

Development of Identities and Statehood Movement In Jharkhand state of IndiaShital Kumari ¹, Dr. Anil Kumar ²¹PhD Research scholar, Department of History, Sabarmati University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat² Associate Professor, Department of History, Sabarmati University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Abstract -

Political identities are based on ethnic, linguistic, religious or other similar grounds. Failure of developmental policy for betterment of socioeconomic conditions encourages societal groups to articulate themselves as political identities. The Jharkhand movement was the classic example of the same. Policy for Tribal development of the colonial and postcolonial Indian state under the study of the colonial and nationalist discourses was not sufficient to accommodate tribal communities into mainstream developmental discourses. In this chapter the researcher has tried to study and analyses the historical roots of the Jharkhand movement and its political formations under different theoretical underpinnings which have been presented by various scholars of national and international reputed. In research article , discuss about Development of Identities and Statehood Movement In Jharkhand state of India.

1.Introduction

As the state in India controls a vast array of resources, disadvantaged societal groups articulate themselves as self-conscious ethnic identities in order to augment their political resources and influence the policy process in their own favor.

Jharkhand movement in order to develop its own identities and political conscious was by and large able to gain better bargaining power. The Jharkhandi identity was by and large successful in influencing the state's response in terms of securing a Development Council for the area in the year 1996. Later, as a result of a combination of factors such as identity assertion and political imperatives of the region, the objective of creating the state of Jharkhand was achieved in the year 2000. The Jharkhandi identity was shaped by the response of the policy machinery

to local needs and demands. The two-way interaction between the state and the Jharkhandi communities had also significantly altered the character of the identity itself. Therefore, in the light of these demands and movements the politics of development and identity was born out

2.Formation of Jharkhand State: Development Politics and Politics of Development

The contemporary world is witness to a wave of ethnic conflict, causing widespread misery and bloodshed. This phenomenon has been threatening the very existence of many states and has resulted in the emergence of new nation

states based on ethnic lines. Such ethnic revival has also significantly altered the relationship between societal groups and the states in which they reside. Therefore, the issue of ethnicity has also emerged as major issue in international politics also. The growth in ethnic politics at national and international level has led to the demolition of the notion that with increasing modernization and communication, more particularistic identities would eventually be eroded or would be submerged into national identities.

Ethnicity continues to be an important and meaningful source of identity for millions of the people in the world. Hence, political, social and economic issues are being increasingly identified on 'ethnic' or the 'ethno-religious lines'. Ethnicity does not operate in circumstances that are independent of other identities. In a multi-ethnic country like India individuals can and do have a number of identities. Today there are broadly two strands in the articulation of political identity.

The first supports the state and its policies and the status quo. This is more inclusive and accommodative. This can be defined as national identity which has precedence over all other identities.

Second is narrower, which is more inscriptive, particularistic and much more region specific identities which is called sub national or ethnic identities. This is often merging with national identities. They may seek political recognition (sometimes even they may ask for a sovereign state).

Ethnicity simply may be defined as "the fact or state of belonging to a social group that has a common national or cultural tradition"

Ethnic group is defined as a collective within a larger society that claims common ancestry, shared past and shared subjective identifications. They share common history, language, culture, territorial ancestry. National and ethnic identities can be differentiated on the ground of demands they make on the political process. National identities might be inclined to seek statehood, whereas ethnic identities might seek autonomy and adequate representation within an existing state.

The demand of autonomy was granted through the formation of Jharkhand Autonomous Council (JAC) in the year 1995. Later on it was also granted statehood in the year 2000. Post formation period of the state (2000-2016) situation seems to be very disastrous. The very fundamental identities of Jharkhand have been threatened by the development modal which has been adopted by the Jharkhand state. People have been lacking basic infrastructure facilities. Socio economic conditions of the population are not very satisfactory.



People

have been displaced from their lands in the name of development and national interests. Failures of developmental policies are evident, particularly for the tribal communities.

Brass has argued that Indian state has limited resource capacity. Development policies are focused on group or region. Not all regions and societal groups have been equal beneficiaries of the positive action of the state. Consequently, a number of region-specific or culture specific identities have been thrown up by the grass roots. These identities have, in some cases, been called ethnic identities and their demands are large in the nature of demanding a greater share in the benefits resulting from the positive action of the state or demanding greater administrative autonomy. Brass has identified three sets of struggle in the process of ethnic identity

formation:

