

Taylor C. Sherman

The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948-56

**Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)**

Original citation:

Sherman, Taylor C. (2007) *The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948-56*. [Indian economic & social history review](#), 44 (4). pp. 489-516.

DOI: [10.1177/001946460704400404](https://doi.org/10.1177/001946460704400404)

© 2007 [Sage Publications](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/32805/>

Available in LSE Research Online: June 2013

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Dr Taylor C. Sherman

The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948-56

Abstract

This article explores the impact of the police action and the anti-communist struggle in Hyderabad on the formation of the Indian state in the first years after independence. Because of its central location and diverse cultural heritage, the absorption of the princely state of Hyderabad into the Indian Union was an important goal for Nehru's government. But the task of bringing Hyderabad into the Union was not an easy one. As it entered Hyderabad, the government of independent India had to come to terms with the limitations of the police, military and bureaucracy which it had inherited from the colonial state. As it took over the governance of the state, it had to find ways to manage relations between Hindus and Muslims, even as the social order was being transformed. And it had to fight communism in the Telangana region of the state, whilst trying to ensure the loyalty of its new citizens. This article examines the ways in which India's first government confronted these complex problems. The following pages argue that these early years must be seen as a time of great dynamism, rather than as a period of stability inherited from the colonial state.

There is near consensus amongst scholars of postcolonial India that, at least in retrospect, the Nehruvian period was one of relative calm and stability. According to this line of thought, independence did herald change in India, including the introduction of democracy with universal suffrage and a constitution with a charter of fundamental rights, but the trauma of partition, the war over Kashmir and the integration of the princely states, 'ensured that precisely those traits of the Raj which Indian nationalists had struggled against were now reinforced'.¹ The police, military and bureaucracy inherited from the colonial regime, it is agreed, enabled the Congress-led government to 'enforce central authority', and to ensure stability in a unified Indian state.²

The following pages challenge this view by examining the integration of the princely state of Hyderabad into the Indian Union. It is argued that this view posthumously invests the colonial state/early postcolonial state with qualities it did not have. The idea that the colonial state acted as a monolithic machine to stamp out dissent and disorder where it pleased is unsustainable. Central policy was often fraught with contradictions. Institutions, especially the police, courts and prisons, were often overwhelmed by the work thrust upon them during times of unrest. Tensions between the centre and local administrators frequently erupted, as officers used their position as 'the man on the spot' to act contrary to orders or to justify committing acts of violence against the subject population. Taken as a whole, therefore, the colonial state was often either weak and inefficient or extraordinarily violent and ineffective.³ By taking the absorption of Hyderabad as a case study, this work examines the ways in which the new government coped with its inheritance.

Hitherto, the story of the integration of the princely state of Hyderabad into the Indian Union has been told from a number of relatively parochial perspectives. There have

been personal stories of hardship and bravery during the conflict;⁴ detailed analyses of the tortured negotiations between the Indian government, the Nizam of Hyderabad and the British;⁵ clinical accounts of the military operations;⁶ and histories of the communist Telangana movement in the territory.⁷ None of these accounts, however, have examined the impact of the integration of Hyderabad on the formation of the state in newly independent India.

The absorption of Hyderabad provides an excellent study of the nature of the postcolonial Indian state for three reasons. First, Hyderabad had been part of the calculations of all-India political parties at least since the 1930s.⁸ The territory was therefore a vital part of the self-image of newly-independent India. Secondly, it was the Ministry of States, part of the central government in Delhi, which assumed overall responsibility for the integration of the former princely states. After the police action of September 1948, the Hyderabad regime was virtually disbanded. As a result, the new authorities had relative freedom to shape the new territory as they pleased. Finally, as Hyderabad was brought into the Union, police, military and members of the bureaucracy were drafted in from the rest of India to rebuild Hyderabad. One can therefore use the case of Hyderabad not only to try to understand the 'mind' of the central government, but to examine the extent to which policies designed by the centre were successfully implemented on the ground.

When they assumed power in Hyderabad, the new Indian government faced an array of questions the answers to which would impact the shape and character of the new nation-state as a whole. These included, how to deal with the limitations of the military, police, and bureaucracy which they had inherited; how to frame the new constitution to protect the integrity of the country; how to manage relations between Hindus and Muslims, whether in the bureaucracy or in the population; and how to fight communism and ensure the loyalty of their new citizens. This article explores

these questions in three sections. First, it situates the princely state of Hyderabad at the geographic, economic and cultural heart of the sub-continent, and locates the territory in the vision of India imagined by the British and their Indian successors. Secondly, it analyses the ways in which the Indian authorities addressed the question of relations between Hindus and Muslims after the fall of the Muslim-led government of the Nizam of Hyderabad. Finally, it turns to the ways in which the Indian army, and then the civilian authorities, confronted the communist Telangana movement in the eastern part of the state. It is argued below that, in the years shortly after independence, India's internal character had yet to be set in stone, and the experience of the integration of Hyderabad reflects the vibrancy and uncertainty of the early Nehruvian period.

Hyderabad and the Indian Union

The history of the awkward place of the princely states in the transfer of power negotiations is well known.⁹ On the eve of independence, several large states, including Hyderabad, had declined to join either India or Pakistan. Each state presented its own unique problems, but the Government of independent India believed that the accession of Hyderabad to the Indian Union was ineluctable. As early as June 1947, Nehru had warned he would 'encourage rebellion in all states that go against us'.¹⁰ In the new Indian Government, the accession of the subcontinent's second largest princely state was viewed as a foregone conclusion because Hyderabad could not be independent except in name, given its geographical position.¹¹ Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, India's Home member and Minister for States remarked, 'Hyderabad is, as it were, situated in India's belly. How can the belly breathe if it is cut off from the main body?'¹² In the summer of 1948, as India's statesmen, especially Patel, began to hint of an invasion, the British encouraged

India to avoid using force, but repeatedly declined the Nizam's requests to intervene on his behalf.¹³

In the months preceding independence, however, Nizam Mir Osman Ali Khan Bahadur had refused to accede to either India or Pakistan. He attempted, instead, to manoeuvre his state towards independence, from where he could negotiate an alliance with India, rather than amalgamation into India.¹⁴ To avoid accession, the Nizam's government had signed a Standstill Agreement with the Government of India. The accord provided that relations between the state and the Indian Union would remain for one year as they had been prior to independence. India would handle Hyderabad's foreign affairs, but Indian Army troops stationed in Secunderabad would be removed. Soon after the agreement had been struck, however, each side began to accuse the other of violating its terms. The Nizam alleged that the Indian government was imposing an informal embargo by using its control over railways leading into the state to deny the territory vital goods, especially arms and medical supplies.¹⁵ India claimed that the government of Hyderabad was edging towards independence by divesting itself of its Indian securities, banning the Indian currency, halting the export of ground nuts, organising illegal gun-running from Pakistan, and inviting new recruits to its army and to its irregular forces, the Razakars. These moves were regarded in Delhi as part of a 'comprehensive plan to break up the economic cohesion of India.'¹⁶

The situation in Hyderabad in 1948

While the Nizam attempted to manoeuvre himself towards independence, the internal situation in the territory was deteriorating. The state had been crippled by communist insurgents on the one hand, and forces loyal to the Nizam of Hyderabad on the other. To a limited extent, Congress volunteers engaged in *satyagraha* had contributed to

the internal disorder by disrupting courts, filling jails, and engaging in sabotage with the aim of convincing the Nizam to join the Indian Union. As stories of the conflict in the state spread in India, and refugees fled into the surrounding Indian provinces, the Government of India concluded that the unrest threatened to undermine peace in the whole of India.

