and in the multilateral organisations like the UN. According to Jairam Ramesh, neither Menon or Nehru "particularly cared for or were fond of the term 'non alignment' much less of the idea of 'non-aligned movement' or a 'non aligned grouping'".

Early developments

The Non-Aligned Movement had its origins in the 1947 Asian Relations Meeting in New Delhi and the 1955 Asian-African Conference in Bandung, Indonesia. India also participated in



the 1961 Belgrade Conference that officially established the Non-Aligned Movement but Nehru's declining prestige limited his influence. In the 1960s and 1970s, India concentrated on internal problems and bilateral relations but retained membership in the increasingly factionalised and radicalised movement. During the contentious 1979 Havana summit, India worked with moderate nations to reject Cuban President Fidel Castro's proposition that "socialism" was the "natural ally" of non-alignment.

Non-aligned and Sino-Indian conflict

The Sino-India war of 1962 was one of the first situations in which the non-aligned countries faced a situation that was not directly related to the two blocs or issues such as colonialism. The Belgrade Summit had been held in 1961 with representation from 24 countries, the reaction of which ranged from ignoring the situation, making low-profile appeals and statements to making attempts to mediate.

According to V.K. Krishna Menon in 1964; "non-aligned nation(s) must be non-aligned with the non-aligned ... that is why, when some people here say, 'why haven't the non-aligned people stood up and shouted against China', I tell them, 'they have their own policy, they have their own independence'". In 1984, Sarvepalli Gopal said; "India ... found non-alignment deteriorating into isolation. Even the other non-aligned leaders, with the honourable exception of Nasser and Tito were guarded in their response to India's case.

Non-alignment and Indo-Pakistan conflicts

The response of non-aligned nations to the Indo-Pakistan conflicts revealed insights into their views towards self determination, issues of secession, the use of force in boundary disputes, armed intervention, external support in liberation struggles, human rights and genocide. Many of the non-aligned nations were facing similar problems in their own countries. The Indo-Pakistani War of 1965 saw a continuing decline in the role of non-aligned nations in peacekeeping, a decline that started with a failure to mediate during the 1962 Indo-Sino war.

The Indo-Pakistani War of 1971 started as an "internal issue" of human rights in Pakistan, an issue of human rights but became India's problem with the migration of millions of



refugees into India, which was referred to as "civilian aggression". Two major alignments developed; Pakistan aligned with the United States and China, and India aligned with the Soviet Union. Without Soviet support, India would not have been able to defend itself against the US-Pakistan-China alliance. This polarization influenced all forums and international opinion, including that of the Non-Aligned Movement, which at the time consisted of 53 nations. The non-aligned responses varied from calling the situation an internal matter of Pakistan to seeking a political solution to a humanitarian problem but only one of the non-aligned states mentioned the human rights aspect. It took time for some of the non-aligned nations to deal with the emergence of Bangladesh and to appreciate the contradictory issues of Pakistan national unity and the Bengali right to self-determination. During the Uniting for Peace resolution, non-aligned responses became clearer; some of the African non-aligned nations were the most critical of India while others that wanted to stay neutral made contradictory statements. The predicament of small non-aligned states was also seen. India was disappointed with the non-aligned response. In August 1971, M. C. Chagla, a former foreign affairs minister of India, said:

Look at the non-aligned countries, we have prided ourselves of our nonalignment. What have the non-aligned countries done? Nothing. ... many countries have skeletons in their cupboard. They have minorities whom they have not treated well and they feel that if they support Bangladesh, these minorities will also rise in revolt, in rebellion, against the oppressive policies being pursued by the administration.

The signing of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation in 1971 and India's involvement in the internal affairs of its smaller neighbours in the 1970s and 1980s tarnished its image as a non-aligned nation and led some observers to question India's non-alignment. Rather than an issue of non-aligned solidarity, India's declining influence in non-aligned areas compared to the rise of China also affected the international withdrawal of support to India. There was no commitment for the non-aligned nations to help each other. Non-alignment also affected India's bilateral relations with many countries.



21st century

In 2019, India was represented at the 18th NAM summit by its vice president and external affairs minister. In May 2020, the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi participated in a NAM virtual summit. In July 2020, India's External Affairs Minister Subrahmanyam Jaishankar said during an interview; "non-alignment was a term of a particular era and a particular, shall I say, geopolitical landscape".

India and the United Nations

India was among the charter members of the United Nations that signed the Declaration by United Nations at Washington, D.C., on 1 January 1942 and also participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco from 25 April to 26 June 1945. As a founding member of the United Nations, India strongly supports the purposes and principles of the UN and has made significant contributions in implementing the goals of the Charter, and the evolution of the UN's specialised programmes and agencies.

India has been a non permanent member of the UN Security Council for eight terms (a total of ongoing 16 years), with the most recent being the 2021–22 term. India is a member of G4, group of nations who back each other in seeking a permanent seat on the Security Council and advocate in favour of the reformation of the UNSC. India is also part of the G-77.

India is a charter member of the United Nations and participates in all of its specialised agencies and organizations. India has contributed troops to United Nations peacekeeping efforts in Korea, Egypt and the Congo in its earlier years and in Somalia, Angola, Haiti, Liberia, Lebanon and Rwanda in recent years, and more recently in the South Sudan conflict.

History of UN

India was one of the original members of the League of Nations. In principle, only sovereign states can become UN members. However, although today all UN members are fully sovereign states, four of the original members (Belarus, India, the Philippines, and Ukraine) were



not independent at the time of their admission. India signed the Declaration by United Nations on 1 January 1942 and was represented by Girija Shankar Bajpai who was the Indian Agent-General at the time. Afterwards the Indian delegation led by Sir Arcot Ramaswamy Mudaliar signed the United Nations Charter on behalf of India during the historic United Nations Conference on International Organization held in San Francisco, United States on 26 June 1945. Sir A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar later went on to serve as the first president of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

India gained full independence in 1947. Independent India viewed its membership at the United Nations as an important guarantee for maintaining international peace and security. India stood at the forefront during the UN's tumultuous years of struggle against colonialism and apartheid. India's status as a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 cemented its position within the UN system as a leading advocate of the concerns and aspirations of developing countries and the creation of a more equitable international economic and political order. India was among the most outspoken critics of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, being the first country to have raised the issue in the UN (in 1946).

UN General Assembly

India was one of the founding members of the United Nations, joining in October 1945, two years before acquiring independence from United Kingdom. By 1946, India had started raising concerns regarding decolonization, apartheid and racial discrimination. From early 1947–48, India took an active part in Drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Dr. Hansa Mehta, a Gandhian political activist and social worker who led the Indian delegation, had made important contributions in drafting of the Declaration, especially highlighting the need for reflecting gender equality by changing the language of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from 'all men are created equal' (Eleanor Roosevelt's preferred phrase) to 'all human beings'.

In 1953, the chief delegate of India at the time, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit was elected the first woman President of the UN General Assembly. India supported the struggle towards global



disarmament and the ending of the arms race, and towards the creation of a more equitable international economic order. India had a mediatory role in resolving the stalemate over prisoners of war in Korea contributing to the signing of the armistice ending the Korean War in 1953. India chaired the five-member Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission while the Indian Custodian Force supervised the process of interviews and repatriation that followed. India then went on to chair the three international commissions for supervision and control for Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos established by the 1954 Geneva Accords on Indochina. India also had an active role to play in the Suez Crisis in 1956 with the role of Jawaharlal Nehru, both as Prime Minister of India and a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement being significant. Indian historian Inder Malhotra wrote that "Now Nehru—who had tried to be even-handed between the two sides—denounced Anthony Eden and co-sponsors of the aggression vigorous. He had a powerful, if relatively silent, ally in the US president Dwight D. Eisenhower who went to the extent of using America's clout in the IMF to make Eden and Mollet (the then French Prime Minister) behave".

Charter provisions on non-self-governing territories were given a new thrust when the UN adopted the landmark 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was co-sponsored by India. The following year, the Special Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on Decolonization was established to study, investigate and recommend action to bring an end to colonialism, it was chaired by India for the first time. India played a leading role in the formation of a Sub-Committee against Apartheid set up by the General Assembly. When the Convention on Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted in 1965, India was among the earliest signatories, however it does not recognise competence under article 14 and it does not consider itself bound by article 22.

India also played a prominent role in articulating the economic concerns of developing countries in such UN-sponsored conferences as the triennial UN Conference on Trade and Development and the 1992 Conference on the Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. It has been an active member of the Group of 77, and later the core group of the G-15 nations. Other issues, such as environmentally sustainable development and the promotion



and protection of human rights, have also been an important focus of India's foreign policy in international forums.

UN Security Council

Activities during 1947–1962

Despite its anti-status quo stand on many global issues, India's attitude toward the basic structure of the UN was fundamentally conservative. It accepted the organization and distribution of power in the UN, as both a guarantee of Indian sovereignty and as a check on the numerical superiority of the U.S. and its western coalition. India supported the charter provisions for a Security Council veto for the great powers, opposed the U.S. initiative to circumvent the veto through the Uniting for Peace Resolution, dismissed Hammarskjöld's notion of a "UN presence" as interventionist and opposed all efforts to conduct UN directed plebiscites as tests of opinion.

India's procedural conservatism was based both on its commitment to national sovereignty and its desire to protect Indian interests. Its experience with the UN had not always been positive. In the early years after independence, a whole range of issues, which had their origins in the partition of the Indian subcontinent between India and Pakistan, came before the UN. These issues included the disputed princely states of Junagadh, Hyderabad and Kashmir, which were ultimately incorporated into the Indian Union through the use of military force.

The most persistent of these disputes was the Kashmir conflict. Nehru's faith in the UN and adherence to its principles proved costly on some occasions due to the power play inherent in the organization. This was seen by his decision to refer Pakistan's intervention ('invasion') in disputed Kashmir to the UN Security Council in January 1948. The United Kingdom, which was hoping to avoid being seen as unfriendly to a Muslim state after the creation of Israel, used pressure tactics on its allies France, Canada and the US to support the Pakistani viewpoint that Kashmir's accession to India was disputable and had to be put to the test of a plebiscite. Nehru's hope that the UN would unconditionally instruct Pakistan to vacate the one-third portion of Kashmir that the Pakistani tribesmen and army had occupied fell flat in the face of geopolitical



manoeuvrings and cross-issue linkage. To this day, Indian strategic commentators and critics of Nehru bemoan his cardinal mistake of taking the Kashmir dispute to a UN that was packed with pro-Pakistani partisan powers. According to columnist Brahma Chellaney, 'Nehru did not appreciate that the UN was an institution of power politics, not an impartial police force'. As if a double reminder were needed that India was small fry in a UN dominated by crafty Great Powers divided into two ideological camps, New Delhi was disappointed to find that Security Council members the US, United Kingdom and France tried to prevent it from forcibly absorbing the Portuguese colony of Goa in 1961. But for the Soviet veto in favour of India, Goa could have become enmeshed in another Kashmir-like stalemate for decades, buffeted by the changing winds of Great Power alignments and preferences that were paralysing and hijacking the UN.