- The struggle within the ethnic group itself, for control over its symbolic and material resources which in turn involves defining the groups' boundaries and its rules of exclusion and inclusion.
- The struggles between ethnic groups compelling one another for rights, privileges and available resources.
- The struggle between the state and the groups that dominate it, on the other hand and the population that inhabits its territory on the other.
- He further argued that Ethnicity and nationalism, inter-ethnic conflicts, and secessionist movements have been major forces shaping the modern world and the structure and stability of contemporary states. In the closing decades of the twentieth century, such forces and movements emerged with new intensity. Drawing examples, from a wide variety of multiethnic situations around the world, with special emphasis on South Asia, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union, brass has presented a distinctive theory concerning the origins of ethnic identity and modern nationalism. Brass (1991),²⁷ Brass his ideas on two arguments: one, that ethnicity and nationalism are not "givens" but are social and political constructions; and, two, that ethnicity and nationalism are modern phenomena inseparably connected with the activities of the modern centralizing state. The theory of elite competition is presented to show how both ethnicity and nationalism arise out of specific types of interactions between the leadership of centralizing states and elites from nondominant ethnic groups, especially in the peripheries of those states.

The state is always engaged in the differential distribution of resources among various categories in the population. The state is not merely a policy producing mechanism that simply balances conflicting societal interests.

Instead the state tends to support particular groups to distribute privileges unequally, and to differentiate among various categories in the population.²⁸ Most modern states adopt policies of selective discrimination for a variety of reasons. Equalizing policies such as 'affirmative action' or

'prot

ective discrimination' are often seen as participating in the formation of new identities amongst various categories or social groups.

Louis Tillin (2013)²⁹ has studied the formation of three states in the year 2000 i.e. Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand. There is widespread consensus today that the constitutional flexibility to alter state boundaries has bolstered the stability of India's democracy. Yet debates persist about whether more states should be created. 'Remapping India' looks at the episode of state creation in 2000, when the states of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand came into being in some of the poorest, yet resource-rich, regions of Hindi-speaking north and central India, and explains the politics that lay behind this episode of 'post-linguistic' state reorganization.

3. Development of the Jharkhand State: A Theoretical Case Note

There is no clear consensus on the defining characteristics of a state and the definition can vary significantly based upon the focus of the particular study.³⁰ In general though, for studies of state formation, the state is considered to be a territorially bound political unit with centralized institutions for the administration of governance, as distinct from tribes or units without centralized institutions.

According to Painter & Jeffrey, there are 5 distinctive features of the modern state:

- i. they are ordered by precise boundaries with administrative control across the whole;
- ii. they occupy large territories with control given to organized institutions;
- iii. they have a capital city and are endowed with symbols that embody state power;
- iv. the government within said state creates organizations to monitor, govern and control its population through surveillance and record keeping;
- v. they increase monitoring over time

Friedrich Engels articulated one of the earliest theories of the state based on anthropological evidence in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884).³³ The theory of Engels developed from study of *Ancient Society* (1877) by Lewis H. Morgan and from the sketches of this work by Karl Marx on the Asiatic mode of production. Engels argues that the state developed as a result of the need to protect private property. The theory contended that surplus production as a result of the development of agriculture created a division and specialization of labor: leading to classes who worked the land and to those who could devote time to other tasks. Class antagonism and the need to secure the private property of those living on the surplus production produced by agriculturalists resulted in the creation of the state. The anthropologist Morton Fried (1923-1986) further developed this approach, positing social stratification as the primary dynamic underlying the development of the state.

Some scholars, linked to wider debates in Anthropology, has increasingly emphasized the state as a primarily cultural artifact, and focuses on how symbolism plays a primary role in state formation. Formation of Jharkhand state also deeply owes this theory as primordial identities like culture

tribalis
m ethnicity, language and others have played very important role.

Culture was in fact main agenda for all the Jharkhandi political parties in their election manifesto. As they had realized that only with the idea that it was not possible to get a separate state on the basis of majority population of tribes in districts. Therefore, they had come to an agreement to include districts of Santhal Pargana and Chotanagpur divisions.

Post-World War II was an entirely changed society as the process of decolonization took place. States in all across the world were getting modern shape with their own military, bureaucracy, and the most important thing was political theories of their own. While modern states existed without European influence around the world before colonialism, post-colonial state formation has received the most significant attention. While warfare is primary in theories about state formation in Europe, the development of the international norm of non-interventionism means that other processes of state formation have become prominent outside Europe (including colonial imposition, assimilation, borrowing, and some internal political processes. John W. Meyer's *World Society Theory* contends that the state form was exported from Europe, institutionalized in the United Nations, and gradually the modern nation-state became the basis for both those in power and those challenging power. In addition, because many of the early modern states like the United Kingdom and France had significant empires, their institutional templates became standard for application globally.