When, in 1947, the authorities in Hyderabad refused to accede to either dominion, many opposition parties in the state called for the Nizam to join the Indian Union. The Congress launched a *satyagraha*, and encouraged students to leave schools, and lawyers to boycott courts. More radical members of the Hyderabad State Congress planned acts of sabotage, organised raids against government property and communications, and authorised their members to take action in 'self-defence', with weapons if necessary. According to an Indian government note in March 1948, 'the educational institutions function no more, the law courts are barren and the commercial life is shattered.'¹⁷ As many as 21,000 congressmen were said to have been arrested.¹⁸ However, the Hyderabad State Congress Party was divided organisationally along regional lines, and ideologically between socialists and liberals; its impact on the internal situation in the state, therefore, was more limited than that of the communists.¹⁹

The fight between the communists and forces loyal to the Nizam, by contrast, was characterised in the spring of 1948 as 'a people's revolt on the one side and fascist orgy and anarchy on the other'.²⁰ Its roots were in the insurgency begun in 1944-1945 in the Nalgonda and Warangal districts, known as the Telangana area, in the east of the territory. Forces loyal to the Nizam of Hyderabad sought to repress this communist movement. These forces comprised of police and military as well as local members of the Razakars. The Razakars, headed by Kasim Razvi, were a paramilitary organisation comprised of volunteers who were said to be as

enthusiastic as they were undisciplined.²¹ Razvi and his volunteers were associated with the Majlis-i-Ittehad-ul-Muslimein, a political party with considerable influence over the Nizam and dedicated to maintaining Muslim rule in Hyderabad.²² Both communists and forces loyal to the Nizam employed brutal measures to strike against their enemy and intimidate villagers into collaboration. According to a pamphlet that the Government of India had drawn up for public consumption, between 15 August 1947 and 13 September 1948, the communists had murdered 2000 people, attacked 22 police outposts, destroyed village records, manhandled 141 village officials, seized 230 guns, eight revolvers and one rifle, looted or destroyed paddy worth Rs70,000, robbed cash and jewellery worth Rs10,43,668, and destroyed 20 customs outposts.²³ While the primary fight up until early 1948 had been between the communists and the Nizam's forces, in May 1948, the Nizam and urban members of the communist party struck an improbable tactical alliance against a common enemy, the 'bourgeois' Indian Union. According to the agreement, which aimed to bolster the fight for the independence of Hyderabad, the Nizam amnestied communists from jails, cancelled outstanding arrest warrants and lifted the ban on the party.

During the summer of 1948, the Razakars continued to seek out and eliminate the enemies of the regime.²⁴ They targeted not only Hindus, but Muslims whose loyalty was in doubt.²⁵ As it became clear that negotiations with the Indian Union were stalemated, they also courted confrontation with Indian forces. Their raids against trains and villages in Madras, the Central Provinces (CP) and Bombay raised panic in these provinces. In July, Razakars killed six Indian Army troops in an ambush near the Indian enclave of Nanaj.²⁶ Equally, there were allegations that Indian troops crossed Hyderabad's borders as they gave chase to Razakars. The Government in Delhi concluded that the increasing influence and violence of these unruly volunteer paramilitaries proved that the Nizam had lost control over his own territory.

These battles threatened to spill into Union territory in more than one way. First, refugees fleeing the disorders escaped into Indian territory to form large camps in the provinces of Madras and Bombay. Some estimates put the number of refugees at 40,000 in CP alone.²⁷ Secondly, though the fault lines in the conflict did not run neatly along religious lines, the *perceived* 'communal' nature of the fighting threatened to revive Hindu-Muslim tensions in India.²⁸

The Nizam's government tended to privilege a few thousand Muslims, leaving an underclass of poor Muslims. Nationalist Muslims in the State tended to oppose the Nizam, while, as far away as Delhi, the Socialist Party enrolled Muslim volunteers to agitate against the Nizam.²⁹ At the same time, the Depressed Classes Association and Depressed Classes Conference in Hyderabad had joined hands with the Nizam in June 1947 to fight against incorporation into the Indian Union, because they believed accession would entail domination by caste Hindus.³⁰

The structure of rule in the state, however, where a predominantly-Muslim government and gentry held power over large numbers of disadvantaged, of whom the majority were Hindus, appeared to divide the population along religious lines. And some political parties took advantage of this. Since the war, the All-India Hindu Mahasabha had used this government structure to gather support for their organisation. In 1941 they began to keep a record of all, 'tyrannous and political injustices and unfairness on the Hindus in all Provinces and particularly under Muslim administration and Muslim states.'³¹ Hyderabad was no exception.³² As the violence of the Nizam's forces increased in Hyderabad, Hindu nationalists called on Muslims throughout India 'to give proof of their loyalty to the Indian Union,' by opposing the Nizam's regime.³³ Clearly, the subtleties and complexities of the Hyderabad situation were being folded into all-India communal politics. The Government of India,

therefore, concluded that the unrest in Hyderabad threatened to destabilise 'the communal situation in the whole of India'.³⁴

In the volatile international situation in South Asia in the year following independence, Nehru had been reluctant to use force to bring Hyderabad into the Indian Union.³⁵

The Indian economy was suffering a crisis of inflation, accompanied by a panic in the gold market, which impelled the Government of India to re-impose controls on textiles and other essential commodities. In addition, the autumn of 1948 was a tense time for the militaries on the subcontinent. Pakistan had admitted that its troops were present in Kashmir, and Nehru was writing of being at war with its neighbour, albeit an undeclared one.³⁶ India feared that any move against Hyderabad would prompt a military response from Pakistan. Though Pakistan had no plans to protect Hyderabad with arms, India did not know this.³⁷ Moreover, the new government in India was trying to calm tensions after the violence of partition, and struggling to provide for millions of refugees. The situation in Hyderabad, they concluded, must be resolved before it adversely affected India's internal and international security.

On 13 September 1948, therefore, the Government of India declared a state of emergency, and sent its troops into Hyderabad State. During the 'police action', the Indian Army entered Hyderabad with the objective of forcing the Nizam to re-install Indian troops in Secunderabad to allow them to restore order in the state. The Nizam surrendered in four days, and the Government of India appointed Major-General J.N. Chaudhuri as Military Governor. Delhi decided that the Nizam could retain his position as Rajpramukh, though law-making and enforcement power rested with the Military Governor.

Hindu-Muslim relations and the character of the new Hyderabad State

Once they had seized control of the territory, the new Military Governor, Major General Chaudhuri, the Chief Civil Administrator, D.S. Bakhle, and the Government in Delhi had to ask themselves what character and composition they wished the new Hyderabad state to have. This question involved a number of different elements. First, to what extent would those who took part in violence before and during the police action be punished for their activities? Secondly, how far would the Muslim-dominated administration in the state be altered? Finally, what role would the Congress Party have in the new state? Given that each of these questions impacted Hindu-Muslim relations, Nehru felt that the decisions which they made in Hyderabad would be seen as the touchstone of the Indian government's minority policy.³⁸

Before the invasion of Hyderabad, Nehru's primary concern was to normalise Hindu-Muslim relations there and in the rest of the country. He wrote to Patel that, after the problem of the Razakars, all other issues were 'relatively secondary'.³⁹ Before the first Indian troop set foot in Hyderabad, there was much uncertainty over whether the police action would provoke an adverse reaction amongst Muslims in India. In the state's surrounding provinces, therefore, provincial governments detained dozens of Muslims, including Members of the Legislative Assembly, for 'security reasons', on the grounds that their sympathies with Hyderabad might spur them into inciting unrest.⁴⁰ As troops marched into the state, many Muslims in India lent their support to the police action, however.⁴¹ Prominent Muslims in Delhi publicly welcomed the Government of India's choice to come to the aid of the 'innocent masses' threatened by the Razakars, and appealed for calm.⁴² In the event, there was no trouble in India during the five days of the police action. Indeed, before reports emerged of the fighting within the state, Nehru ventured to declare that Hyderabad had 'suddenly opened out a new picture of communal peace and harmony.'⁴³

Quickly, however, stories began to seep out of large-scale violence within the territory in the immediate aftermath of the police action. It is unclear exactly what happened between the people of Hyderabad, the members of the falling regime, and the invading forces during and immediately after the police action, but it appears that there was widespread bloodshed as the population took the opportunity to commit acts of violence against the Razakars and other Muslims. Two prominent nationalists, Pandit Sunderlal and Qazi Abdulghaffar prepared a report on the situation after Nehru appointed them to tour the state and assess the extent of the destruction, but the original was suppressed and only scraps of it remain.⁴⁴ They recorded that after 13 September, there had been a widespread anti-Muslim purge, which had occurred primarily in the Marathwada and Telangana areas. What evidence is available suggests that Hindu residents as well as some members of the Army attacked persons and property in the weeks after the police action began.⁴⁵ Conservative estimates suggest that 50,000 Muslims were killed.⁴⁶ Others claim several hundred thousand died.⁴⁷ Indian troops in some places remained aloof from these activities, in others, they were implicated in them.⁴⁸ Sunderlal and Abdulghaffar concluded that, 'In general the attitude of the military *officers* was good but the *soldiers* showed bigotry and hatred.'⁴⁹ The invasion of Hyderabad had not heralded a new era of communal harmony in the territory. Instead, the main task of the new authorities in the state was to cope with the aftermath of the turmoil.