Overall the period from 1947-1962 was marked by India's active interest in all UN activities under the leadership of V. K. Krishna Menon who was the Indian Ambassador to the United Nations from 1952-1962. Indian leadership and peacekeeping roles in the UN brought it considerable recognition and global standing.

The phase from 1962 to 1976

India's defeat in the Sino-Indian War came as a grave shock compared to its global aspirations and recognition. Large-scale hostilities and military reverse dealt a shattering blow to its self-confidence and pride. India was obliged to turn towards the west for military and political support. Following the conflict with China, India became involved in two wars with Pakistan and entered a period of political instability, economic stagnation, food shortages and near-famine conditions. India's role diminished in the UN which came both as a result of its image and a deliberate decision by the post-Nehru political leadership to adopt a low profile at the UN and speak only on vital Indian interests. This change in policy was implemented during the 1965 debate on Kashmir in the Security Council when Indian Foreign Minister Swaran Singh dramatically stormed out of the session in response to the intemperate language of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pakistan's Foreign Minister. In his book "India's Changing Role in the United Nations" Stanley Kochanek shows how 'bilateralism became the guiding principle of Indian foreign policy', relegating the UN to just an 'arena for maintaining such contacts'. Further



the Soviet Union's backing became far more important than a slow and indecisive UN Security Council when India obtained its greatest strategic victory by beating China in the 1967 War and breaking up Pakistan into two and carving out independent Bangladesh in 1971.

In 1974, India tested its first nuclear device, the aftermath of which resulted in an atomic embargo by the US and Canada. Soon after the UN's non-proliferation agenda became another irritant that forced New Delhi to view some units of the organization with distaste as fronts for imposing discriminatory regimes instead of promoting universal disarmament. From the very beginning it has refused to lend its support to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty with India's then External Affairs Minister and later President, Pranab Mukherjee in a visit to Tokyo in 2007 commenting that: "If India did not sign the NPT, it is not because of its lack of commitment for non-proliferation, but because we consider NPT as a flawed treaty and it did not recognise the need for universal, non-discriminatory verification and treatment." In short, the 1960s as a whole saw major changes in the global system but a general decline in UN activities.

Activities since 1976

From January 2011 to January 2013, India was a non permanent member of the UN Security Council. According to Rejaul Karim Laskar, a scholar of India's foreign policy, as a non-permanent member from January 2011 to January 2013, India played a crucial role on important international issues with a view to promote international peace and security as well as India's own national security.

Activities in the Council after 2020

From January 2021 onwards, India became a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council for the 8th time. India's term will last through 2021 and 2022. India became the President of the Security Council in the month of August 2021 and will hold the position once more in the month December 2022. India aims to focus on issues like maritime security, peacekeeping, counter-terrorism, Africa, etc. India seeks a permanent seat in the Security Council as a member of the G4. India will bid for non-permanent member for term 2028-2029. If elected it will be her 9th term in UNSC.



Seeking of Permanent Seat in UNSC

India has been elected eight times to the UN Security Council. India has been seeking a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council as a member of the G4, an organization composed of Brazil, Germany, Japan, and India, all who are currently seeking permanent representation. The Russian Federation, United States, United Kingdom and France support India and the other G4 countries gaining permanent seats.

According to the G4 proposal, the UN Security Council should be expanded beyond the current fifteen members to include twenty-five members. If this actually happens, it would be the first time permanent Security Council status is extended to a South Asian nation and supporters of the G4 plan suggest that this will lead to greater representation of developing nations rather than the current major powers.

India makes a number of claims to justify its demand. India has the world's second largest population and is the world's largest liberal democracy. It is also the world's fifth largest economy and third largest in terms of purchasing power parity as of 2020. India is the largest contributor of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions with 7,860 personnel deployed with ten UN Peacekeeping Missions as of 2014 after Bangladesh and Pakistan, all three nations being in South Asia. India has contributed more than 180,000 troops, the largest number from any country, participated in more than 43 missions and 156 Indian peacekeepers have made the supreme sacrifice while serving in UN missions. India has also provided and continues to provide eminent Force Commanders for UN Missions.

Although the U.S. and other permanent Council members were not very supportive of expanding the Security Council, in his visit to India, US President Barack Obama has offered his support for India to become a permanent member of the Council. However, the reaction from other Council members are not very clear, particularly from China. Thus it is uncertain whether the demands by G4 nations will be implemented anytime soon.



International Court of Justice

From 1945 to present, a total of 4 members from India have been appointed as Judges of the International Court of Justice, the primary judicial branch of the United Nations. Moreover, Nagendra Singh was appointed as the President from 1985 to 1988. In addition, 3 member have also served as Judges sitting ad hoc. Now India's Supreme Court Justice 'Justice: Dalveer Bhandari' has been appointed as the judge in International Court of Justice for a second term. Justice Dalveer Bhandari has studied at JNVU Jodhpur and served as judge in both high court and The Supreme Court in India.

Peacekeeping

So far India has taken part in 43 Peacekeeping missions with a total contribution exceeding •India has contributed the most personnel to UN 2,53,000 troops and a significant number of police personnel having been deployed. In 2014 India is the third largest troop contributor (TCC) with 7,860 personnel deployed with ten UN Peacekeeping Missions of which 995 are police personnel, including the first female formed Police Unit under the UN. The Indian Army has undertaken numerous UN peacekeeping missions. As of 30 June 2014, 157 Indians have been killed during such operations. The Indian army has also provided paramedical units to facilitate the withdrawal of the sick and wounded.

In service to the United Nations, Satish Nambiar was appointed as 1st Force Commander and Head of Mission of UNPROFOR and Jai Shanker Menon as Head of Mission and Force Commander of United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. According to UN estimates, India is currently the fourth-largest police-contributing country with 1,009 officers, and the third-largest contributor of female police officers. As of February 2017, 163 Indians have been killed while serving in UN peacekeeping operations. As of 16 April 2019, the United Nations had arrears of USD 38 million to India for its troop contributions.



South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)

SAARC stands for South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, is an intergovernmental organization for the development of economic and regional integration. The organization has the support of different countries known as member-state.

| | |
|--|--|
| SAARC Established in | 1985 (December 8), Dhaka (Bangladesh) |
| Number of Member Countries in SAARC | 8 Countries - India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Bhutan, Afghanistan, Pakistan. |
| Number of Observers in SAARC | 9 Observers - Australia, European Union (E.U), Iran, Japan, Mauritius, South Korea, United States of America (USA), China, Myanmar. |
| SAARC Headquarters | Kathmandu, Nepal |
| Launch of SAARC Satellite for South Asia | 2017 |
| SAARc Specialized Bodies | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Asian University (SAU)- India 2. South Asian Standards Organization (SARSO) – Dhaka 3. SAARC Development Fund (SDF) – Bhutan 4. SAARC Arbitration Council (SARCO) - Pakistan |
| Ist Secretary General of SAARC | Abdul Ahsan (Bangladesh) |
| Current Secretary General of SAARC | Esala Weerakoon (Sri Lanka) – Took office from 1 st March 2020 |



| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Last Member to Join SAARC | Afghanistan (April 2007) |
| Last SAARC Summit | 19 th SAARC Summit in Pakistan (Cancelled) |

SAARC- An Overview

SAARC was founded by seven states in 1985. In 2005, Afghanistan requested its accession to SAARC and formally applied for membership in the same year. This organization was formed in Dhaka on December 8, 1985, and its secretariat is based in Kathmandu, Nepal. SAARC Potential future members- Turkey and Russia have also applied for SAARC membership. SAARC comprises of 8 member states and 9 observer states

| SAARc Member states | SAARC Observer States |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Afghanistan | Australia |
| Bangladesh | China |
| Bhutan | European union |
| India | Iran |
| Maldives | Japan |
| Nepal | Mauntius |
| Pakistan | United States |
| Sri Lanka | Myanmar |
| | Republic of Korea |

SAARC-Historical background

The idea of regional cooperation in South Asia was first initiated in May 1980. The Foreign Secretares of the then seven countries met for the first time in Colombo in April 1981. Five key areas for regional cooperation were identified and with time other important areas were added later. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation was set up when its Charter was formally adopted on 8 December 1985 by the Heads of State or Government of India, Bangladesh, Maldives, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Pakistan



Areas of Cooperation Among SAARC Nations

- Agriculture and Rural Development
- Human Resource Development and Tourism
- Economic, Trade and Finance
- Social Affairs
- Environment, Natural Disasters and Biotechnology
- Education, Security and Culture and Others
- Information and Poverty Alleviation
- Energy, Transport, Science and Technology

SAARC Objectives

The main motto of the organization is to work towards a common goal of achieving social, cultural, economic growth by at the people within the South Asia region

The objectives of SAARC, as defined in its charter, are as follows:

Promote the welfare of the peoples of South Asia and improve their quality of life. Accelerate economic growth, social progress, and cultural development in the region by providing all individuals the opportunity to live in dignity and realize their full potential. Promote and strengthen collective self-reliance among the countries of South Asia). Contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems Promote active collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical, and scientific fields. Strengthen co-operation with other developing countries. Strengthen co-operation among themselves in international forums on matters of common interest; and Cooperate with international and regional organizations with similar aims and purposes.

SAARC Principles

Cooperation within the framework of the SAARC shall be based on:

Respect for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non- interference in the internal affairs of other States and mutual benefit. Such



cooperation shall not be a substitute for bilateral and multilateral cooperation but shall complement them. Such cooperation shall not be inconsistent with bilateral and multilateral obligations.

SAARC-Structure

SAARC has the following structure: Council - It is the apex policy-making body. The council is represented by government heads of the respective member countries. Council of Ministers - The Council of Ministers comprises the foreign ministers and they meet generally two times annually.

Council of Ministers-Functions are : Policy formulation, Reviewing the progress of regional cooperation, Identifying newer areas of cooperation, and Setting up additional mechanisms as required.

Standing Committee

It comprises the foreign secretariat of the member countries. The major functions of the standing committee are stated below : To monitor and coordinate the programs, To deal with modalities of financing, To mobilize cooperation within and outside the region

Programming Committee

It comprises senior officials of the member governments. The major functions of this committee are as follows: Finalizing the annual meet schedule, Budget scrutinization, External activities assigned by the standing committee.