Two related theories are based on military development and warfare, and the role that these forces played in state formation. Charles Tilly developed an argument that the state developed largely as a result of "state-makers" who sought to increase the taxes they could gain from the people under their control so they could continue fighting wars. According to Tilly, the statemakes war and war makes states.⁴³ In the constant warfare of the centuries in Europe, coupled with expanded costs of war with mass armies and gunpowder, warlords had to find ways to finance war and control territory more effectively. The modern state presented the opportunity for them to develop taxation structures, the coercive structure to implement that taxation, and finally the guarantee of protection from other states that could get much of the population to agree. Essentially, Tilly argues, state making is similar to organized crime because it is a "quintessential protection racket with the advantage of legitimacy."

4. Sub National Political Movements and Marginal Politics in India

Sub national identities in India are generally based on linguistic, racial, ethnic, historical and geographical bases. After the transfer of power into the hands of national leaders, the sub national imagined political communities began to assert themselves in order to give concrete expression to their political aspirations.

Apart from the cultural factors, a feeling of deprivation or neglect, resulting from the nature of national decision making process provides the logic for mass movement in most cases.' The feelings of neglect communities combined

with
the cultural factors to forge potent sub national political identities. The demands of these sub national identities range from greater autonomy to complete independence.

According to Bezbaruah "Identities are imagined in the sense of being adopted by those who see themselves as marginalized by the state".

Cultural factors combined with development issues and a feeling of alienation from the state and its policies have led to the articulation of sub national identities in many part of India.

Sub national identities in most parts of India draw upon socio-economic factors, in addition to their cultural bases of mobilization, has led them to adopt a radical leftist idiom of politics in some regions particularly in some parts of West Bengal, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Andhra Pradesh. Such mobilization has come to be known as 'Naxalite Politics' that advocate radical action such as execution of 'exploiters' after trial in a people's courts', sforcible harvest of fields alienated from the tribal peasants and violent overthrowing of the existing administration.

Guha, argued that Adivasi as a whole have gained least and lost more from six decades of democracy and development in India. He argued that they are even more deprived than the dalits. However, unlike the dalits, they have been unable to effectively articulate their grievances through the democratic and electoral process. The failure of the state and of the formal political system has provided a space for Maoist revolutionaries to move into. He further argued that there is a double tragedy at work in tribal India.

5. National to Regional Identity Politics: Demand for a Separate Tribal Statehood in Local Voices

'Swaraj can have no meaning nor any charm for the people of Chotanagpur, if they are not allowed self-rule, even after the liberation of India.' The economic exploitation of India, which was the *raison d'être* of opposition to the British Raj and the leitmotif of Indian nationalism and the freedom movement, has been well documented (Deoshkar 1908/1987; Dutt, 1940/1986; Habib, 1985; Naoroji, 1901; Sen, 1992; Tomlinson, 1993). the economic condition of India, which had been quite advanced up to the 18th century, began to deteriorate thereafter, to the point where, by the end of the 19th century, the picture had become one of arrested economic development (Anstey 1911). Dutt⁴⁶ describes in detail what he called 'The Plunder of India' and Habib⁴⁷ (1985), calculates that the drain from India in 1882 announced amounted to Rs 1,355 million (at 1946-47 prices), which works out to more than 4% of the national income at the time. In 1900, the drain was around 18 million out of an estimated total national income of 120 million pounds (Goldsmith 1983). In his *Discovery of India*, Nehru argues that the industrial revolution in England was based on the plunder of Bengal, and that the British Raj caused the destruction of India's industry and the decay of its agriculture (Nehru 1946/1994). From the colonial perspective, on the other hand, India was the foundation stone of the British Empire as Lord Curzon wrote in 1894: "Just as De Tocqueville remarked that the conquest and government of India are really the achievements which have given to England her place in the opinion of the world, so the

prestig

e and the wealth arising from her Asiatic position are the foundation stones of the British Empire” - (Quoted in 1989, R P Datta Lord Curzon wrote 1894 “India is the pivot of our Empire. If the Empire loses any other part of its Dominion we can survive, but if we lose India, the sun of our empire will have set”.

6. Situation of Jharkhand at the Time of State Formation

Ganesh Deoshkar⁴⁸ wrote in his *Deshar Katha* which was banned by the British because of its tendency to excite disaffection towards His Majesty or the Government by law in British India; a British source is quoted as stating: it is literally true that at the present moment out of the fifty millions of net revenue of India, half comes to England to pay the Home charges, while probably another third is spent on the army, which is mainly employed in Safeguarding the frontier. Very little of the Indian revenue is spent in fact in India at all.