In order to depose the existing regime and to contain the unrest, the Government of India's police and military authorities had detained Razakars, Hindu militants, communists and many others more loosely connected with the general upheaval. According to their own figures, the military and police detained over 13,000 Muslims, plus several hundred Arabs and Pathans, who were associated with the Razakars and the Nizam's irregular forces. Another several thousand Hindus were jailed after having been implicated in the post-police action reprisals against Muslims. Many

communists were also detained. But it is clear that, with their limited knowledge of the local situation, the invading forces simply jailed thousands of suspects without real knowledge of their activities. The police and military were captive to local informants, who took advantage of the situation to have their political enemies imprisoned.⁵⁰ Indeed, many of the difficulties which the colonial regime had faced when confronting large-scale communal unrest also affected the early postcolonial government: the police and military were disposed to make mass arrests in order to restore order, and to think about prosecution only after the event. But court cases often simply provided another arena for the conflict, and the government came under political pressure to release those detained.⁵¹

Having imprisoned an estimated 17,550 people as they entered the territory, the Government of India was left with the questions of what to do with all the prisoners rounded up in the upheaval, and how to relieve the problem of over-crowded jails.⁵² In Hyderabad, the Government of India inherited a criminal justice system which had been paralysed by the conflict, and could not process any significant number of cases. This meant that, just as in British India, politics came to determine who was subjected to formal punishment, and who escaped. Of course, many of the political aims of the Nehru government were different from those of the British: they were concerned not to spend money on expensive legal proceedings which could otherwise be used for development projects; and they were sensitive to the importance of political parties in a democratic age. For their part, many members of the public remained constant in their insistence that, when the government punished participants in communal violence, this only worsened relations between those communities who were perceived to be at loggerheads with one another.⁵³ For these reasons, though thousands were originally detained, only a few exemplary persons remained in jail by 1953.

Given the volume of cases, the military regime decided to prosecute only those 'who indulged in the worst kind of atrocities'.⁵⁴ In the six months following the Nizam's defeat, therefore, the government released over 11,000 Muslims without trial because no incriminating evidence against them existed. They also deported some 2000 Arabs back to Aden and a similar number of Pathans to 'other parts of India'.⁵⁵ Major-General Chaudhuri and his administration planned to prosecute the remainder of those detained. Accordingly, shortly after the proclamation of the State of Emergency, the Government of India propounded a Special Courts Order to dispense with the large numbers of persons in jail. In a word, the order was designed to process cases speedily. To this end, it relaxed the standards of written evidence by requiring only summaries of the evidence rather than full accounts; it made it impossible for an accused to deliberately delay proceedings, e.g. by hunger striking; and, at first, it provided for no right to appeal to higher courts. This latter provision was amended in October 1949, to allow appeals to the High Court for major offences. There was no mention either way as to access to a lawyer, and it appears that while some of the accused obtained counsel, others declined or were denied access to one.⁵⁶ The ordinance strongly resembled those which had been passed by the colonial government during the twentieth century. For example, it incorporated the lessons which the British had learnt by making it impossible for a defendant to delay a case by hunger striking.⁵⁷

In reality, the Special Tribunals were anything but speedy. In each of the courts sat a three-member panel, all of whom had to be present for a case to proceed; when one member was sick or on leave, the tribunal did not meet. Further, English was the working language of the tribunals, but there were few advocates who were able to conduct a prosecution in English.⁵⁸ As the trials made halting progress, thousands languished in jails waiting for the police to finish investigating their cases or for the courts to begin their trials.⁵⁹

By April 1949, appeals for an amnesty were gaining volume. Thirteen Urdu newspapers jointly asked the government to free Muslims who had been imprisoned 'on mere suspicion' and had yet to stand trial. The editors suggested that these men had suffered in jail long enough, and that their continued detention would serve no good purpose. To release them would help create a 'harmonious atmosphere' in the state, and it would foster the minority community's confidence in the government.⁶⁰ Similarly, Swami Ramandanda Tirtha, leader of the Congress Party in the state, agreed that the institution of cases for events which had occurred nine months before was 'causing great discontent'.⁶¹

The constraints of governance in a democratic state had an impact in three rather contradictory ways on the decisions which the government made about these prisoners. First, as these men had been detained for several months without trial, the International Committee for the Red Cross was pressing Nehru to see that those detained were either prosecuted or released.⁶² Nehru had long since realised that the eyes of the world were on Hyderabad and wished to prove that the new Indian Government could be balanced in its approach to both Hindus and Muslims.⁶³ Secondly, it was the widely held opinion amongst the new rulers of the state that the communist and 'communalist' parties in the state remained popular because the state Congress Party was weak. Chaudhuri, therefore, hoped that the release of prisoners would 'rehabilitate the prestige of the Hyderabad State Congress' Party in the eyes of the public in Hyderabad, and improve relations between the state and national sections of the party.⁶⁴ Even so, there could be no general amnesty because the Military Governor still wished to prosecute prominent Razakars such as Kasim Razvi.⁶⁵

When the government of Hyderabad, in consultation with the centre, weighed these arguments, they knew that any policy adopted could not be seen to favour either Hindus or Muslims. The new government convinced itself that equal blame did attach to each community. In Major-General Chaudhuri's words, 'in political physics, Razakar action and Hindu reaction have been almost equal and opposite'.⁶⁶ Thus, when it was decided to free all Hindus and to institute a programme for the review of Muslim cases with an aim to gradually letting many out of jail, the government preferred that the policy be given no publicity.⁶⁷ Releases were staggered and former prisoners made to report periodically to the police.⁶⁸

Because prosecutions of either Hindus or Muslims in cases of 'communal' violence tended to elicit allegations of bias, any cases which were brought to court had to be designed to minimise ethnic tensions. Thus, Kasim Razvi and four of his associates were prosecuted for the alleged murder of a fellow Muslim, Shoebullah Khan. The victim, a nationalist journalist who had opposed the Razakars, was killed on 22 August 1948. His murder attracted public interest, though only after the police action had begun. *The Bombay Chronicle* described the journalist as 'a brave young man' for refusing to bow to the will of the Ittehad-ul-Muslimein. The paper went on to declare Shoebullah 'a martyr in the cause of the people'.⁶⁹ Though a Special Tribunal found Razvi and his cohorts guilty, they were acquitted in the High Court. The same men stood accused in the Bibinaga Dacoity Case, which ran simultaneously with the Shoebullah Khan case. In the former, it was alleged that, when passing through Bibinaga station in a train, the accused had shouted 'Shah-e-Osman zindabad', but the people in the station had replied with the nationalist slogan 'Mahatma Gandhi ki jai'. The accused then disembarked, and proceeded to burn down a house, and beat and rob those in the vicinity of the station.⁷⁰ In this case, the High Court upheld the Special Tribunal's guilty verdict, and the men were sentenced to imprisonment. It was believed that if this type of case were chosen then the prosecutions would be more

likely to inspire in the public feelings of pure abhorrence or deep nationalism, rather than enmity between Hindus and Muslims.

As news of the convictions of Razvi and his men reached the public, prominent politicians again pressed Nehru to show generosity to the Muslims of Hyderabad.⁷¹ The Prime Minister was sympathetic. Hyderabadis Muslims, he wrote to Patel, exemplified a unique 'and rather attractive culture', and were 'very much above the average'.⁷² In essence, Nehru argued that Muslim prisoners in Hyderabad were not criminal types, and therefore did not merit punishment. Instead, their behaviour in the summer and autumn of 1948 was analogous to the 'madness' that seized 'decent people' in the country during partition. Many of those guilty of partition violence remained free in India and lived 'as respected citizens.'⁷³ By this logic, if the crimes of partition could be buried, so could those of Hyderabad's accession. Nehru also warned that if a gesture of 'friendliness' were not offered 'to those who are down and out and full of fear' these disenfranchised Muslims could join forces with the communists. Finally, the Prime Minister argued, in a developing state the money spent on prosecution could have 'brought rich results if spent on constructive activities in Hyderabad.'⁷⁴

When Nehru first voiced these arguments, Patel demurred. He was convinced that the promise of penal action against criminals had helped restore law and order, and that if that promise were not fulfilled, it would signal the government's partiality for Muslims and would endanger the peace in the state.⁷⁵ By the time the cases of Kasim Razvi and of the ex-ministers of the Nizam's regime had wound their way through the judicial system, Patel had passed away and elections were about to be held under a much improved political atmosphere in the state. In January 1952, all ex-Ministers were released; only Kasim Razvi and a few members of the Nizam's regime who had been involved in the most notorious cases remained in prison.⁷⁶

In the end, only a handful of symbolic Razakars were punished with formal imprisonment. Just as its colonial predecessor had been, the Indian government faced administrative constraints which precluded the use of the ordinary judicial system to dispose of every case arising out of large scale violence. The police and military, lacking real intelligence or familiarity with the territory, jailed thousands without obvious cause, and without labouring to find one. Courts, even special tribunals, were unable to work through the cases at a reasonable speed. Pleas for amnesty inevitably arose in circumstances in which the members of the public believed that people were being detained unfairly for protracted periods. Political considerations, therefore, determined the futures of those who found themselves in jail.