Technical Committee

It consists of representatives of the member nations. The major functions of the committee are as follows: To formulate projects and monitor the same, To submit reports.



Secretariat

It is headed by the Secretary-general appointed by the Council of Ministers. The main functions of the Secretariat are as follows : Coordination and execution of activities conducted by SAARC, Monitoring the SAARC meetings, Work as a communication link between SAARC and other international summits and forums.

SAARC Regional Centres

Regional Centres established in Member Countries are the supporting pillars to the secretariat for promoting regional cooperation. These Regional Centres are managed by respective Governing entities comprising representatives from Member States, SAARC Secretary-General, and the Ministry of Foreign/External Affairs of the host government.

The Regional Integrated Programme of Action covers the following aspects:

1. Agriculture and Rural Development
2. Women, Youth, and Children
3. Health and Population Activities
4. Science and Technology and Meteorology
5. Environment and Forestry
6. Human Resource Development, and
7. Transport

Working Groups have also been established in the following areas

1. Biotechnology
2. Information and communications Technology
3. Intellectual Property Rights
4. Energy



5. Tourism

Significance of SAARC

SAARC is the world's most densely populated region and one of the most fertile areas. It comprises 3% of the world's area, 21% of the world's population and 3.8% (US\$2.9 trillion) of the global economy. SAARC countries synergize their actions as they have the common tradition, dress, food and culture, and political aspects. The SAARC nations have problems and solutions to the problems in common such as poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition, natural disasters, internal conflicts, industrial and technological backwardness, low GDP, and poor socio-economic condition. These nations uplift their living standards by creating common areas of development.

Importance of SAARC for India

SAARC is a game-changer for India's Act East Policy. It links South Asian economies with Southeast Asian that will further boost economic integration and prosperity to India mainly in the Services Sector. Primacy to the country's immediate neighbors. Nations of SAARC help in the creation of mutual trust and peace within the region thus promoting stability. SAARC can engage Nepal, Bhutan, the Maldives, and Sri Lanka in economic cooperation and development process to counter China (OBOR). SAARC offers a platform to India to showcase its leadership in the region by taking up extra responsibilities

Achievements of SAARC

A Free Trade Area is established by the member countries to increase their internal trade and lessen the trade gap of some states considerably. SAARC is comparatively a new organization in the global arena. SAARC Free Trade Agreement-SAFTA was signed to reduce customs duties of all traded goods to zero by the year 2016. The agreement was confined to goods, but excluding all services like information technology. South Asia Preferential Trading Agreement - SAPTA for promoting trade amongst the member countries came into effect in 1995. SAARC Agreement on Trade in Services- SATIS is following the GATS-plus 'positive list



approach for trade in services liberalization. SAARC University-Establish a SAARC university in India, a food bank, and also an energy reserve in Pakista.

SAARC-Specialized Bodies

The specialized bodies are created by the member states and their structure is different from the regional centers. The management is taken care of by the representatives of the member states, ministry of foreign affairs of the host government

The different SAARC specialized bodies are given below

1 SAARC Arbitration Council (SARCO) - Pakistan

2 SAARC Development Fund (SDF)-Bhutan

3 South Asian University (SAU)- India

5. South Asian Regional Standards Organization (SARSO) - Dhaka

The detailed description of SAARC specialized bodies are given below-

1. SAARC Arbitration Council

It is an inter-governmental body having its office in Pakistan is mandated to provide a legal framework/forum within the region for fair and efficient settlement of commercial, industrial, trade, banking, investment, and such other disputes, as may be referred to it by the member states and their people.

2. SAARC Development Fund (SDF): Its primary objective is the funding of project-based collaboration in social sectors such as poverty alleviation, development, etc. SDF is governed by a Board consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Finance of the Member States. The Governing Council of SDF (Finance Ministers of MSS) oversees the functioning of the Board.

3. South Asian Regional Standards Organization

South Asian Regional Standards Organization (SARSO) has its Secretariat at Dhaka, Bangladesh. It was established to achieve and enhance coordination and cooperation among



SAARC member states in the fields of standardization and conformity assessment and is aimed to develop harmonized Standards for the region to facilitate intra-regional trade and to have access in the global market

4. South Asian University

South Asian University (SAU) is an international university, located in India. Degrees and Certificates awarded by the SAU are at par with the respective Degrees and Certificates awarded by the National Universities/ Institutions.

Challenges with SAARC

Relation between India and Pakistan escalated tensions and conflicts severely hampers the prospects of SAARC. The frequency of SAARC meetings is low. More engagements between member nations are required instead of biennial meetings SAARC nations should meet annually. The energy and resources are diverted due to the Broad area of cooperation. The implementation of the SAARC Free Trade Agreement has not been satisfactory.

Way Forward with SAARC

In a region increasingly targeted by Chinese investment and loans, SAARC could be a common platform to demand more sustainable alternatives for development, or to oppose trade tariffs together, or to demand better terms for South Asian labour around the world. SAARC, as an organisation, reflects the South Asian identity of the countries, historically and contemporarily. This is a naturally made geographical identity. Equally, there is a cultural, linguistic, religious and culinary affinity that defines South Asia. The member countries should explore the potential of SAARC in maintaining peace and stability in the region. SAARC should be allowed to progress naturally and the people of South Asia, who make up a quarter of the world's population should be offered more people-to-people contact.



UNIT – V

DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN INDIA AFTER INDEPENDENCE

After the implementation of plans, efforts were made to spread education. Government decided to provide free and compulsory education to all children up to the age of 14. But this aim could not be achieved yet. In First Five Year Plan 7.9% of total plan outlay was allocated for education. In Second and Third Plan, the allocations were 5.8% and 6.9% of the total plan outlay. In Ninth Plan only 3.5% of the total outlay was allocated for education.

To streamline the education, the Govt. implemented the recommendations of Kothari Commission under 'National Policy on Education' in 1968. The main recommendations were universal primary education. Introduction of new pattern of education, three language formula, introduction of regional language in higher education, development of agricultural and industrial education and adult education.

To combat the changing socio-economic needs of the country, Govt. of India announced a new National Policy on Education in 1986. Universalisation of primary education, vocationalisation of secondary education and specialisation of higher education were the main features of this policy. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) at National level and State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) at State level were established to maintain the standard of education. University Grants Commission (UGC) was instituted to determine the standard of higher education.

The following points explain the development of education in India after independence:

Expansion of General Education:

During the period of planning there has been expansion of general education. In 1951, the percentage of literacy was 19.3. In 2001 the literacy percentage increased to 65.4%. The enrolment ratio of children in the age group of 6-11 was 43% in 1951 and in it became 100% in 2001.



Primary education – been free and compulsory. Midday meal has been started in schools since 1995 to check drop-out rate. The number of primary schools has risen by three times from 2.10 lakh (1950-51) to 6.40 lakhs (2001-02). There were only 27 universities in 1950-51 which increased to 254 in 2000-01.

2. Development of Technical Education:

Besides general education, technical education plays important role in human capital formation. The Govt. has established several Industrial Training Institutes, Polytechnics, Engineering colleges and Medical and Dental colleges, Management institutes etc.

(a) Indian Institute of Technology:

For education and research in engineering and technology of international standard, seven institutes have been established at Mumbai, Delhi, Kanpur, Chennai, Khargpur, Roorkee and Gauhati, Technical education is imparted here both for graduation and post-graduation and doctorate level.

(b) National Institute of Technology (NIT):

These institutes impart education in engineering and technology. These were called Regional College of Engineering (REC). These are 17 in number throughout the country. There are other institutes in the country to teach engineering and technical education.

(c) Indian Institute of Management:

These institutes impart education in business management and administration. These institutes are located at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Kolkata, Lucknow, Indore and Kozhikode.

(d) Medical education:

There were only 28 medical colleges in the country in 1950-51. There were 165 medical and 40 dental colleges in the country in 1998-99.



(e) Agricultural education:

Agricultural Universities have been started in almost all States to improve production and productivity of agriculture. These universities impart education and research in agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry and veterinary sciences etc.

3. Women education:

In India, literacy among women was quite low. It was 52% according to 2001 census. While the literacy among men was 75.8%. Women education was given top priority in National Policy on Education. Many State Governments have exempted the tuition fee of girl's up to university level. Separate schools and colleges have been established to raise level of literacy among women.

4. Vocational education:

National Policy of Education, 1986, aims at vocationalisation of secondary education. Central Govt. has been giving grants to State Governments to implement the programme since 1988. Agriculture, Pisciculture, diary, poultry, typing, electronics, mechanical and carpentry etc. had been included in higher secondary curriculum.

5. Growth of higher education:

In 1951, there were 27 universities. Their number increased to 254 in 2001. In Orissa state, there was only one university in 1951. Now there are 9 universities.

6. Non-formal education:

This scheme was launched on an experimental basis from the Sixth plan and on regular basis from Seventh plan. The aim was to achieve universal elementary education to all children in the age group of 6-14 years. The scheme was meant for those children who cannot attend schools regularly and for full time due to poverty and pre-occupation with other works.



The Central Govt. is providing assistance to State Govt. and voluntary organisation to implement the scheme. Non-formal education centres have been set up in remote rural areas, hilly and tribal areas and in slums. These impart education to children of 6-14 age group.

7. Encouragement to Indian Language and Culture:

After the adoption of National Policy of Education 1968, regional language became the medium of instruction in higher education. Syllabus on science and technology, dictionaries, books, and Question Papers are translated into regional languages. Indian history and culture have been included in school and college curriculum.

8. Adult education:

Simply speaking adult education refers to the education for the illiterate people belonging to the age group of 15-35 years. The National Board of Adult Education was established in the First Five Year Plan. The village level workers were assigned the job of providing adult education. The progress remained not too good. The National Adult Education Programme was started in 1978. The programme is considered as a part of primary education. National Literary Mission was also started in 1988 to eradicate adult illiteracy particularly in rural areas. The Centre gives assistance to states, voluntary organisations and some selected universities to implement this programme. There were 2.7 lakh adult education centres working in the country in 1990-91. This programme helped to raise the literacy rate to 65.38% in 2001.

9. Improvement of Science education:

Central Govt. started a scheme for the improvement of science education in schools in 1988. Financial assistance is given to provide science kits, up gradation of science laboratories, development of teaching material, and training of science and mathematics teachers. A Central Institute of Educational Technology (CIET) was set up in NCERT to purchase equipment for State Institutes of Educational Technology.



10. Education for all:

According to 93rd Amendment, education for all has been made compulsory. The elementary education is a fundamental right of all children in the age group of 6-14 years. It is also free. To fulfill this obligation Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) has been launched.