What has been written about the colonization of India by the British applies to the colonization of Jharkhand by India, in particular by North Bihar (Gyan ranjan and Sinha 1993; Mahto 1989; Roy 1982; R N Singh 1956; Sen Gupta 1982) In erstwhile Bihar, Jharkhand produced 27.77 % of the total minerals of India, as compared to 0.47% in the rest of former Bihar. It contributed only 70% of the total revenue of former Bihar, but received only 20% of the total state expenditure. It produced almost the entire electricity for Bihar but rural electrification in Jharkhand is a meager 5% compared to 40% for the rest of Bihar. Most of the Jharkhand was not covered by Railways and therefore, it depended mainly on the roads. Not only that, Dumka, the head quarter of Santhal Pargana Division and Hazaribag, the head quarter of North Chotanagpur division were not connected by rail. The shares of paved roads in Jharkhand were only 5km per 1000 compared to 20 km for the rest of erstwhile Bihar.

Post –independence developments in the Jharkhand region are reflected correctly and sadly in the title of a book by Victor Das (1992), *Jharkhand: Castle over the Graves*⁵⁰. With the industrialization of India, the tribals perish; with the development of India the tribals decay (Iyer, 1992:7). The innocent, powerless tribals have been sacrificed at the altar of the ‘Development God that Filed’. Nirad Chaudhari’s phantasmagoric and cynical vision has proved prophetic. It was in 1960 that he wrote: All the large industrial undertakings of India after Independence are growing up, not in Chotanagpur alone, but elsewhere as well, in areas which are in the occupation of the aboriginals. For me, the fore, the pioneer iron and steel

factory at Jamshedpur has become a symbol, which it might also be for others. as one travels by train at night, from quite a long distance, its blast furnaces can be seen shooting up flames. As immense glow lights up the sky, and that red glare seems to rise from the gigantic unquenchable funeral pyre of the primitives. “Nobody knows better than I how pointless it is to regret this. I would say it is almost foolish to denounce it. The motives, ideas and forces which are ranged behind the modern onslaught on the aboriginals belong to an amoral world, where neither ethics not the destruction of the aboriginals’ life is as inevitable as the submergence of the Egyptian temples caused by the dams of the Nile”.

References

- S

gh.K.S. (2004) Ecology, Ethnicity. Regionalism and State Formation: An Exploration of the Jharkhand Movement. In Rajib Balakrishnan (Eds.) *Jharkhand Matters : Essays on Ethnicity, Regionalism and Development in India*, New Delhi, Konark.

- Kujur, Iqbal.(2003) Jharkhand Betrayed. In Ram Dayal Munda & S.Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, Copenhagen, IWGIA.
- Mishra, Asha. (2010). Indigenous Movement for a Separate State-Jharkhand During The Twentieth Century In Asha Mishra & Chittaranjan Kumar Paty (Eds.) *Tribal Movements in Jharkhand, 1857-2007*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
- Mullick, S.Bosu. (2007). State Forest policy and Adivasi Selfrule in Jharkhand. In Chittaranjan Kumar Paty(Eds.) *Forest, Government and Tribe*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
- Pathak, Akhileshwar. (1994). *Contested Domains, The State, Peasants and Forests in Contemporary India*. New Delhi, Sage.
- Munda, R.D, Mullick, S.Bosu (2003). *The Jharkhand Movement, Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*. IWGIA.
- Narayan, S. (1988). *Movement, Development, Police and Judiciary in Tribal World*. New Delhi, Inter India.
- Report of Committee on Jharkhand Matters. May, 1990.
- Ekka, William, & Sinha, R.K. (2004). *Documentation of Jharkhand Movement*. Kolkata, Anthropological Survey of India.
- Gadgill, Madhav. (1989). Deforestation, Problems and Prospects. Society for Promotion of Waste land Development. URL www.ces.ennet.in/biodiversity/sdev/mg/pdfs/mg087.doc.
- Keshari B.P, Munda, R.D. (2003). Recent Development in Jharkhand Movement. In R.D.Munda & S.Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous People Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
- Rana, L.N. (1996). Political Consciousness in Jharkhand, 1900-1947. *Indian History Congress Proceedings, 57th Session*.
- Rana, Santosh. (2003). The Jharkhand Movement. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
- Roy, Amit. (2003). Second phase of Jharkhand Movement. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
- Sharma, Usha. (1998). The Background and Nature of the Congress-Jharkhand Merger (20th June 1963). *Indian History Congress proceedings, 59th Session*.
- Vidyarthi, L.P. (1972). An appraisal of the leadership pattern among the tribes of Bihar." In K.S Singh (Eds.) *Tribal Situation in India*, Shimla, IAS