Intimately tied to these issues was the question of the Hindu-Muslim balance in the services. The well-known rivalry between Patel and Nehru was crucial in this respect, as Patel often ran the States Ministry without as much consultation with Nehru's Cabinet as the Prime Minister would have preferred.⁷⁷ Before the invasion, Nehru had presided over a meeting in which it was decided that, in order to be generous to the Nizam and to create a positive impression on the other princely states, the military regime ought to change as little as possible in Hyderabad. Dramatic administrative and policy changes in the territory were to wait for a democratically-elected government.⁷⁸ At other levels of administration, however, divergent ideas took hold. The new authorities in Hyderabad attempted to adjust the ethnic balance in the executive, police and administrative services, where Muslims predominated. To this end, they dismissed over a hundred officers, from the Chief Secretary to low-level police personnel.⁷⁹ They also detained many of those local officers who were suspected of participating in the violence which accompanied the police action. In addition, they attempted to reduce the number of Muslims working in the civil service

or sitting as judges through forced retirement, or transfer from the state. They adopted a policy of not hiring new Muslims in the services. The civilian administration under Vellodi continued this policy.⁸⁰ And the government introduced in June 1950 under a scheme of diarchy had similar ideas.⁸¹

To replace those dismissed, they drafted in junior officers from Bombay, CP and Madras. This created greater difficulties, however, as many of the new officers were not only inexperienced, but were also unable to speak the languages of the people under their jurisdiction, and were unfamiliar with local conditions.⁸² This left the administration generally, and the criminal justice system in particular, unable to function efficiently or effectively. The Prime Minister objected to these schemes on the grounds that they were both inspired by 'communal' chauvinism and impractical because they brought in incompetent outsiders.⁸³ Nehru, along with many Hyderabadis, called for qualified Hyderabad residents to fill vacant posts. However, the people taking the reigns of power in Hyderabad were able to circumvent these orders by falsifying residency documents.⁸⁴ Thus, the answers which were found to the question of the ethnic composition of the services were neither similar, nor coordinated. It is clear that the new Indian government in Delhi, like its British predecessor, had to contend with competing visions of the state. These visions were not identical to those present before 1947, but they were a mark of the continued inability of the centre to elicit discipline and obedience from the individuals it employed.

The Congress party in Hyderabad

The final question facing the new authorities in Hyderabad was what the role of the Congress Party in the state ought to be. Initially, the answer seemed relatively straightforward to the government in Delhi. Congressmen at the head of the

Government of India wished the Hyderabad State Congress Party to guide the future of the state. To some extent this decision can be explained by the supposed ideological affinity between the local and the national party. Technically, the Hyderabad State Congress had not been part of the all-India party because affiliations with outside organisations had been banned under the Nizam.

Hyderabad's Swami Ramananda Tirtha, however, had participated in the non-cooperation movement in Sholapur, and later made frequent visits to Gandhi. Tirtha often consulted him on matters of policy, though the two did not always agree.⁸⁵ In addition, the all-India party had contributed to the Congress *satyagraha* in the state in 1938.⁸⁶ Moreover, the Hyderabad State Congress was also one of the few political organisations which was not confined to a single linguistic group, and which attempted to span the entire state. It would be easier to work with a single organisation rather than with the several linguistic parties.

At the time, however, the Hyderabad State Congress had been in existence for little more than a decade, and had operated as no more than a token institution before 1946. It suffered from organisational shallowness and internal divisions.⁸⁷ If it were to take power successfully, the Hyderabad State Congress Party would need all the help it could get from the national party. To this end, when they took over the governance of the state, the Indian authorities ordered the release of all Congressmen who had landed in Hyderabad's jails during their campaign of *satyagraha* and sabotage before the police action. Before the release, there was some debate as to whether those who had committed crimes of violence should be freed. In the event, Congressmen accused of violent crimes were let out, while communists were kept in jail, whether their crimes involved violence or not.⁸⁸ Under these orders, the Government of India released 1222 out of 1736 detenus, and 7893 out of 9218 political prisoners.⁸⁹

The situation was far more fluid than had been anticipated, however. As the military and police attempted to restore order by arranging prosecutions against those who had partaken in the violence, many Congressmen ended up back in jail. The Military Governor reported that one faction in the party, 'has given information against the members of the other groups for having been concerned in the commission of atrocities after police action.'⁹⁰ It became clear that the fissures within the Hyderabad State Congress would not be easy to repair. Nehru met with Congressmen in the state to persuade them to bury their differences in the interests of their country.⁹¹ V.P. Menon and Sardar Patel, repeatedly pressed the divergent blocs in the party to adopt a 'united approach', but their 'bickering' and 'mud flinging' continued unabated.⁹² Thus, though the Government of India originally had intended to establish a constituent assembly in Hyderabad, and to transfer power to a civilian government composed of Hyderabadis, within a few months of the police action, both objectives were soon shelved. The government in Delhi refused to hand power to democratically-elected representatives when the Hyderabad State Congress remained in ideological and organisational disarray.⁹³ It therefore orchestrated a more gradual transfer of power, and did not sanction state-wide elections until 1952.

If the state comprises not only policy, but institutions and individuals, it is difficult to draw a clear and simple picture of the Indian state during the first months after the police action because these three levels seem to be pulling in different directions. Policy coming from the Government of India level was clearly concerned to appear even-handed in its punishment of participants in the violence which surrounded the deposal of the Nizam's regime. Nehru, at least, was also keen to avoid making drastic changes to state institutions. But as they took control of Hyderabad, the new Indian government found itself with poor institutions and independently-minded local officers. As a result, the composition of the administration in Hyderabad was changed significantly, and Muslims tended to be disenfranchised during this period. The

nature of politics in a democratic state also affected policy, for the centre's decisions were designed to improve the stature of the Congress party, and to appeal to certain members of the electorate. But there were others who were not so easily pleased, and it is to the communists that we now turn.

The communist insurgency and the making of the new state

When they arrived in Hyderabad, the Indian military found that the communists had done great damage to the structures of government in the Telangana region, but that they had also introduced reforms on an impressive scale. The government, therefore, both fought the communists, and learned from them. Or rather, they fought them first, and then they learned from them. Their various encounters with the communists affected the future of India as a whole in many ways. This section will highlight two. First, some of the oppressive measures used against the movement came to be incorporated into the new nation's constitution. Secondly, the development work of the communists encouraged the government to adopt its own programme of uplift for the peasantry.

While the main justification the Government of India used as they entered Hyderabad was to end the 'communal' violence, they soon found that the problems in the state were intimately related to the communist uprising which was flourishing in the Telangana region of the state, for the violent struggle against the Nizam was centred in Telangana and led by communists. The communists drew adherents from a number of fronts. Amongst the poor peasantry and landless labourers, there was great resentment against the *jagirdari* system of landholding which governed 43 per cent of land in the state. This system was infamous for the high rate of forced labour extracted from peasants who held little land, were given paltry access to water and manure, and were subjected to high rates by (often absentee) landlords. Moreover,

during the Second World War, the burden of a compulsory levy fell heavily on the peasants who were experiencing similar agrarian troubles to those which plagued the rest of India. Rural areas also lacked facilities for medical care and education. These factors combined with a system in which customary class distinctions were often reinforced with brutal violence to leave a large number of peasants alienated from those who governed them.⁹⁴ In addition, urban communists and wealthier peasants had initially fought their own battles under the communist banner, but by 1948, the coalition between poor and middling peasants had fallen apart.⁹⁵

In rural areas, the communist cause, led by Ravi Narayan Reddi and organised under the aegis of the Andhra Mahasabha, sought to alleviate the grievances of the poor peasants in the Telangana area.⁹⁶ Though at the outset, they only targeted zamindars and deshmukhs, the police and military were pulled into the conflict at the request of local magnates, and by December 1945, the communists had launched a full-scale agitation against the state. Initially, they assaulted the prestige of government officials, especially the police. They progressed to boycotting local revenue collectors and judicial officials, and then to establishing their own panchayats and courts. Between July and November 1946, encounters between the communists and the Nizam's forces grew increasingly violent, and in the last two months of that year, the Nizam's police and military, with the occasional aid of local Razakars, undertook coordinated action against the communists. The Nizam's forces' tactics were varied. They cordoned off villages and captured suspected communists *en masse*, shot into crowds, burnt villages and engaged in widespread loot in a manner than that was described by one Congressman as 'absolutely indiscriminate and organised.'⁹⁷ Habeeb Mohammed, the subedar of Warangal, was later tried for crimes which included murder, and the burning of two hundred houses in the village of Gurtur. The taluqdar of Nalgonda, Moazzam Hussain, was said to have ordered the death of twenty 'innocent Hindus' after a group of several hundred

communists had attacked and killed several dozen Razakars.⁹⁸ The communists responded with 'punishment' against government officials and suspected collaborators. Their measures were said to be more targeted but equally brutal.⁹⁹ Accounts of the action taken by both sides were documented by the Government of India,¹⁰⁰ by politicians such as Sarojini Naidu's daughter, Padmaja Naidu,¹⁰¹ and they also appeared in the press.¹⁰²