The above discussion makes it clear that a lot of development in education has been made in India after Independence. There is wide growth in general education and higher education. Efforts have been made to spread education among all sections and all regions of the country. Still our education system is ridden with problems.

Transport and communication

We use many items in our daily life. From tooth paste to our bed tea, milk, clothes, soaps, food items, etc. are required every day. All these can be purchased from the market. All the production is meant for consumption. From the fields and factory, the produce is brought to the place from where consumers purchase it. It is the transportation of these items from the site of their production to the market which make them available to the consumer. We not only use material things like fruits, vegetables, books, clothes, etc. but also use ideas, views and messages in our daily life. Do you know we exchange our views, ideas and messages from one place to another or one individual to another while communicating with the help of various means? The use of transport and communication depends upon our need to move things from place of their availability to the place of their use. Human-beings use various methods to move goods, commodities, ideas from one place to another.

Land Transport

The pathways and unmetalled roads have been used for transportation in India since ancient times. With the economic and technological development, metalled roads and railways were developed to move large volume of goods and people from one place to another. Ropeways, cableways and pipelines were devised to cater to the demands of transporting specific goods under special circumstances.



Road Transport

India has one of the largest road networks in the world with a total length of 42.3 lakh km (2008-09). About 85 per cent of passenger and (1961) was introduced to improve the conditions of roads in India. However, roads continue to concentrate in and around urban centres. Rural and remote areas had the least connectivity by road. For the purpose of construction and maintenance, roads are classified as National Highways (NH), State Highways(SH), Major District Roads and Rural Roads.

Sher Shah Suri built the Shahi (Royal) road to strengthen and consolidate his empire from the Indus Valley to the Sonar Valley in Bengal. This road was renamed the Grand Trunk (GT) road during the British period, connecting Calcutta and Peshawar. At present, it extends from Amritsar to Kolkata. It is bifurcated into 2 segments : (a) National Highway(NH)-1 from Delhi to Amritsar, and (b) NH- 2 from Delhi to Kolkata. Road transport in modern sense was very limited in India before World War-II. The first serious attempt was made in 1943 when ‘Nagpur Plan’ was drawn. This plan could not be implemented due to lack of coordination among the princely states and British India. After Independence, twenty-year road plan.

National Highways

The main roads which are constructed and maintained by the Central Government are known as the National Highways. These roads are meant for inter-state transport and movement of defence men and material in strategic areas. These also connect the state capitals, major cities, important ports, railway junctions, etc. The length of the National Highways has increased from 19,700 km in 1951 to 70,934 km in 2008-09. The National Highways constitute only 1.67 per cent of the total road length but carry 40 per cent of the road traffic. (Table 10.1)

The National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) was operationalised in 1995. It is an autonomous body under the Ministry of Surface Transport. It is entrusted with the responsibility of development, maintenance and operation of National Highways. This is also the apex body to improve the quality of the roads designated as National Highways.



National Highways Development Projects

NHAI has taken up some major projects in the country under different phases : Golden Quadrilateral : It comprises construction of 5,846 km long 4/6 lane, high density traffic corridor, to connect India's four big metro cities of Delhi-Mumbai-Chennai-Kolkata. With the construction of Golden Quadrilateral, the time- distance and cost of movement among the mega cities of India will be considerably minimised. North-South and East-West Corridors : North-South corridor aims at connecting Srinagar in Jammu and Kashmir with Kanyakumari in Tamil Nadu (including Kochchi-Salem Spur) with 4,076 km long road. The East-West Corridor has been planned to connect Silchar in Assam with the port town of Porbandar in Gujarat with 3,640 km of road length.

Rural Roads

These roads are vital for providing links in the rural areas. About 80 per cent of the total road length in India are categorised as rural roads. There is regional variation in the density of rural road because these are influenced by the nature of the terrain?

State Highways

These are constructed and maintained by state governments. They join the state capitals with district headquarters and other important towns. These roads are connected to the National Highways. These constitute 4 per cent of total road length in the country.

District Roads

These roads are the connecting link between District Headquarters and the other important nodes in the district. They account for 14 per cent of the total road length of the country.

Other Roads

Other roads include Border Roads and International Highways. The Border Road Organisation (BRO) was established in May 1960 for accelerating economic development and



strengthening defence preparedness through rapid and coordinated improvement of strategically important roads along the northern and north-eastern boundary of the country. It is a premier multifaceted construction agency. It has constructed roads in high altitude mountainous terrain joining Chandigarh with Manali (Himachal Pradesh) and Leh (Ladakh). This road runs at an average altitude of 4,270 metres above the mean sea level.

Apart from the construction and maintenance of roads in strategically sensitive areas, the BRO also undertakes snow clearance in high altitude areas. The international highways are meant to promote the harmonious relationship with the neighbouring countries by providing effective links with India. The distribution of roads is not uniform in the country. Density of roads (length of roads per 100 square km of area) varies from only 12.14 km in Jammu and Kashmir to 517.77 km in Kerala with a national average of 142.68 km in 2011. The density of road is high in most of the northern states and major southern states. It is low in the Himalayan region, northeastern region, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Why does this variation occur? Nature of terrain and the level of economic development are the main determinants of density of roads. Construction of roads is easy and cheaper in the plain areas while it is difficult and costly in hilly and plateau areas. Therefore, not only the density but also the quality of roads is relatively better in plains as compared to roads in high altitude areas, rainy and forested regions.

Rail Transport

Indian railways network is one of the longest in the world. It facilitates the movement of both freight and passengers and contributes to the growth of economy. Mahatma Gandhi said, the Indian railways “brought people of diverse cultures together to contribute to India’s freedom struggle.” Indian Railway was introduced in 1853, when a line was constructed from Bombay to Thane covering a distance of 34 km. Indian Railways is the largest government undertaking in the country. The length of Indian Railways network is 64460 km. as on 31 March 2011. Its very large size puts lots of pressure on a centralised railway management system. Thus, in India, the railway system has been divided into sixteen zones. Table 10.3 shows the zone-wise performance of Indian Railways.



On the basis of width of the track of Indian Railways, three categories have been made: Broad gauge: The distance between rails in broad gauge is 1.676 metre. The total length of broad gauge lines was 55188 km in 2011. Metre gauge: The distance between rails is one metre. Its total length was 6809 km in 2011. Narrow gauge: The distance between the rails in this case is 0.762 metre or 0.610 metre. The total length of narrow gauge was 2463 km in 2011. It is generally confined to hilly areas.

Indian Railways has launched extensive programme to convert the metre and narrow gauges to broad gauge. Moreover, steam engines have been replaced by diesel and electric engines. This step has increased the speed as well as the haulage capacity. The replacement of steam engines run by coal has also improved the environment of the stations. Metro rail has revolutionised the urban transport system in Kolkata and Delhi. replacement of diesel buses by CNG run vehicles along with introduction of metro is a welcome step towards controlling the air pollution in urban centres. Areas around towns, raw material producing areas and of plantations and other commercial crops, hill stations and cantonment towns were well-connected by railways from the British colonial era. These were mostly developed for the exploitation of resources. After the Independence of the country, railway routes have been extended to other areas too. The most significant development has been the development of Konkan Railway along the western coast providing a direct link between Mumbai and Mangaluru. Railway continues to remain the main means of transport for the masses. Railway network is relatively less dense in the hill states, north eastern states, central parts of India and Rajasthan. Water Transport Waterways is an important mode of transport for both passenger and cargo traffic in India. It is the cheapest means of transport and is most suitable for carrying heavy and bulky material. It is a fuel-efficient and eco-friendly mode of transport. The water transport is of two types– (a) inland waterways, and (b) oceanic waterways.

Inland Waterways

It was the chief mode of transport before the advent of railways. It, however, faced tough competition from road and railway transport. Moreover, diversion of river water for irrigation purposes made them non navigable in large parts of their courses. India has 14,500 km of



navigable waterways, contributing about 1% to the country's transportation. It comprises rivers, canals, backwaters, creeks, etc. At present, 5,685 km of major rivers are navigable by mechanised flat bottom vessels. For the development, maintenance and regulation of national waterways in the country, the Inland Waterways Authority was set up in 1986. The following waterways have been declared as the National Waterways by the Government (Table 10.4).

Inland Waterways Authority has also identified ten other inland waterways, which could be upgraded. The backwaters (Kadal) of Kerala has special significance in Inland Waterway. Apart from providing cheap means of transport, they are also attracting large number of tourists in Kerala. The famous Nehru Trophy Boat Race (VALLAMKALI) is also held in the backwaters. Oceanic Routes India has a vast coastline of approximate 7,517 km, including islands. Twelve major and 185 minor ports provide infrastructural support to these routes. Oceanic routes play an important role in the transport sector of India's economy. Approximately 95 per cent of India's foreign trade by volume and 70 per cent by value moves through ocean routes. Apart from international trade, these are also used for the purpose of transportation between the islands and the rest of the country. Air Transportation Air transport is the fastest means of movement from one place to the other. It has reduced distances by minimising the travel time. It is very essential for a vast country like India, where distances are large and the terrain and climatic conditions are diverse. Air transport in India made a beginning in 1911 when airmail operation commenced over a little distance of 10 km between Allahabad and Naini. But its real development took place in post-Independent period. The Airport Authority of India is responsible for providing safe, efficient air traffic and aeronautical communication services in the Indian Air Space. The authority manages 125 airports. The air transport in India is managed by two corporations, Air India and Indian Airlines after nationalisation. Now many private companies have also started passenger services. Air India Air India provides International Air Services for both passengers and cargo traffic. It connects all the continents of the world through its services.

History of Indian Airlines 1911 – Air transport in India was launched between Allahabad and Naini. 1947 – Air transport was provided by four major companies namely Indian National Airways, Tata Sons Limited, Air Services of India and Deccan Airways. 1951 – Four more



companies joined the services, Bharat Airways, Himalayan Aviation Limited, Airways India and Kalinga Airlines. 1953 – Air transport was nationalised and two Corporations, Air India International and Indian Airlines were formed. Now Indian Airlines is known as ‘Indian’.

The country’s largest state-owned domestic carrier, Indian Airlines dropped the word ‘Airlines’ from its name and is known as ‘Indian’ w.e.f. December 8, 2005. The new brand name ‘Indian’ now appears on both sides of the fuselage. The logo on the orange tail depicting ‘IA’ has also been changed. It has been replaced by a new logo which is a partly visible blue wheel and is inspired by the Sun Temple at Konark (Odisha), symbolising timeless motion, convergence and divergence. It also embodies strength as well as trust that has stood the test of time.

