

1. “The ineffective functioning of the Telangana Regional Committee contributed to the emergence of the early phase of the separate Telangana movement.” Comment.

The formation of **Telangana Regional Committee (TRC)** in 1958 was a constitutional and administrative mechanism under the **Andhra Pradesh Regional Committee Order**, designed to **safeguard the developmental and administrative interests of the Telangana region** within the newly merged state of Andhra Pradesh. However, the failure to operationalise this institution effectively is often cited as a major contributing factor to the early phase of the **Telangana separatist movement**, particularly the 1969 agitation.

Intended Role and Powers of the TRC

The TRC was envisaged as an institutional safeguard following the **Gentlemen’s Agreement (1956)**. Its roles included:

- **Jurisdiction over key developmental areas** like agriculture, education, public health, and local bodies.
- **Legislative review powers:** Approval required for general bills concerning Telangana before being tabled in the State Assembly.
- **Monitoring and planning:** Power to prepare and review developmental schemes specific to Telangana.
- **Land protection:** Oversight on land transfers to prevent exploitation of Telangana land by outsiders.
- **Dispute resolution:** Mechanism to involve the Centre in conflicts between TRC and state leadership. Had these powers been **properly implemented**, they could have addressed the core concerns of **regional imbalance, economic neglect, and cultural subordination**.

Factors Leading to Ineffectiveness of TRC

Despite the ambitious mandate, the TRC became ineffective due to multiple structural and political reasons:

1. **Political Non-Cooperation**
 - CM Neelam Sanjiva Reddy reportedly did not allow the TRC to function after its establishment in 1958.
 - Lack of genuine political will hampered the institutional start-up.
2. **Administrative Weaknesses**
 - Absence of adequate **funds, staff, and autonomy**
 - Functioned merely as a consultative body with no binding authority
3. **Erosion of Mandate**
 - Power to prepare development schemes was taken away in 1962.
 - Membership diluted from original 15 to all Telangana MLAs, weakening focused representation.
4. **Ignored Recommendations**
 - Developmental suggestions were rarely implemented by the state government.
 - TRC’s authority over land regulation was flouted.
5. **Ineffective Dispute Resolution**
 - Governor, entrusted to resolve disputes, failed to mediate effectively.

6. Eventual Abolition

- The **Six-Point Formula (1973)** abolished the TRC altogether, ending an important institutional safeguard.

Evidence of TRC's Partial Effectiveness

Despite its limitations, scholars like **K.V. Narayana Reddy** note that TRC worked **relatively well within its limited mandate**:

- Functioned as a **pressure group**, raising Telangana concerns in the Assembly.
- Secured development funds, e.g., ₹3 crore grant to Osmania University.
- Highlighted regional disparities in education and employment.

Link to the Separate Telangana Movement

- The **failure of TRC to deliver institutional justice** became one of the key reasons for growing public frustration.
- The **1969 Telangana agitation** stemmed from the perception that Telangana's identity, resources, and opportunities were being compromised in united Andhra Pradesh.
- The non-implementation of safeguards promised through TRC fuelled **alienation and regional distrust**.

Conclusion

While the TRC was established as a political compromise to allay Telangana's fears post-merger, its **ineffective functioning and eventual dismantling** only validated the concerns of regional marginalisation. Had the TRC been **granted autonomy, political support, and functional resources**, it could have mitigated many grievances and possibly delayed or softened the demand for a separate state. The failure of the TRC serves as a lesson in **the importance of empowering federal and regional institutions not just in form, but in function** to accommodate regional aspirations within a larger political entity like India.

2. Examine the perspectives of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on the 1956 merger of Hyderabad State with Andhra State.

The 1956 merger of the Telangana region of Hyderabad State with Andhra State to form Andhra Pradesh marked a critical moment in post-independence Indian federalism. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's perspective on this merger was deeply nuanced — shaped by competing concerns of national integration, cultural preservation, legal complications, and political compulsions.

1. Nehru's Initial Reservations: Preservation of Hyderabad's Diversity

- **Cultural Concerns:** Nehru initially regarded Hyderabad as an "ideal" state due to its **multi-lingual composition (Telugu, Marathi, Kannada)** and rich **Deccani cultural heritage**.
- He was hesitant to **break up the state**, fearing it would dilute its historical and cultural uniqueness.
- He understood the merger as not merely administrative, but a **“psychological and emotional change”** with long-term implications for federal unity.

2. Legal and Diplomatic Compulsions

- **Unresolved International Status:** The **Nizam's complaint to the UN (1948)** over India's military action in Hyderabad remained pending till 1956, which restrained Nehru's diplomatic room to oppose the merger.

- **Supreme Court Judgments (1950 & 1951)** had ruled Hyderabad was **not yet an integral part of India**, further complicating Nehru's legal stance.
- Nehru thus had to **tread carefully** to avoid international backlash while still steering the merger through constitutional means.

3. Political Pressure and Andhra Lobbying

- Nehru faced sustained **lobbying from Andhra leaders**, who claimed **linguistic and cultural affinity** between Andhra and Telangana.
- Andhra leaders used **public pressure and political mobilization** to press for the merger.
- **Blackmail politics** and a push from dominant Andhra factions contributed to his eventual acquiescence.

4. Nehru's Reluctance and Emotional Discomfort

- Despite permitting the merger, Nehru **remained uncomfortable** with the decision.
- He famously remarked:
"We are marrying off an innocent girl (Telangana) to a naughty boy (Andhra)... if they get along, good; if not, they can divorce."
- This metaphor reflected his **emotional unease** and underlying concern for Telangana's fate within the unified Andhra Pradesh.
- He also characterized the merger as having a **"tint of expansionist imperialism"**, implying concerns over Andhra dominance.

5. Emphasis on Safeguards and Democratic Process

- Nehru supported the **Gentlemen's Agreement (1956)** to institutionalize safeguards for Telangana (e.g., TRC – Telangana Regional Committee).
- He hoped such measures would ensure **balanced development** and prevent marginalization.
- His approach was rooted in **democratic values**, envisioning a **gradual integration** that respected local identities.

6. Legacy and the Telangana Movement

- Nehru's fears ultimately materialized in the **1969 Telangana agitation**, a response to the perceived breach of safeguards and dominance by Andhra elites.
- The failure of institutional safeguards like the TRC reflected the **gap between Nehru's intent and actual implementation**.
- The eventual **formation of Telangana in 2014** validated Nehru's early apprehensions and the metaphor of "divorce" that he had presciently used.

Conclusion

Pandit Nehru's perspective on the 1956 merger of Hyderabad with Andhra was a blend of idealism, realism, and caution. While compelled by legal and political pressures to approve the merger, he did so with visible discomfort and a clear emphasis on preserving Telangana's identity through safeguards. His nuanced stance highlights the **complexities of managing regional aspirations** within the framework of Indian unity and the **challenges of linguistic reorganization** in a diverse nation.