When it became clear that the communists had not laid down their arms when the Indian Army arrived, the Military Governor adopted a policy of rooting out communists wherever they were found. Rhetoric was found to match. Nehru instructed Chaudhuri that the fighters in Telangana should not be referred to as communists, but as terrorists. The Prime Minister wrote, 'too much talk of communists confuses the issue because communists in other countries function differently.'¹⁰³ He made a distinction between communists in the Soviet Union and Indonesia who opposed imperialism, and those fighting the free government of independent India. To add factual support to this discourse, the Government of Hyderabad drew up a pamphlet entitled 'Communist terrorism in Hyderabad'. The pamphlet's message was simple:

the Communist hooligans of Hyderabad have carried forward their campaign of crime to an extent that assures it a prominent place in any anthology of destruction.¹⁰⁴

Government forces, it was implied, had the right to use force to restore order, and to remove these outlaws from the territory. The means adopted to dislodge the communists were also heavy-handed. By December 1949, the police and military had jailed over 6000 persons without trial, and yet the ranks of communists seemed to be growing.¹⁰⁵

Fundamental Rights in the Indian Constitution and the situation in Hyderabad

Though these detentions did not have much effect on the communist movement, they did have a profound impact on the shape of the Indian Constitution, which was finalised during this crucial period in the country's history. As the document was being drawn up by the Constituent Assembly, the sub-committee on Fundamental Rights was given the task of articulating the legal, political and social rights of the new citizens of the Republic of India.¹⁰⁶ B.R. Ambedkar drew up a set of rules for arrest and detention which would suit India's unique needs. After many revisions, the substance of Ambedkar's final, multi-part article provided for very little protection against long-term detention without trial. It laid down rights for those arrested or detained, but then stated that these rights did not apply to those held under preventive detention laws which might be passed by the legislatures.¹⁰⁷ Ambedkar justified the text on two grounds. First, India was in great turmoil: refugees, economic crisis, uncertainty over princely states and the rise of communism throughout the country justified the use of preventive detention. Secondly, it was not a 'practical possibility' to expect the current executive, judicial and administrative system to process and review large numbers of detentions, given the current political situation in the country.¹⁰⁸ The infrastructure they had inherited was inadequate for the work at hand. If the constitution were to endow citizens with the right to have their cases reviewed in less than three months, as critics of the clause had suggested, then thousands would have to be released because courts and review boards would fail to meet the deadline.

It would be easy to conclude that these measures signalled the willingness of the Government of India's new leadership to anchor their power in the country by any means necessary. However, the articles adopted in the constitution must be seen in the context of the recent past in India. That most Congressmen had been detained

without trial for several years during the recent war affected the way that detention was viewed in the country. Imprisonment without trial was seen as a measure necessary in the face of grave danger. But the inveterate legalism of the leadership of the nationalist movement encouraged them to try to articulate in law the precise terms on which that power could be exercised. And yet, with knowledge of the weakness of the institutions which they had inherited, the constitution makers were unwilling to be tied down. The clause was the uneasy result of a compromise between legalism and pragmatism.

Civilian administration and the victory of the generous

Just as the constitution came into force, the political situation in Hyderabad began to take a new direction. In December 1949, the Military Governor's administration ended, and M.K. Vellodi replaced Major-General Chaudhuri at the head of the new civilian administration in Hyderabad. Vellodi toured the Telangana districts and found that the authorities stationed in the area had not dealt with the communist cause 'with any understanding'. He testified that, 'the villagers who had been alternately beaten up by the Military and the Police and the communists had a haunted look.'¹⁰⁹ This section examines how the civil administration won the war with a combination of more responsive policing, and more aggressive programmes of development.

Though the communists were branded 'terrorists' in public, the government quietly learned lessons from them. It was clear that the communists had earned the support of the people because they had tapped into grievances which the Indian government in the state had not begun to address. Assessing the achievements of the communists in the field of social and economic uplift, the Intelligence Bureau's Deputy Director deemed them 'positive and in some cases great.'¹¹⁰ The communists had redistributed land and livestock, reduced rates, ended forced labour and

increased wages by one hundred percent. They inoculated the population and built public latrines; they encouraged women's organisations, discouraged sectarian sentiment and sought to abolish untouchability. 'Thus', concluded the Deputy Director, 'the Communist regime was one of relief and uplift to the isolated villager and improved his self-respect.'¹¹¹

Members of the government in India were not ignorant of the significant influence of agrarian uplift on the political situation. Indeed, Nehru encouraged the Ministry of States to view the problems of the peasantry in Hyderabad in the context of the 'great agrarian revolution ...taking place over these vast areas of Asia'.¹¹² In light of the communist uprisings in Burma, Malaya and Indonesia in 1948, it was obvious to the more discerning members of India's governing class that the communist movement appealed to those in Telangana who suffered under conditions of socio-economic distress.¹¹³ Indeed, soon after the police action, Swami Ramananda Tirtha and his group in the State Congress cautioned Nehru that the use of force against communists would have to be supplemented with agrarian reforms in order to strike at the 'root cause' of the movement.¹¹⁴

As the state's first Chief Minister, Vellodi initiated a number of more nuanced military measures designed to disrupt the communist movement. He replaced the Brigadier in charge of the Telangana area, who spoke no Telugu, with Captain Nanjappa of the Indian Civil Service, who acted as Special Commissioner in the region.¹¹⁵ Review committees were constituted to consider the cases of prisoners who were elderly, infirm, or were no threat to security.¹¹⁶ Within a year over 5000 detenus were freed.¹¹⁷ Nanjappa substituted the sweeping and heavy-handed operations of the military with small police parties which worked on the basis of intelligence.¹¹⁸ Home guards and village patrols were organised to assist the police.¹¹⁹ In the beginning of 1951, Nanjappa gave secret instructions to start a 'whispering campaign' to let it be

known that those who laid down their arms voluntarily would have their cases 'favourably considered.'¹²⁰

The authorities also began to build or repair infrastructure from roads and wells to dispensaries and schools. They passed a Tenancy Act, which was designed to improve the rights of tenants by capping landholdings, opening the market to cultivators, and protecting tenants from ejection.¹²¹ Although land reforms were not implemented in a uniform manner, and they did not go far enough in many areas, the Act went some way to recognising peasant grievances.¹²² A Tribal Reclamation Scheme was introduced in Warangal, under which two teams of Social Service Officers were constituted to 'redress grievances and create contentment' amongst the inhabitants of the area.¹²³ To this end, they travelled through rural areas, and tried to settle any outstanding disputes, and alleviate all major difficulties in the lives of the villagers. These officers aimed to see that vacant government land was allotted, tenants' rights confirmed, disputes with absentee landlords settled, land taken by moneylenders restored and debts reconciled. Having been allotted a lump sum of two lakhs, and an annual budget of 1.38 lakhs, they arranged for the supply of essential commodities such as cloth, kerosene and iron at subsidised prices.¹²⁴ Police and Revenue officials who visited tribal people distributed medicines, sold cheap cloth, and handed out free dhotis, sarees, soap, slates and books. As a result, noted the Deputy Central Intelligence officer with a hint of surprise, 'their cooperation with the forces of law and order in this division is most spontaneous.'¹²⁵ They were even helping to capture communists.¹²⁶

There are indications in the available documents, however, that these schemes were not without elements of coercion. The hill tribes in the area, the Koyas, Chenchus and Lambadas, were said to have had connections with the communists, who used them as couriers, and their settlements as hide-outs.¹²⁷ In order to disrupt the

association between the two, the tribes 'were uprooted from their villages inside the forests and made to live nearer to human habitation.'¹²⁸ By February 1951, 7000 out of 30,000 Koyas in the Warangal area had been settled in villages under this scheme.¹²⁹ It was widely reported that, because re-located tribes people lacked basic facilities such as drinking water, they and their livestock fell victim to hunger and disease.¹³⁰

Measures for the uplift or simple relocation of tribesmen and of the peasantry, whether forced or voluntary, seemed to have drawn many away from communist influence. As a result, the communists had difficulty securing food, water and ammunition from the population.¹³¹ Moreover, the Communist Party of India (CPI) was divided over whether to continue the violent struggle in Telangana, or to participate in the general elections due the following year.¹³² In Hyderabad, the movement split along the same lines. Raj Bahadur Goud, and Maqdoom Mohiuddin, members of the City Communist Party, as well as Ravi Narayan Reddi, a prominent leader of the Andhra Mahasabha came out of hiding to disassociate themselves from the violent movement. They were promptly arrested.¹³³ After seeking guidance from Moscow and Beijing, the CPI and the Andhra Mahasabha called off the armed struggle in the state in mid-October 1951.¹³⁴ Top-ranking communists visited the state to support the call for a turn to electioneering. Though the change in policy did not satisfy all members of the movement, it brought about a formal end to the Telangana struggle.¹³⁵ In 1952, the various parties of the left in the state united to form the People's Democratic Front to contest the forthcoming general elections.