In 2010, domestic movement involved 520.21 lakh passengers and about 23 lakh metric tonnes of cargo. Pawan Hans is the helicopter service operating in hilly areas and is widely used by tourists in north-eastern sector. In addition, Pawan Hans Limited mainly provides helicopter services to petroleum sector and for tourism. Open Sky Policy To help the Indian exporters and make their export more competitive, the government had introduced an Open Sky Policy for cargo in April 1992. Under this policy, foreign airlines or association of exporters can bring any freighters to the country. Oil and Gas Pipelines Pipelines are the most convenient and efficient mode of transporting liquids and gases over long distances. Even solids can also be transported by pipelines after converting them into slurry. Oil India Limited (OIL) under the administrative set up of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas is engaged in the exploration, production and transportation of crude oil and natural gas. It was incorporated in 1959 as a company. Asia’s first cross country pipeline covering a distance of 1,157 km was constructed by OIL from Naharkatiya oilfield in Assam to Barauni refinery in Bihar. It was further extended up to Kanpur in 1966. Another extensive network of pipelines has been constructed in the western region of India of which Ankleshwar-Koyali, Mumbai HighKoyali and Hazira-Vijaipur-Jagdishpur (HVJ) are most important. Recently, a 1256 km long pipeline connecting Salaya (Gujarat) with Mathura (U.P.) has been constructed. It supplies crude oil from Gujarat to Punjab (Jalandhar) via Mathura. OIL is in the process of constructing of 660 km long pipeline from Numaligarh to Siliguri. Communication Networks Human beings have evolved different methods of communication over time. In earlier times, the messages were delivered by beating the drum or



hollow tree trunks, giving indications through smoke or fire or with the help of fast runners. Horses, camels, dogs, birds and other animals were also used to send messages. Initially, the means of communication were also the means of transportation. Invention of postoffice, telegraph, printing press, telephone, satellite, etc has made the communication much faster and easier. Development in the field of science and technology has significantly contributed in bringing about revolution in the field of communication.

Personal Communication System Among all the personal communication system internet is the most effective and advanced one. It is widely used in urban areas. It enables the user to establish direct contact through e-mail to get access to the world of knowledge and information. It is increasingly used for e-commerce and carrying out money transactions. The internet is like a huge central warehouse of data, with detailed information on various items. The network through internet and e-mail provides an efficient access to information at a comparatively low cost. It enables us with the basic facilities of direct communication. You might have noticed the proliferation of cyber cafes in urban areas.

Mass Communication System Radio Radio broadcasting started in India in 1923 by the Radio Club of Bombay. Since then, it gained immense popularity and changed the sociocultural life of people. Within no time, it made a place in every household of the country. Government took this opportunity and brought this popular mode of communication under its control in 1930 under the Indian Broadcasting System. It was changed to All India Radio in 1936 and to Akashwani in 1957. All India Radio broadcasts a variety of programmes related to information, education and entertainment. Special news bulletins are also broadcast at specific occasions like session of parliament and state legislatures.

Television (T.V.) Television broadcasting has emerged as the most effective audio-visual medium for disseminating information and educating masses. Initially, the T.V. services were limited only to the National Capital where it began in 1959. After 1972, several other centres became operational. In 1976, TV was delinked from All India Radio (AIR) and got a separate identity as Doordarshan (DD). After INSAT-IA (National Television-DD1) became operational, Common National Programmes (CNP) were started for the entire network and its services were extended to the backward and remote rural areas.

Satellite Communication Satellites are mode of communication in themselves as well as they regulate the use of other means of communication.



However, use of satellite in getting a continuous and synoptic view of larger area has made satellite communication very vital for the country due to the economic and strategic reasons. Satellite images can be used for the weather forecast, monitoring of natural calamities, surveillance of border areas, etc. On the basis of configuration and purposes, satellite system in India can be grouped into two: Indian National Satellite System (INSAT) and Indian Remote Sensing Satellite System (IRS). The INSAT, which was established in 1983, is a multipurpose satellite system for telecommunication, meteorological observation and for various other data and programmes. The IRS satellite system became operational with the launching of IRS-IA in March 1988 from Vaikanour in Russia. India has also developed her own Launching Vehicle PSLV (Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle). These satellites collect data in several spectral bands and transmit them to the ground stations for various uses. The National Remote Sensing Centre (NRSC) at Hyderabad provides facilities for acquisition of data and its processing. These are very useful in the management of natural resources.



UNIT-V

CULTURE OF INDIA

Indian culture is the heritage of social norms and technologies that originated in or are associated with the ethno-linguistically diverse India. The term also applies beyond India to countries and cultures whose histories are strongly connected to India by immigration, colonisation, or influence, particularly in South Asia and Southeast Asia. India's languages, religions, dance, music, architecture, food and customs differ from place to place within the country.

Indian culture, often labelled as a combination of several cultures, has been influenced by a history that is several millennia old, beginning with the Indus Valley civilization and other early cultural areas. Many elements of Indian culture, such as Indian religions, mathematics, philosophy, cuisine, languages, dance, music and movies have had a profound impact across the Indosphere, Greater India, and the world. There was also mutual influence between India and Southeast Asian, having an influence on the formation of local Hinduist branches and mythology. Hinduism itself formed from various distinct folk religions, which merged during the Vedic period and following periods. There is evidence for local Austroasiatic influence, evident in Munda and Mon Khmer, which merged their traditional cultures with Indian-derived ones. Several scholars, such as Professor Przyluski, among others, concluded that there is a significant cultural, linguistic, and political Mon-Khmer (Austroasiatic) influence on early Munda-speaking people within eastern India. The British Raj further influenced Indian culture, such as through the widespread introduction of the English language, and a local dialect developed.

Religious Culture:

Indian-origin religions Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism, are all based on the concepts of dharma and karma. Ahimsa, the philosophy of nonviolence, is an important aspect of native Indian faiths whose most well known proponent was Mahatma Gandhi, who used civil disobedience to unite India during the Indian independence movement – this philosophy further inspired Martin Luther King Jr. during the American civil rights movement. Foreign-origin



religion, including Abrahamic religions, such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam, are also present in India, as well as Zoroastrianism and Bahá'í Faith both escaping persecution by Islam have also found shelter in India over the centuries.

India has 28 states and 8 union territories with different culture and it is the second most populated country in the world. The Indian culture, often labeled as an amalgamation of several various cultures, spans across the Indian subcontinent and has been influenced and shaped by a history that is several thousand years old. Throughout the history of India, Indian culture has been heavily influenced by Dharmic religions. Influence from East/Southeast Asian cultures onto ancient India and early Hinduism, specifically Austroasiatic groups, such as early Munda and Mon Khmer, but also Tibetic and other Tibeto-Burmese groups, had noteworthy impact on local Indian peoples and cultures. Several scholars, such as Professor Przyluski, Jules Bloch, and Lévi, among others, concluded that there is a significant cultural, linguistic, and political Mon-Khmer (Austroasiatic) influence on early India, which can also be observed by Austroasiatic loanwords within Indo-Aryan languages and rice cultivation, which was introduced by East/Southeast Asian rice-agriculturalists using a route from Southeast Asia through Northeast India into the Indian subcontinent. They have been credited with shaping much of Indian philosophy, literature, architecture, art and music. Greater India was the historical extent of Indian culture beyond the Indian subcontinent. This particularly concerns the spread of Hinduism, Buddhism, architecture, administration and writing system from India to other parts of Asia through the Silk Road by the travelers and maritime traders during the early centuries of the Common Era. To the west, Greater India overlaps with Greater Persia in the Hindu Kush and Pamir Mountains. Over the centuries, there has been a significant fusion of cultures between Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Jains, Sikhs and various tribal populations in India.

India is the birthplace of Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, and other religions. They are collectively known as Indian religions. Indian religions are a major form of world religions along with Abrahamic ones. Today, Hinduism and Buddhism are the world's third and fourth-largest religions respectively, with over 2 billion followers altogether, and possibly as



many as 2.5 or 2.6 billion followers. Followers of Indian religions – Hindus, Sikhs, Jains and Buddhists make up around 80–82% population of India.

Philosophy:

Indian philosophy comprises the philosophical traditions of the Indian subcontinent. There are six schools of orthodox Hindu philosophy, Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Samkhya, Yoga, Mimamsa and Vedanta and four heterodox schools Jain, Buddhist, Ajivika and Carvaka last two are also schools of Hinduism. However, there are other methods of classification; Vidyananda for instance identifies sixteen schools of Indian philosophy by including those that belong to the Śaiva and Rasesvara traditions. Since medieval India (ca.1000–1500), schools of Indian philosophical thought have been classified by the Brahmanical tradition as either orthodox or non-orthodox astika or nastika depending on whether they regard the Vedas as an infallible source of knowledge.

Authors who gave contemporary meaning to traditional philosophies include Shrimad Rajchandra, Swami Vivekananda, Ram Mohan Roy, and Swami Dayananda Saraswati.

Family Structure and Marriage:

For generations, India has had a prevailing tradition of the joint family system. It is when extended members of a family – parents, children, the children's spouses, and their offspring, etc. – live together. Usually, the oldest male member is the head of the joint Indian family system. He mostly makes all important decisions and rules, and other family members are likely to abide by them. With the current economy, lifestyle, and cost of living in most of the metro cities are high, the population is leaving behind the joint family model and adapting to the nuclear family model. Earlier living in a joint family was with the purpose of creating love and concern for the family members. However, now it's a challenge to give time to each other as most of them are out for survival needs. Rise in the trends of nuclear family settings has led to a change in the traditional family headship structure and older males are no longer the mandated heads of the family owing to the fact that they mostly live alone during old age and are far more vulnerable than before.



Arranged marriage:

Arranged marriages have long been the norm in Indian society. Even today, the majority of Indians have their marriages planned by their parents and other respected family members. In the past, the age of marriage was young. The average age of marriage for women in India has increased to 21 years, according to the 2011 Census of India. In 2009, about 7% of women got married before the age of 18. In most marriages, the bride's family provides a dowry to the bridegroom. Traditionally, the dowry was considered a woman's share of the family wealth, since a daughter had no legal claim on her natal family's real estate. It also typically included portable valuables such as jewelry and household goods that a bride could control throughout her life. Historically, in most families the inheritance of family estates passed down the male line. Since 1956, Indian laws treat males and females as equal in matters of inheritance without a legal will. Indians are increasingly using a legal will for inheritance and property succession, with about 20 percent using a legal will by 2004.

In India, the divorce rate is low — 1% compared with about 40% in the United States. These statistics do not reflect a complete picture, though. There is a dearth of scientific surveys or studies on Indian marriages where the perspectives of both husbands and wives were solicited in-depth. Sample surveys suggest the issues with marriages in India are similar to trends observed elsewhere in the world. The divorce rates are rising in India. Urban divorce rates are much higher. Women initiate about 80 percent of divorces in India. Opinion is divided over what the phenomenon means: for traditionalists, the rising numbers portend the breakdown of society while, for some modernists, they speak of healthy new empowerment for women.

