

1. Do you agree that the Justice Jagan Mohan Reddy Committee Report represented a state-sanctioned attempt to contain student-led dissent in Hyderabad? Critically examine the implications of the report.

Introduction

The Justice Jagan Mohan Reddy Committee was constituted by the **Government of Hyderabad State** under **Burgula Ramakrishna Rao** on **9th September 1952**, in the aftermath of the **Mulki agitation**, particularly the **City College and Osmania Hospital police firing incidents**. While officially framed as an investigative exercise into student unrest and police response, the **timing, scope, and recommendations** of the report raise important questions regarding its true intent — whether it was a sincere probe or a mechanism for **state-sanctioned containment of dissent**.

Was It a Tool to Contain Student Agitation?

1. Limited Scope of Investigation:

- The committee focused primarily on **law-and-order violations**, not the **root cause** — namely, the **violation of Mulki rules** and local grievances about employment and identity.
- It emphasized the right to protest through formal channels while discouraging street mobilization, **delegitimizing popular dissent**.

2. Exoneration of Police Actions:

- The report did **not hold the police accountable** for the violence despite clear instances of disproportionate force.
- This signaled a **state preference for control over engagement**, undermining the moral legitimacy of the student movement.

3. Pacification Over Resolution:

- The committee's function appeared to be **reactive**—quelling immediate protests rather than addressing structural issues.
- There was **no recommendation to reform employment policy** or strengthen the enforcement of Mulki rules.

Implications of the Committee Report

1. Erosion of Public Trust:

- The youth and local communities perceived the committee as **biased and ineffective**, further alienating them from the administration.
- The report's failure to recommend structural reforms only **deepened regional resentment**.

2. No Tangible Change in Policy:

- The **Mulki rules remained poorly implemented**, with no strong administrative corrective mechanism in place post-report.

3. Reinforcement of Regional Identity Assertion:

- The committee's inadequacy indirectly **amplified the Telangana identity discourse** and the perception of Andhra dominance.
- It also contributed to the **popular rejection of the Vishalaandhra proposal**, seen as a threat to Telangana's autonomy.

4. Precedent for Managing Dissent:

- The episode revealed how the **post-colonial Indian state employed legal means to neutralize popular mobilizations** without addressing deeper socio-political discontent.

Conclusion

While the Justice Jagan Mohan Reddy Committee Report was presented as an impartial legal intervention, its **narrow focus and exoneration of state excesses** indicate that it functioned more as a **state-sanctioned tool to contain dissent** than a genuine effort to resolve the grievances. Its legacy lies not in healing divisions, but in **institutionalizing distrust**, and it foreshadowed the **longer struggle for Telangana's regional rights and identity**.

2. Critically Analyze the “Andhra Mindset” and Imperial Aspirations Behind the Slogan of Vishalandhra, Prior to the Formation of States Reorganization Committee.

Introduction

The slogan of **Vishalandhra**, advocating the unification of **Andhra and Telangana** into a single Telugu-speaking state, emerged prominently in the early 1950s. Though projected as a movement for **linguistic unity**, its underlying motivations reveal a deeper blend of **political ambition, cultural assertion, and economic interest**. This was shaped by what critics have termed the **“Andhra mindset”**, characterized by assertive regionalism and a sense of entitlement to leadership over Telangana, well before the **States Reorganization Committee (SRC)** was even constituted in 1953.

The Andhra Mindset: Cultural and Linguistic Assertion

- **Linguistic Nationalism:** Leaders from the Andhra region viewed themselves as pioneers of the **Telugu linguistic movement**, seeking to unite all Telugu-speaking areas under a single political entity.
- **Cultural Pride:** The Andhra intelligentsia drew upon the rich literary and philosophical legacy of Andhra to argue for a culturally united Vishalandhra. They positioned themselves as natural custodians of Telugu identity.
- **Perceived Superiority:** Statements like that of Deputy Speaker M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar – *“The chariot of Andhras will not stop until it reaches Hyderabad”* – reflect a **triumphant and expansionist tone**, treating Hyderabad and Telangana as future extensions of Andhra's political sphere.

Imperial Aspirations: Political and Economic Goals

- **Strategic Targeting of Hyderabad:** Hyderabad, with its **economic prosperity, infrastructure, and institutional depth**, was viewed as the crown jewel of a potential Vishalandhra. The Andhra leadership envisioned Hyderabad as the **inevitable capital**, even as Kurnool was named a temporary capital in 1953.
- **Power Consolidation:** Leaders like Neelam Sanjeeva Reddy and Kala Venkata Rao openly passed **party resolutions advocating Vishalandhra with Hyderabad as capital**, showcasing the clear **political intent to centralize power** in Andhra hands.
- **Economic Motivation:** The desire to tap into Hyderabad's wealth and resources, especially in contrast to the underdeveloped Andhra region, reveals a **calculated ambition for economic dominance**.

Critical Assessment and Implications

- **Telangana's Resistance:** The push for Vishalandhra was increasingly viewed in Telangana as **linguistic imperialism**, with fears of cultural erasure and economic exploitation. Even Jawaharlal Nehru warned of the **“Andhra imperialistic tendency.”**
- **Lack of Dialogue:** The absence of serious consultations with Telangana leaders before advocating Vishalandhra further alienated the region, sowing **seeds of mistrust** that would shape future agitations.
- **Legacy of Discontent:** These early aspirations created long-standing **regional tensions**, ultimately culminating in the **formation of Telangana as a separate state in 2014**.

Conclusion

The slogan of Vishalandhra, while couched in the language of linguistic unity, was driven by a combination of **Andhra regional pride, political maneuvering, and economic ambition**. The aggressive pursuit of Hyderabad as capital without addressing Telangana's distinct identity and concerns highlights the **imperial undertones** of the movement prior to the SRC's intervention. A truly federal and inclusive approach was missing, leading to **decades of alienation and struggle**.