The fight against the communists can be divided into two phases, the first executed by the military, the next orchestrated by the civilian administration. The military phase of the campaign bore remarkable resemblance to military action during the British period. Hampered by a dearth of intelligence, and blinkered by the over-riding

imperative to restore order, their over-bearing acts of oppression and indiscriminate punishments produced either bitter quiescence or unending antagonism in the subject population. The Indian government in Hyderabad came into its own when Vellodi took power at the head of a civilian administration. Vellodi and Nanjappa 'discovered' that if they could slake the population's thirst for basic goods, the government could win their loyalty as well. And, marking a crucial departure from the British period, they found the funds necessary to achieve this end.

This can be seen as part of a larger, global shift both in the nature of governance more generally and in counter-insurgency tactics in particular. After the second world war, the nature of citizenship changed as the responsibility of the state for the social and economic welfare of its population was greatly expanded. At around the same time, the British, too, began combating the communist insurgency in Malaya with measures designed to ameliorate the economic conditions in the countryside.¹³⁶ The leadership of the new Indian nation quickly grasped the notion that if they were to earn and retain the loyalty of the people of India, they would have to fulfil the promises of the nationalist movement and provide uplift for the common people. If they failed in this task, they risked losing the allegiance of villagers, peasantry and labourers to communists who promised the prosperity that the Congress party could not deliver.

The end of Hyderabad

Hyderabad's fate, in the final account, was intimately connected with that of South India as a whole. Since independence, significant sections of the population had urged the Government of India to re-divide the provinces in India along linguistic lines. Hyderabad, situated in the centre of South India, and populated by four distinct linguistic groups, was elemental to this vision of India. Indeed, as the existence of

Hyderabad kept these groups from being unified with their linguistic brethren, it was seen by some as the 'centre of gravity of the British Empire in India.'¹³⁷ Socialists in the new nation detested the feudal conditions extant in the state, and believed that the system could only be abolished by dismembering every element of the Nizam's regime.¹³⁸ The disintegration of Hyderabad, in these views, was essential in order to establish real swaraj in India.

Though he cautioned against repeating the sins of partition, Nehru conceded that, in principle, if there was 'strong and widespread' support for the re-drawing of India's internal borders, then 'a democratic government must ultimately submit to it.'¹³⁹ In Hyderabad, politics had long moved along linguistic lines, and the major players, including the Andhra Mahasabha, and the faction of the Congress Party led by Swami Ramananda Tirtha, favoured the break-up of the state.¹⁴⁰ The People's Democratic Front, the socialists and the Peasants and Workers Party participated in the campaign for the disintegration of the state as well.¹⁴¹ In addition, the incorporation of Hyderabad into the Indian Union had emphasised the importance of local officers who spoke the local language of the population. This realization, combined with the agitation for linguistic states, tipped the balance against the continued existence of Hyderabad. In 1953, the state of Andhra Pradesh was carved out of Madras. In 1956, the Telugu-speaking regions of Hyderabad, including Telangana, were joined with the new province. And Hyderabad's Marathi speakers were eventually amalgamated into the new state of Maharashtra, and its Kannada speakers into Karnataka.

Conclusion

In light of the experience of Hyderabad, how can one characterise the state in independent India? Though this article only concerns Hyderabad, the police military

and bureaucracy which form the basis of this analysis were drafted into the state from outside, and, though one must be cautious, it is possible to draw conclusions which range beyond the borders of the former princely state. It is clear that, while there were some continuities, there were also sharp differences between the colonial and postcolonial state. When the members of the new government took over the institutions left behind by the British, they inherited many of the constraints of the colonial system. Courts were easily overwhelmed by unrest; prisons continued to be used as holding cells, rather than as disciplinary institutions; the police and the military were often clumsy and heavy handed, especially in the first phase of the occupation; and local officers could not always be relied upon to implement the centre's policies as directed. The colonial apparatus simply did not provide the stability and coherence which many scholars have presumed.

The new Government of India was able to integrate Hyderabad into the Indian Union because it was innovative. These innovations were inspired as much by pragmatism as by democratic concerns and ideological change. Because the Congress Party was concerned to assert its influence over the voting population, members of the government tended to formulate policies to serve this end. Intimately connected with the democratic imperative was the new socialist ethos which influenced government policy. Whether inspired by the communists of Telangana, contemporary practices of counter-insurgency, or Nehruvian socialism, the postcolonial state was more directed towards the uplift of Indian villagers. It quickly learned that development programmes could be more effective than coercion in certain circumstances.

Above all, the rulers of independent India were remarkably flexible, particularly during the first few years after 1947. In Delhi and in Hyderabad members of government were not, as a whole, intractably loyal to any single idea. They were willing to adapt their policies to changing facts on the ground. This means that they did not fight all

their battles in the same way: in Hyderabad development was an important element in their fight against communists; in other places, other tactics predominated. In Hyderabad, new styles of governance had to be developed precisely because postcolonial India did not possess the institutional framework necessary to fight communists using the oppressive powers of the colonial police, military and bureaucracy. If later governments were able to secure their tenure by using these institutions, they did so only after significant change. Indeed, the military changed structurally and doctrinally after 1947.¹⁴² And the ranks of the police and bureaucracy expanded remarkably.¹⁴³ Historians must now turn our attention to these changes, and we must begin to view the Nehruvian era as a time of uncertainty, dynamism and even contest within the new Indian state.

¹ Khilnani, *Idea of India*, p.32.

² Bose and Jalal, *Modern South Asia*, p.204. Also, Brass, *Politics of India*, Chatterjee, 'Development Planning', Hasan, *Politics and the State*. The few dissenting voices tend to be those of economists, see, e.g. Bardhan, *Poverty, Agrarian Structure and Political Economy in India*.

³ Sherman, 'Politics of Punishment and State Violence'.

⁴ see, Narasimhulu, *Telangana Saayudha Poraatam [Telangana Armed People's Struggle]*, Ramachandrareddi, *Telangana Poraata Smrtalu [Telanaga Struggle Memoirs]*, Sundarayya, *Telangana People's Struggle*, Tirtha, *Memoirs*, Stree Shakti Sanghatana, 'We Were Making History'.

⁵ Aziz, *Murder of a State*, Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*, Copland, 'Lord Mountbatten', Menon, *Integration*, Munshi, *End of an Era*, Witmer, 'The 1947-1948 India-Hyderabad Conflict'.

⁶ Prasad, *Operation Polo*.

⁷ Pavier, *Telengana Movement*.

⁸ Copland, "'Communalism" in Princely India, Roosa, 'Quadary of the Qaum'.

⁹ Copland, 'Lord Mountbatten', Menon, *Integration*, Witmer, '1947-48 India-Hyderabad Conflict'

¹⁰ Interview between Mountbatten and Nehru, Sardar Patel and Mr Kripalani, 10 June 1947, in Mansergh, ed., *Transfer of Power*, Volume XI, Document 124.

¹¹ Gopal, ed., *Selected works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, second series (hereafter *SWJN*), volume 7, New Delhi, 1988, p.229, speech in the Constituent Assembly (Legislative), 7 September 1948.

¹² Patel, *For a United India*, p.11.

¹³ Attlee to the Nizam of Hyderabad, 27 July 1948, National Archives UK, PREM 8/818.

¹⁴ Personal Minute from the Minister of State for commonwealth Relations to the Prime Minister, 22 September 1947, National Archives UK, London, PREM 8/568.

¹⁵ HRH the Nizam of Hyderabad to Prime Minister Attlee, 4 July 1948, National Archives UK, PREM 8/818.

¹⁶ V.P. Menon, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of States, Note for the Cabinet, May 1948, National Archives of India, New Delhi, (hereafter NAI), Ministry of States f.1(6) H, 1948.