Recent studies suggest that Indian culture is trending away from traditional arranged marriages. Banerjee et al. surveyed 41,554 households across 33 states and union territories in India in 2005. They find that the marriage trends in India are similar to trends observed over the last 40 years in China, Japan, and other nations. The study found that fewer marriages are purely arranged without consent and that the majority of surveyed Indian marriages are arranged with consent. The percentage of self-arranged marriages (called love marriages in India) was also increasing, particularly in the urban parts of India.



Wedding rituals

A Hindu wedding ritual in progress. The bride and the groom are seated together, receiving instructions from the priest. The sacred square fire container (yajna kund) is behind the priest. Weddings are festive occasions in India with extensive decorations, colors, music, dance, costumes and rituals that depend on the religion of the bride and the groom, as well as their preferences. The nation celebrates about 10 million weddings per year, of which over 80% are Hindu weddings.

While there are many festival-related rituals in Hinduism, vivaha (wedding) is the most extensive personal ritual an adult Hindu undertakes in his or her life. Typical Hindu families spend significant effort and financial resources to prepare and celebrate weddings. The rituals and processes of a Hindu wedding vary depending on the region of India, local adaptations, family resources and preferences of the bride and the groom. Nevertheless, there are a few key rituals common in Hindu weddings – Kanyadaan, Panigrahana, and Saptapadi; these are respectively, gifting away of daughter by the father, voluntarily holding hand near the fire to signify impending union, and taking seven circles before firing with each circle including a set of mutual vows. Mangalsutra necklace of bond a Hindu groom ties with three knots around the bride's neck in a marriage ceremony. The practice is integral to a marriage ceremony as prescribed in Manusmriti, the traditional law governing Hindu marriage. After the seventh circle and vows of Saptapadi, the couple is legally husband and wife. Sikhs get married through a ceremony called Anand Karaj. The couple walks around the holy book, the Guru Granth Sahib four times. Indian Muslims celebrate a traditional Islamic wedding following customs similar to those practiced in the Middle East. The rituals include Nikah, payment of financial dower called Mahr by the groom to the bride, signing of a marriage contract, and a reception. Indian Christian weddings follow customs similar to those practiced in the Christian countries in the West in states like Goa but have more Indian customs in other states.

Festivals:

The Bihu festival is an Assamese tradition; it coincides with Vaisakhi in north India, which is observed by Sikhs and Hindus. Procession of the famous “Lalbaug cha



Raja's Ganesha idol during the Ganesh Chaturthi festival in Mumbai, Maharashtra. Vallamkali snakeboat races are a part of Onam festival tradition.

Dahi Handi, a Krishna Janmashtami festive tradition, in progress near Adi Shankaracharya Road, Mumbai, India. Durga Puja is a multi-day festival in Eastern India that features elaborate temple and stage decorations (pandals), scripture recitation, performance arts, revelry, and processions. The Hornbill Festival, Kohima, Nagaland. The festival involves colourful performances, crafts, sports, food fairs, games and ceremonies. Meitei women in boat race Hiyang Tannaba festival, Manipur Rath Yatra celebration a major festival in Puri. Carnival in Goa or Viva Carnival is a Celebration prior to fasting season of Lent. It refers to the festival of carnival, or Mardi Gras, in the Indian state of Goa.

Gommateshwara statue during the Grand Consecration Mahamastakabhisheka in August 2018 at Shravanabelagola, Karnataka. Mahamastakabhisheka is held every 12 years and it is considered Jainism's one of the most auspicious festival or celebration. India, being a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and multi-religious society, celebrates holidays and festivals of various religions. The three national holidays in India, the Independence Day, the Republic Day and the Gandhi Jayanti, are celebrated with zeal and enthusiasm across India. In addition, many Indian states and regions have local festivals depending on prevalent religious and linguistic demographics. Popular religious festivals include the Hindu festivals of Navratri, Janmashtami, Diwali, Maha Shivratri, Ganesh Chaturthi, Durga Puja, Holi, Rath Yatra, Ugadi, Vasant Panchami, Rakshabandhan, and Dussehra. Several harvest festivals such as Makar Sankranti, Sohrai, Pusnâ, Hornbill, Chapchar Kut, Pongal, Onam and Raja sankranti swinging festival are also fairly popular.

India celebrates a variety of festivals due to the large diversity of India. Many religious festivals like Diwali (Hindu) Eid (Muslim) Christmas (Christian), etc. are celebrated by all. The government also provides facilities for the celebration of all religious festivals with equality and grants road bookings, security, etc. providing equality to the diverse religions and their festivals. The Indian New Year festival is celebrated in different parts of India with a unique style at different times. Ugadi, Bihu, Gudhi Padwa, Puthandu, Vaisakhi, Pohela Boishakh, Vishu and Vishuva Sankranti are the New Year festival of different part of India.



Certain festivals in India are celebrated by multiple religions. Notable examples include Diwali, which is celebrated by Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, and Jains across the country and Buddha Purnima, Krishna Janmashtami, Ambedkar Jayanti celebrated by Buddhists and Hindus. Sikh festivals, such as Guru Nanak Jayanti, Baisakhi are celebrated with full fanfare by Sikhs and Hindus of Punjab and Delhi where the two communities together form an overwhelming majority of the population. Adding colours to the culture of India, the Dree Festival is one of the tribal festivals of India celebrated by the Apatanis of the Ziro valley of Arunachal Pradesh, which is the easternmost state of India. Nowruz is the most important festival among the Parsi community of India.

Islam in India is the second largest religion with over 172 million Muslims, according to India's 2011 census. The Islamic festivals which are observed and are declared public holiday in India are; Eid al-Fitr, Eid al-Adha (Bakri Eid), Milad-un-Nabi, Muharram and Shab-e-Barat. Some of the Indian states have declared regional holidays for the particular regional popular festivals; such as Arba'een, Jumu'ah-tul-Wida and Shab-e-Qadar.

Christianity in India is the third-largest religion with over 27.8 million Christians, according to India's 2011 census. With over 27.8 million Christians, of which 17 million are Roman Catholics, India is home to many Christian festivals. The country celebrates Christmas and Good Friday as public holidays. Regional and community fairs are also a common festivals in India. For example, Pushkar Fair of Rajasthan is one of the world's largest markets of cattle and livestock.

Greetings:

Indian greetings are based on Anjali Mudra, including Pranama and Puja. Greetings include Namaste (Hindi, Sanskrit and Kannada), Nômôskar in Odia, Khulumkha (Tripuri), Namaskara (Kannada and Sanskrit), Paranaam (Bhojpuri), Namaskaram (Telugu, Malayalam), Vakkam (Tamil), Nômôshkar (Bengali), Nomoskar (Assamese), Aadab (Urdu), and Sat Shri Akal (Punjabi). All these are commonly spoken greetings or salutations when people meet and are forms of farewell when they depart. Namaskar is considered slightly more formal than Namaste but both express deep respect. Namaskar is commonly used in India



and Nepal by Hindus, Jains and Buddhists, and many continue to use this outside the Indian subcontinent. In Indian and Nepali culture, the word is spoken at the beginning of written or verbal communication. However, the same hands folded gesture may be made wordlessly or said without the folded hand gesture. The word is derived from Sanskrit (Namah): to bow, reverential salutation, and respect, and (te): "to you". Taken literally, it means "I bow to you".^[81] In Hinduism it means "I bow to the divine in you." In most Indian families, younger men and women are taught to seek the blessing of their elders by reverentially bowing to their elders. This custom is known as Pranama.

Other greetings include Jai Jagannath (used in Odia) Ami Aschi (used in Bengali), Jai Shri Krishna (in Gujarati and the Braj Bhasha and Rajasthani dialects of Hindi), Ram Ram (Jai Sita Ram ji (Awadhi and Bhojpuri dialects of Hindi and other Bihari dialects), and Sat Sri Akal (Punjabi; used by followers of Sikhism), As-salamu alaykum (Urdu; used by follower of Islam), Jai Jinendra (a common greeting used by followers of Jainism), Jai Bhim (used by followers of Ambedkarism), Namu Buddhay (used by followers of Buddhism), Allah Abho (used by followers of the Bahá'í Faith), Shalom aleichem (used by followers of Judaism), Hamazor Hama Ashobed (used by followers of Zoroastrianism), Sahebji (Persian and Gujarati; used by the Parsi people), Dorood (Persian and Gujarati; used by the Irani people), Om Namah Shivaya/Jai Bholenath Jaidev (used in Dogri and Kashmiri, also used in the city of Varanasi), Jai Ambe Maa/Jai Mata di (used in Eastern India), Jai Ganapati Bapa (used in Marathi and Konkani), etc. These traditional forms of greeting may be absent in the world of business and in India's urban environment, where a handshake is a common form of greeting.

Indian food:

Indian food is as diverse as India. Indian cuisines use numerous ingredients, deploy a wide range of food preparation styles, cooking techniques, and culinary presentations. From salads to sauces, from vegetarian to meat, from spices to sensuous, from bread to desserts, Indian cuisine is invariably complex. Harold McGee, a favourite of many Michelin-starred chefs, writes "for sheer inventiveness with the milk itself as the primary ingredient, no country on earth can match India."



India is known for its love of food and spices. Indian cuisine varies from region to region, reflecting the local produce, cultural diversity, and varied demographics of the country. Generally, Indian cuisine can be split into five categories – northern, southern, eastern, western, and northeastern. The diversity of Indian cuisine is characterised by the differing use of many spices and herbs, a wide assortment of recipes and cooking techniques. Though a significant portion of Indian food is vegetarian, many Indian dishes also include meats like chicken, mutton, beef (both cow and buffalo), pork and fish, egg and other seafood. Fish-based cuisines are common in eastern states of India, particularly West Bengal and the southern states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

Despite this diversity, some unifying threads emerge. Varied uses of spices are an integral part of certain food preparations and are used to enhance the flavour of a dish and create unique flavours and aromas. Cuisine across India has also been influenced by various cultural groups that entered India throughout history, such as the Central Asians, Arabs, Mughals, and European colonists. Sweets are also very popular among Indians, particularly in West Bengal where both Bengali Hindus and Bengali Muslims distribute sweets to mark joyous occasions.