¹⁷ A note on Hyderabad submitted to the AISPC standing committee meeting, 23-24 March 1948, NAI, Ministry of States f.337 H, 1948.

¹⁸ Tirtha, *Memoirs*, p.191.

¹⁹ Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*, p.177, Roosa, 'Quadary of the Qaum'.

²⁰ A note on Hyderabad submitted to the AISPC standing committee meeting, 23-24 March 1948, NAI, Ministry of States f.337 H, 1948.

²¹ On the poor training and organisation of the Razakars, see. Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*, pp.208-211.

²² For the Intelligence Bureau's assessment of the threat posed by the Ittehad, see, M.K. Sinha, Deputy Director, Intelligence Bureau, 18 November 1947, NAI, Ministry of States, f.136 PR, 1947.

²³ 'Communist Terrorism in Hyderabad', 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.5(13) H, 1950.

²⁴ see, e.g. Smith, 'Hyderabad: Muslim Tragedy', p.44.

²⁵ see, e.g. Resolution of the Arabs of Jalsa against the Razakars, 21 February 1945, National Archives UK, DO 142/441.

²⁶ See, Prasad, *Operation Polo*, pp.29-39.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.38.

²⁸ By this point 'communalism' has been thoroughly entrenched in the nationalist lexicon. Pandey, *Construction of Communalism*.

²⁹ Fortnightly report from Sahibzada Khurshid, Chief Commissioner, Delhi, to R.N. Banerjee, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, 22 May 1948, India Office Records, British Library, London, L/P&J/5/288.

³⁰ Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*, pp.179-180.

³¹ Resolution no.11, Proceedings of the Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, 19 January 1941, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library (NMML), Hindu Mahasabha papers, C-30.

³² 'Statements of the Injured' [Hindi] *Om*, 22 June 1945, NMML, Hindu Mahasabha papers, P-45.

³³ CID report on the speech of Acharya Kripalani, Diary of the Superintendent of Police, CID Delhi, 17 April 1948, Delhi State Archives (DSA) f.68/47 Confidential part B.

³⁴ V.P. Menon, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of States, Note for the Cabinet, May 1948, NAI, Ministry of Statesf.1(6) H, 1948.

³⁵ Nehru to V.K. Krishna Menon, 15 August 1948, *SWJN*, volume 7, p.207.

³⁶ Letter to Lord Mountbatten, 1 August 1948, *SWJN*, volume 7, p.203.

³⁷ Minute from I.F. Walker, Brigadier, Military Advisor, 13 September 1948, National Archives UK, DO 134/22.

³⁸ Nehru wrote to the military governor, 'the solution of our minority problem largely depends upon the issue in Hyderabad.' Letter to J.N. Chaudhury [sic], 27 December 1948, *SWJN*, volume 9, pp.275-6.

³⁹ Extract from Nehru's letter to Patel, 6 June 1948, in Nandurkar, ed., *Sardar's Letters*, vol. V, p.110.

⁴⁰ Reports of 50 arrests in CP appeared in *The Bombay Chronicle*, 15 September 1948, p.4; another 70 people, including Mr M.A. Salaam, MLA, were reported to have been detained in Madras, *The Bombay Chronicle*, 22 September 1948, p.10.

⁴¹ Including the Indian Union Muslim League President, M. Mohamed Ismail, *The Bombay Chronicle*, 16 September 1948, p.5.

⁴² *The Bombay Chronicle*, 14 September 1948, p.7.

⁴³ To H.S. Sahrawardy, 24 September 1948, *SWJN*, volume 7, p.266.

⁴⁴ see, Khalidi, ed., *Hyderabad: After the Fall*.

⁴⁵ Sunderlal, and Abdulghaffar, 'Report on the Post-Operation Polo Massacres'.

⁴⁶ Smith, *Hyderabad*, p.46. Smith bases this figure on a report commissioned but never published by the Indian Government.

⁴⁷ Aziz, *Murder of a State*. Aziz mentions Sunderlal and Abdulghaffar's report in connection with this figure (p.199-202), but the version of their report cited in this article does not calculate or estimate the total number killed.

⁴⁸ Note to Ministry of States, 26 November 1948, *SWJN*, volume 8, p.107.

-
- ⁴⁹ Sunderlal and Abdulghaffar, 'Report on the Post-Operation Polo Massacres', p.100, emphasis in original.
- ⁵⁰ Major-General J.N. Chaudhuri, Military Governor, Hyderabad, to Shri M.K. Vellodi, Secretary to the Ministry of States, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.
- ⁵¹ Sherman, 'Politics of Punishment and State Violence', ch.6.
- ⁵² Chaudhuri to Vellodi, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.
- ⁵³ Sherman, 'Politics of Punishment and State Violence', ch.6.
- ⁵⁴ Chaudhuri to Vellodi, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.
- ⁵⁵ quotation from *The Bombay Chronicle*, 12 November 1948, p.4. On the programme to deport Arabs, see National Archives UK, CO 1015/322.
- ⁵⁶ e.g. the case of twelve Telangana leaders sentenced to death by the special tribunals. D.N. Pritt, President, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, London to Prime Minister of India, 21 January 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, f 5(6) H, 1950.
- ⁵⁷ Draft Special Courts Order, [undated, October 1948], NAI, Ministry of States, f.100 H, 1948.
- ⁵⁸ D.S. Bakhle to M.K. Vellodi, 27 October 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(25) H, 1949.
- ⁵⁹ It was estimated that in March 1950, 20-25% of those in jail had been remanded in custody until the police concluded investigations into the charges made against them. Extract from Fortnightly report from the Governor of Hyderabad, 31 March 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, f.5(23) H/50
- ⁶⁰ Quotation is from the editorial (presumably translated). Chaudhuri to Vellodi, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Quoting letter from Swami Ramananda Tirtha to the Deputy Prime Minister on 10 May 1949.
- ⁶² Nehru to Dr Paul Reugger, International Red Cross, 30 July 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(15) H, 1949.
- ⁶³ Nehru to J.N. Chaudhury [sic], 27 December 1948, *SWJN*, volume 9, pp.275-6.
- ⁶⁴ Chaudhuri to Vellodi, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Extract from letter from the Military Governor, Hyderabad, 17 June 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.

⁶⁸ Extract from the minutes of a meeting held in States Ministry, 28 September 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(25) H, 1949.

⁶⁹ *The Bombay Chronicle*, 22 September 1949, p.6.

⁷⁰ Note by Government of Hyderabad, Home Department, [undated], NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(16) H, 1951

⁷¹ Padmaja Naidu, Sarojini Naidu's daughter, wrote to Nehru : 'The time has come for forgiveness for all those who sinned so grievously both before and after the police action. Without that there is no chance of any enduring peace of security for the people of any community here.' Nehru to Vallabhbhai Patel, 1 October 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, 1(44) H, 1950.

⁷² Nehru to Patel, 19 October 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, 1(44) H, 1950.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Patel to Nehru, 26 October 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, 1(44) H, 1950.

⁷⁶ Extract from fortnightly report from the Bombay outpost, no.2/52, 29 January, 1952, National Archives UK, DO 35/3264.

⁷⁷ see letters to Patel, 19 October 1950 *SWJN*, vol.15 part I, pp.184-186 and 29 October 1950, *SWJN*, vol.15 part II, pp. 131-132. Patel to Nehru, 26 October 1950, in Nandurkar, ed., *Sardar's Letters*, vol. III, pp. 6-14.

⁷⁸ 'Broadcast from New Delhi', 18 September 1948, *SWJN*, volume VII, p.259.

⁷⁹ Officers dismissed included the Chief Secretary, the Engineer-in-Chief, the Director of Medical and Jail Departments, Director of Elections, Director General of Police, 16 Collectors, 16 Superintendents of Police, and almost 100 *tehsildars* (sub-collectors of revenue) and police personnel were replaced. *SWJN*, volume VIII, p.108 FN 9.

⁸⁰ Extracts from the Minutes of the meeting held at Bolarum Residency, 26 April 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, f.5(23) H/50.

⁸¹ In late 1950, Nehru came across plans that intended to see to the 'dispersal' of Muslim civil servants out of Hyderabad. He wrote to the States Ministry to object: 'I must say that I have

the strongest objection to it. I do not mind, of course, Muslim officers who are competent being sent elsewhere in India. That I would welcome, but evidently the motive underlying this is somewhat different and is communal. I think, therefore that this policy should be definitely put down.' Nehru to N. Gopaldaswami Ayyengar, 23 December 1950, *SWJN*, volume 15, part II, p.136.

⁸² M.K. Vellodi, Chief Minister, Hyderabad, 18 December 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.1(45) H, 1950.

⁸³ Nehru to N. Gopaldaswami Ayyengar, 23 December 1950, *SWJN*, volume 15, part II, p.136.

⁸⁴ Dispatch from the Deputy High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in India to the Acting High Commission for the United Kingdom in India, 17 September 1952, National Archives UK, DO 35/3264.

⁸⁵ Tirtha, *Memoirs*, p.116.

⁸⁶ Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*.

⁸⁷ For a history of the struggle to establish a Hyderabad State Congress, Gnanaprakasham, 'The 1938 Satyagraha in the Hyderabad State', and Tirtha, *Memoirs*. On the party's divisions in 1948, Benichou, *Autocracy to Integration*, p.177.

⁸⁸ V.P. Menon, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of States, to D.S. Bakhle, Chief Civil Administrator, Hyderabad, 8 October 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.327 H, 1948.

⁸⁹ Proceedings of the meeting held at Bolarum Residency, 21 September 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.308 H, 1948.

⁹⁰ Chaudhuri to Vellodi, 31 May 1949, NAI, Ministry of States, f.1(50) H, 1949.

⁹¹ *The Bombay Chronicle*, 25 December 1948, p.1.

⁹² Vallabhbhai Patel to Janardanrao Desai, Working Committee Member, Hyderabad State Congress, 1 October 1949 in Nandurkar, ed., *Sardar's letters*, vol II, pp.72-73.

⁹³ *The Bombay Chronicle*, 1 December 1948, p.5, and 25 December 1948, p.1.

⁹⁴ Deputy Director, Intelligence Bureau, Note on the Communist Movement in the Telengana [sic] Area of Hyderabad State, December 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.11(1) H, 1949.

⁹⁵ Margrit Pernau, *Passing of Patrimonialism*, pp.314-316. On the grievances of the middle-class members, see memorandum submitted by Yeshawantrao Joshi, General Secretary,

Hyderabad State Hindu Mandal to Sardar Hon'ble Jogendra Singh, K.T. Education Member, Government of India, 12 October 1944, NMML, Hindu Mahasabha papers, file P-45.

⁹⁶ Ravi Narayan Reddi had been a member of the nascent Hyderabad State Congress until 1941. When he and his predecessor, Mandamoola Ramachandra Rao, took the Andhra Mahasabha towards communism, the organization split, with M. Narsing Rao leading nationalist elements under a new banner, the Andhra Conference. Tirtha, *Memoirs*, p.148.

⁹⁷ Shri Burgul Ramkrishna Rao, Hyderabad State Congress leader, 29 January 1948, NAI, Ministry of States f.337 H, 1948.

⁹⁸ Note by Government of Hyderabad, Home Department, [undated], NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(16) H, 1951.

⁹⁹ Shri Burgul Ramkrishna Rao, Hyderabad State Congress leader, 29 January 1948, NAI, Ministry of States f.337 H, 1948.

¹⁰⁰ For a graphic account of some of the worst crimes, see Report from the Agent-General, Hyderabad, 24 April 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.3(19) H, 1948. For government records of them see, NAI, Ministry of States, f.3(19) H, 1948; NAI, Ministry of States f.19(66) H, 1950

¹⁰¹ See Padmaja Naidu Papers, NMML.

¹⁰² e.g., *The Bombay Chronicle*, 16 September 1948, p.5.

¹⁰³ To J.N. Chaudhury [sic], 22 May 1949, *SWJN*, volume 11, pp.180-181.

¹⁰⁴ 'Communist Terrorism in Hyderabad', 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.5(13) H, 1950.

¹⁰⁵ M.K. Vellodi, Chief Minister, Hyderabad, 18 December 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.1(45) H, 1950.

¹⁰⁶ See, Rao, *Framing of India's Constitution*, Simon and Nirmal, 'Fundamental Rights'.

¹⁰⁷ Rao, *Framing of India's Constitution*, pp.231-249. For the full debate over the new article, see Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. 9 (30 July - 18 September 1949).

¹⁰⁸ Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, 16 September 1949, Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol.9 (30 July – 18 September 1949), p.1561.

¹⁰⁹ Vellodi, 18 December 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.1(45) H, 1950.

¹¹⁰ Deputy Director, Intelligence Bureau, Note on the Communist Movement in the Telengana [sic] Area of Hyderabad State, December 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.11(1) H, 1949.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, see also, Sundarayya, *Telangana People's Struggle*, pt.I, ch.4.

¹¹² Note to Ministry of States, 8 April 1949, *SWJN*, vol.10, pp. p.340-1.

¹¹³ V. Ayyaswami, Superintendent of Police, Special Brach, Criminal Investigation Department, memorandum 'Communists Activities in Hyderabad State', 22 September 1948, NAI, Ministry of States, f.100 H, 1948.

¹¹⁴ *The Bombay Chronicle*, 25 December 1948, p.1.

¹¹⁵ Note by Vellodi, 18 December 1950, NAI, Ministry of States f.1(45) H, 1950.

¹¹⁶ Note by Vellodi, 18 April 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, f.17(1) H, 1950.

¹¹⁷ Special Commissioner, Warangal, Fortnightly Situation Report on the terrorist activities in the Special Area, 30 April 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(5) H, 1951.

¹¹⁸ Special Commissioner, Warangal, Fortnightly Situation Report on the terrorist activities in the Special Area, 15 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(5) H, 1951.

¹¹⁹ Intelligence Bureau's Communist Survey No.17, 15 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States f.6(7) H, 1951.

¹²⁰ Special Commissioner, Warangal, Fortnightly Situation Report on the terrorist activities in the Special Area, 15 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(5) H, 1951.

¹²¹ *Times*, 27 November 1950, National Archives UK, DO 35/3264.

¹²² Nehru to Rajendra Prasad, 9 January 1949, *SWJN*, vol.9, p.279 FN2.

¹²³ *Report on the Administration of Hyderabad State*, September 1948 – March 1950, pp.115-116, Andhra Pradesh State Archives, Hyderabad.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ Deputy Central Intelligence Officer's Tour Note, 25 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States f.6(7) H, 1951.

¹²⁶ Special Commissioner, Warangal, Fortnightly Situation Report on the terrorist activities in the Special Area, 15 February 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(5) H, 1951.

¹²⁷ Intelligence Bureau's Communist Survey No.17, 15 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States f.6(7) H, 1951.

¹²⁸ *Report on the Administration of Hyderabad State*, September 1948 - March 1950, pp.69-70.

¹²⁹ Deputy Central Intelligence Officer's Tour Note, 14 February 1951, NAI, Ministry of States f.6(7) H, 1951.

-
- ¹³⁰ Tirtha, *Memoirs*, pp.213-215, Sundarayya, *Telangana People's Struggle*, pp.252-3.
- ¹³¹ Intelligence Bureau Interrogation Report, 11 January 1951, NAI, Ministry of States f.6(7) H, 1951, Sundarayya, *Telangana People's Struggle*, pp.423-4.
- ¹³² Amongst those who advocated an end to the struggle were Ajoy Ghosh, S.V. Ghate and S.A. Dange. Alam, 'Communist Politics', p.189.
- ¹³³ Special Commissioner, Warangal, Fortnightly Situation Report on the terrorist activities in the Special Area, 15 May 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.6(5) H, 1951.
- ¹³⁴ Pavier, *Telangana Movement*, pp.166-168.
- ¹³⁵ Documents seized in a raid in the autumn of 1951 suggested that the 'rank and file' objected to the call to abandon violence. Fortnightly report from the Chief Minister of Hyderabad for the first half of October 1951, NAI, Ministry of States, f.17(7) H, 1951.
- ¹³⁶ On Malaya see, e.g. Harper, *End of Empire*, Stubbs, 'Malayan Emergency'.
- ¹³⁷ Tirtha, *Memoirs*, p.65.
- ¹³⁸ *The Bombay Chronicle*, 20 September 1948, p.8.
- ¹³⁹ Draft prepared by Nehru and accepted by the Linguistic Provinces Committee appointed at the Jaipur Congress, 26 March 1949, *SWJN*, volume 10, p.132.
- ¹⁴⁰ On the Hindu Mahasabha's views see, V.G. Deshpande to Veer Joshi and Veer Bhadra Rao, 14 February 1950, NMML, Hindu Mahasabha papers, file P-127.
- ¹⁴¹ Extract from fortnightly report from the Bombay outpost, no.6 (II)/52 for the period 10th to 23rd March 1952, National Archives UK, DO 35/3264.
- ¹⁴² Cohen, 'Military and Indian Democracy'.
- ¹⁴³ On the latter see, Potter, *India's Political Administrators*.