Indian cuisine is one of the most popular cuisines across the globe. In most Indian restaurants outside India, the menu does not do justice to the enormous variety of Indian cuisine available the most common cuisine served on the menu would be Punjabi cuisine (chicken tikka masala is a very popular dish in the United Kingdom). There do exist some restaurants serving cuisines from other regions of India, although these are few and far between. Historically, Indian spices and herbs were one of the most sought after trade commodities. The spice trade between India and Europe led to the rise and dominance of Arab traders to such an extent that European explorers, such as Vasco da Gama and Christopher Columbus, set out to find new trade routes with India leading to the Age of Discovery. The popularity of curry, which originated in India, across Asia has often led to the dish being labeled as the "pan-Asian" dish.

Regional Indian cuisine continues to evolve. A fusion of East Asian and Western cooking methods with traditional cuisines, along with regional adaptations of fast food are prominent in major Indian cities.



The cuisine of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana consists of the Telugu cuisine, of the Telugu people as well as Hyderabadi cuisine (also known as Nizami cuisine), of the Hyderabadi Muslim community.^{[105][106]} Hyderabadi food is based heavily on non-vegetarian ingredients while, Telugu food is a mix of both vegetarian and non-vegetarian ingredients. Telugu food is rich in spices and chillies are abundantly used. The food also generally tends to be more on the tangy side with tamarind and lime juice both used liberally as souring agents. Rice is the staple food of Telugu people. Starch is consumed with a variety of curries and lentil soups or broths. Vegetarian and non-vegetarian foods are both popular. Hyderabadi cuisine includes popular delicacies such as Biryani, Haleem, Baghara baingan and Kheema, while Hyderabadi day to day dishes see some commonalities with Telanganite Telugu food, with its use of tamarind, rice, and lentils, along with meat. Yogurt is a common addition to meals, as a way of tempering spiciness.

Nimatnama-i-Nasiruddin-Shahi (Book of Recipes), written about 1500 C.E, documents the fine art of making Kheer, a milk-based dessert of India: Select the cows carefully; to get quality milk, pay attention to what the cows eat; feed them sugar canes; use this milk to make the best Kheer. While, another popular variant is Phirni.

Clothing:

Traditional clothing in India greatly varies across different parts of the country and is influenced by local culture, geography, climate, and rural/urban settings. Popular styles of dress include draped garments such as sari and mekhela sador for women and dhoti or lungi or panche (in Kannada) for men. Stitched clothes are also popular such as churidar or salwar-kameez for women, with dupatta (long scarf) thrown over shoulder completing the outfit. The salwar is often loose fitting, while churidar is a tighter cut. The dastar, a headgear worn by Sikhs is common in Punjab.

Indian women perfect their sense of charm and fashion with makeup and ornaments. Bindi, mehendi, earrings, bangles and other jewelry are common. On special occasions, such as marriage ceremonies and festivals, women may wear cheerful colours with various ornaments made with gold, silver or other regional stones and gems. Bindi is often an



essential part of a Hindu woman's make up. Worn on their forehead, some consider the bindi as an auspicious mark. Traditionally, the red bindi was worn only by married Hindu women, and coloured bindi was worn by single women, but now all colours and glitter have become a part of women's fashion. Some women wear sindoor – a traditional red or orange-red powder (vermilion) in the parting of their hair (locally called mang). Sindoor is the traditional mark of a married woman for Hindus. Single Hindu women do not wear sindoor; neither do over 1 million Indian women from religions other than Hindu and agnostics/atheists who may be married. The make up and clothing styles differ regionally between the Hindu groups, and also by climate or religion, with Christians preferring Western and Muslim preferring the Arabic styles. For men, stitched versions include kurta-pyjama and European-style trousers and shirts. In urban and semi-urban centres, men and women of all religious backgrounds, can often be seen in jeans, trousers, shirts, suits, kurtas and variety of other fashions.

Performing arts:

Dance:

Let drama and dance be the fifth vedic scripture. Combined with an epic story, tending to virtue, wealth, joy and spiritual freedom, it must contain the significance of every scripture, and forward every art. India has had a long romance with the art of dance. The Hindu Sanskrit texts Natya Shastra (Science of Dance) and Abhinaya Darpana (Mirror of Gesture) are estimated to be from 200 BCE to early centuries of the 1st millennium CE.

The Indian art of dance as taught in these ancient books, according to Ragini Devi, is the expression of inner beauty and the divine in man. It is a deliberate art, nothing is left to chance, each gesture seeks to communicate the ideas, each facial expression the emotions.

Indian dance includes eight classical dance forms, many in narrative forms with mythological elements. The eight classical forms accorded classical dance status by India's National Academy of Music, Dance, and Drama are: bharatanatyam of the state of Tamil Nadu, kathak of UttarPradesh, kathakali and mohiniattam of Kerala, kuchipudi of AndhraPradesh, yakshagana of Karnataka, manipuri of Manipur, odissi (orissi) of the state of Odisha and the sattriya of Assam.



In addition to the formal arts of dance, Indian regions have a strong free form, folksy dance tradition. Some of the folk dances include the bhangra of Punjab; the bihu of Assam; the zeliang of Nagaland; the Jhumair, Domkach, chhau of Jharkhand; the Ghumura Dance, Gotipua, Maharidance and Dalkhai of Odisha; the qauwwalis, birhas and charkulas of Uttar Pradesh; the jat-jatin, nat-natin and satori of Bihar; the ghoomar of Rajasthan and Haryana; the dandiya and garba of Gujarat; the kolattam of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana; the yakshagana of Karnataka; lavani of Maharashtra; Dekhnni of Goa. Recent developments include adoption of international dance forms particularly in the urban centres of India, and the extension of Indian classical dance arts by the Kerala Christian community, to tell stories from the Bible.

Drama:

Indian drama and theatre has a long history alongside its music and dance. Kalidasa's plays like Shakuntala and Meghadoota are some of the older dramas, following those of Bhasa. Kutiyattam of Kerala, is the only surviving specimen of the ancient Sanskrit theatre, thought to have originated around the beginning of the Common Era, and is officially recognised by UNESCO as a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. It strictly follows the Natya Shastra. Natyacharya Māni Madhava Chakyar is credited for reviving the age old drama tradition from extinction. He was known for mastery of Rasa Abhinaya. He started to perform the Kalidasa plays like Abhijnnasakuntala, Vikramorvaśīya and Malavikagnimitra; Bhasa's Swapnavāsavadatta and Pancharatra; Harsha's Nagananda.

Puppetry:

India has a long tradition of puppetry. In the ancient Indian epic Mahabharata there are references to puppets. Kathputli, a form of string puppet performance native to Rajasthan, is notable and there are many Indian ventriloquists and puppeteers. The first Indian ventriloquist, Professor Y. K. Padhye, introduced this form of puppetry to India in the 1920s and his son, Ramdas Padhye, subsequently popularised ventriloquism and puppetry. Almost all types of puppets are found in India.



String puppets:

India has a rich and ancient tradition of string puppets or marionettes. Marionettes with jointed limbs controlled by strings allow far greater flexibility and are therefore the most articulate of the puppets. Rajasthan, Orissa, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu are some of the regions where this form of puppetry has flourished. The traditional marionettes of Rajasthan are known as Kathputli. Carved from a single piece of wood, these puppets are like large dolls that are colourfully dressed. The string puppets of Orissa are known as Kundhei. The string puppets of Karnataka are called Gombeyatta. Puppets from Tamil Nadu, known as Bommalattam, combine the techniques of rod and string puppets.

Rod puppets:

Rod puppets are an extension of glove-puppets, but are often much larger and supported and manipulated by rods from below. This form of puppetry now is found mostly in West Bengal and Orissa. The traditional rod puppet form of West Bengal is known as Putul Nautch. They are carved from wood and follow the various artistic styles of a particular region. The traditional rod puppet of Bihar is known as Yampuri.

Glove puppets

Glove puppets are also known as sleeve, hand or palm puppets. The head is made of either papier mâché, cloth or wood, with two hands emerging from just below the neck. The rest of the figure consists of a long, flowing skirt. These puppets are like limp dolls, but in the hands of an able puppeteer, are capable of producing a wide range of movements. The manipulation technique is simple the movements are controlled by the human hand, the first finger inserted in the head and the middle finger and the thumb in the two arms of the puppet. With the help of these three fingers, the glove puppet comes alive.

The tradition of glove puppets in India is popular in Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, West Bengal and Kerala. In Uttar Pradesh, glove puppet plays usually present social themes, whereas in Orissa such plays are based on stories of Radha and Krishna. In Orissa, the puppeteer plays a dholak (hand drum) with one hand and manipulates the puppet with the other. The delivery of



the dialogue, the movement of the puppet and the beat of the dholak are well synchronised and create a dramatic atmosphere. In Kerala, the traditional glove puppet play is called Pavakoothu.

Shadow play:

Shadow puppets are an ancient part of India's culture and art, particularly regionally as the keelu bomme and Tholu bommalata of Andhra Pradesh, the Togalu gombeyaata in Karnataka, the charma bahuli natya in Maharashtra, the Ravana chhaya in Odisha, the Tholpavakoothu in Kerala and the thol bommalatta in Tamil Nadu. Shadow puppet play is also found in pictorial traditions in India, such as temple mural painting, loose-leaf folio paintings, and the narrative paintings. Dance forms such as the Chhau of Odisha literally mean "shadow". The shadow theatre dance drama theatre are usually performed on platform stages attached to Hindu temples, and in some regions these are called Koothu Madams or Koothambalams. In many regions, the puppet drama play is performed by itinerant artist families on temporary stages during major temple festivals. Legends from the Hindu epics Ramayana and the Mahabharata dominate their repertoire. However, the details and the stories vary regionally.

Music:

Music is an integral part of India's culture. Natyasastra, a 2000-year-old Sanskrit text, describes five systems of taxonomy to classify musical instruments. One of these ancient Indian systems classifies musical instruments into four groups according to four primary sources of vibration: strings, membranes, cymbals, and air. According to Reis Flora, this is similar to the Western theory of organology. Archeologists have also reported the discovery of a 3000-year-old, 20-key, carefully shaped polished basalt lithophone in the highlands of Odisha.

The oldest preserved examples of Indian music are the melodies of the *Samaveda* (1000 BC) that are still sung in certain Vedic Śrauta sacrifices; this is the earliest account of Indian musical hymns. It proposed a tonal structure consisting of seven notes, which were named, in descending order, as *Krusht*, *Pratham*, *Dwitiya*, *Tritiya*, *Chaturth*, *Mandra* and *Atiswār*. These refer to the notes of a flute, which was the only fixed frequency instrument. The *Samaveda*, and other Hindu texts, heavily influenced India's classical music tradition, which is known today in



two distinct styles: Carnatic and Hindustani music. Both the Carnatic music and Hindustani music systems are based on the melodic base (known as Raga), sung to a rhythmic cycle (known as Taa); these principles were refined in the nāṭyaśāstra (200 BC) and the dattilam (300 AD).

The current music of India includes multiple varieties of religious, classical, folk, filmi, rock and pop music and dance. The appeal of traditional classical music and dance is on the rapid decline, especially among the younger generation.

Cave Paintings:

Cave paintings from Ajanta, Bagh, Ellora and Sittanavasal and temple paintings testify to a love of naturalism. Most early and medieval art in India is Hindu, Buddhist or Jain. A freshly made coloured floor design (Rangoli) is still a common sight outside the doorstep of many (mostly South Indian) Indian homes. Raja Ravi Varma is one of the classical painters from medieval India.

Pattachitra, Madhubani painting, Mysore painting, Rajput painting, Tanjore painting and Mughal painting are some notable Genres of Indian Art; while Nandalal Bose, M. F. Husain, S. H. Raza, Geeta Vadhera, Jamini Roy and B. Venkatappa^[171] are some modern painters. Among the present day artists, Atul Dodiya, Bose Krishnamacnahri, Devajyoti Ray and Shibu Natesan represent a new era of Indian art where global art shows direct amalgamation with Indian classical styles. These recent artists have acquired international recognition. Jehangir Art Gallery in Mumbai, Mysore Palace has on display a few good Indian paintings.

Thiruvalluvar Statue, or the Valluvar Statue, is a 133-feet (40.6 m) tall stone sculpture of the Tamil poet and philosopher Tiruvalluvar. The Statue of Unity is the world's tallest statue, with a height of 182 metres (597 feet), located in the state of Gujarat. It depicts Indian statesman and independence activist Vallabhbhai Patel (1875–1950), who was the first deputy prime minister and home minister of independent India. It was inaugurated by the Prime Minister of India, Narendra Modi, on 31 October 2018.

The first sculptures in India date back to the Indus Valley civilisation, where stone and bronze figures have been discovered. Later, as Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism developed further, India produced some extremely intricate bronzes as well as temple carvings. Some huge



shrines, such as the one at Ellora were not constructed by using blocks but carved out of solid rock.

Sculptures produced in the northwest, in stucco, schist, or clay, display a very strong blend of Indian and Classical Hellenistic or possibly even Greco-Roman influence. The pink sandstone sculptures of Mathura evolved almost simultaneously. During the Gupta period (4th to 6th centuries) sculpture reached a very high standard in execution and delicacy in modeling. These styles and others elsewhere in India evolved leading to classical Indian art that contributed to Buddhist and Hindu sculptures throughout Southeast Central and East Asia.

Indian architecture:

Indian architecture encompasses a multitude of expressions over space and time, constantly absorbing new ideas. The result is an evolving range of architectural production that nonetheless retains a certain amount of continuity across history. Some of its earliest production are found in the Indus Valley civilisation (2600–1900 BC) which is characterised by well-planned cities and houses. Religion and kingship do not seem to have played an important role in the planning and layout of these towns.

During the period of the Mauryan and Gupta empires and their successors, several Buddhist architectural complexes, such as the caves of Ajanta and Ellora and the monumental Sanchi Stupa were built. Later on, South India produced several Hindu temples like Chennakesava Temple at Belur, the Hoysaleswara Temple at Halebidu, and the Kesava Temple at Somanathapura, Brihadeeswara Temple, Thanjavur built by Raja Raja Chola, the Sun Temple, Konark, Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple at Srirangam, and the Buddha stupa (Chinna Lanja dibba and Vikramarka kota dibba) at Bhattiprolu. Rajput kingdoms oversaw the construction of Khajuraho Temple Complex, Chittor Fort and Chaturbhuj Temple, etc. during their reign. Angkor Wat, Borobudur and other Buddhist and Hindu temples indicate strong Indian influence on South East Asian architecture, as they are built in styles almost identical to traditional Indian religious buildings.

The traditional system of Vaastu Shastra serves as India's version of Feng Shui, influencing town planning, architecture, and ergonomics. It is unclear which system is older, but



they contain certain similarities. Feng Shui is more commonly used throughout the world. Though Vastu is conceptually similar to Feng Shui in that it also tries to harmonise the flow of energy, (also called life-force or Prana in Sanskrit and Chi/Ki in Chinese/Japanese), through the house, it differs in the details, such as the exact directions in which various objects, rooms, materials, etc. are to be placed.

With the advent of Islamic influence from the west, Indian architecture was adapted to allow the traditions of the new religion, creating the Indo-Islamic style of architecture. The Qutb complex, a group of monuments constructed by successive sultanas of the Delhi Sultanate is one of the earliest examples. Fatehpur Sikri, Taj Mahal,^[176] Gol Gumbaz, Red Fort of Delhi and Charminar are creations of this era, and are often used as the stereotypical symbols of India. British colonial rule in India saw the development of Indo-Saracenic style and mixing of several other styles, such as European Gothic. The Victoria Memorial and the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus are notable examples.

Indian architecture has influenced eastern and southeastern Asia, due to the spread of Buddhism. A number of Indian architectural features such as the temple mound or stupa, temple spire or shikhara, temple tower or pagoda and temple gate or torana, have become famous symbols of Asian culture, used extensively in East Asia and South East Asia. The central spire is also sometimes called a vimanam. The southern temple gate, or gopuram is noted for its intricacy and majesty.

Contemporary Indian architecture is more cosmopolitan. Cities are extremely compact and densely populated. Mumbai's Nariman Point is famous for its Art Deco buildings. Recent creations such as the Lotus Temple, Golden Pagoda and Akshardham, and the various modern urban developments of India like Bhubaneswar and Chandigarh, are notable.

Sports and Martial arts:

Sports:

Field hockey was considered to be the national game of India, but this has been recently denied by the Government of India, clarifying on a Right to Information Act (RTI) filed that India has not declared any sport as the national game. At a time when it was especially popular,



the India men's national field hockey team won the 1975 Men's Hockey World Cup, and 8 gold, 1 silver, and 2 bronze medals at the Olympic Games. However, field hockey in India no longer has the following that it once did.

Cricket is considered the most popular sport in India.^[180] The India national cricket team won the 1983 Cricket World Cup, the 2011 Cricket World Cup, the 2007 ICC World Twenty20, the 2013 ICC Champions Trophy and shared the 2002 ICC Champions Trophy with Sri Lanka. Domestic competitions include the Ranji Trophy, the Duleep Trophy, the Deodhar Trophy, the Irani Trophy and the Challenger Series. In addition, BCCI conducts the Indian Premier League, a Twenty20 competition.

Football is popular in the Indian state of Kerala also considered as home of football in India. The city of Kolkata is the home to the largest stadium in India, and the second largest stadium in the world by capacity, Salt Lake Stadium. National clubs such as Mohun Bagan A.C., Kingfisher East Bengal F.C., Prayag United S.C., and the Mohammedan Sporting Club

Chess is commonly believed to have originated in northwestern India during the Gupta empire, where its early form in the 6th century was known as *chaturanga*. Other games which originated in India and continue to remain popular in wide parts of northern India include Kabaddi, Gilli-danda, and Kho kho. Traditional southern Indian games include Snake boat race and Kuttiyum kolum. The modern game of polo is derived from Manipur, India, where the game was known as 'Sagol Kangjei', 'Kanjai-bazee', or 'Pulu'.^{[187][188]} It was the anglicised form of the last, referring to the wooden ball that was used, which was adopted by the sport in its slow spread to the west. The first polo club was established in the town of Silchar in Assam, India, in 1833.

In 2011, India inaugurated a privately built Buddh International Circuit, its first motor racing circuit. The 5.14-kilometre circuit is in Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, near Delhi. The first Formula One Indian Grand Prix event was hosted here in October 2011.

Indian martial arts

One of the best known forms of ancient Indian martial arts is the *Kalarippayattu* from Kerala. This ancient fighting style is mentioned in Sangam



literature 400 BCE and 600 CE and is regarded as one of the oldest surviving martial arts. In this form of martial arts, various stages of physical training include ayurvedic massage with sesame oil to impart suppleness to the body (*uzichil*); a series of sharp body movements so as to gain control over various parts of the body (*miapayattu*); and, complex sword fighting techniques (*paliyankam*), which was developed around 200 AD, traces its roots to the Sangam period in southern India. Silambam is unique among Indian martial arts because it uses complex footwork techniques (*kaaladi*), including a variety of spinning styles. A bamboo staff is used as the main weapon. The ancient Tamil Sangam literature mentions that between 400 BCE and 600 CE, soldiers from southern India received special martial arts training which revolved primarily around the use of spear (*vel*), sword (*val*) and shield.

Among eastern states, *Paika akhada* is a martial art found in Odisha. *Paika akhada*, or *paika akhara*, roughly translates as "warrior gymnasium" or "warrior school".^[198] In ancient times, these were training schools of the peasant militia. Today's Paika akhada teach physical exercises and martial arts in addition to the Paika dance, performance art with rhythmic movements and weapons being hit in time to the drum. It incorporates acrobatic manoeuvres and use of the khanda (straight sword), patta (guntlet-sword), sticks, and other weapons.

In northern India, the *musti yuddha* evolved in 1100 AD and focussed on mental, physical and spiritual training.^[199] In addition, the *Dhanur Veda* tradition was an influential fighting arts style which considered the bow and the arrow to be the supreme weapons. The *Dhanur Veda* was first described in the 5th-century BCE Viṣṇu Puraṇa and is also mentioned in both of the major ancient Indian epics, the *Ramayana* and *Mahābhārata*. A distinctive factor of Indian martial arts is the heavy emphasis laid on meditation (*dhyāna*) as a tool to remove fear, doubt and anxiety

Indian martial arts techniques have had a profound impact on other martial arts styles across Asia. The 3rd-century BCE *Yoga Sutras of Patanjali* taught how to meditate single-mindedly on points located inside one's body, which was later used in martial arts, while various mudra finger movements were taught in Yogacara Buddhism. These elements of yoga, as well as finger movements in the *nata* dances, were later incorporated into various martial arts. According to some historical accounts, the South Indian Buddhist monk Bodhidharma was one of the main founders of the Shaolin Kungfu.



Reference Books

1. Biphan Chandra, India after Independence, (1947-2000) Penguin Books, New Delhi, 2000.
2. Braw P.K., Politics of India since Independence, New Delhi, 1999.
3. Chakaravarthy S.R, Contemporary India, New Delhi, 2005.
4. Dharamraj. J., Contemporary History of India, (Tamil) Tensy Publications, Sivakasi, 2014.
5. 'Varalatra Suvadugal' (Tamil) Thina thanthi Pathippagam, Veperi, Chennai, 2010.