

JUSTICE Srikrishna's INJUSTICE

How SKC Report tried to suppress truth
and deceive Telangana

&

Why India should Reject SKC Report



TELANGANA DEVELOPMENT FORUM - INDIA

Reg. No. 139/IV/2007

402, Sai Pragati Plaza, Above Food World, Nallakunta,
O.U. Main Road, Hyderabad - 500 044, Phone : 040-66666643
www.telangana.org

D.P. Reddy, M.Tech.
President
Cell : 98481 28708
reddydp@yahoo.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, announced the formation of the Committee for Consultations on the Situation in Andhra Pradesh (CCSAP), popularly known as Justice Srikrishna Committee (SKC), the proponents of Telangana Statehood received it with a healthy dose of skepticism. But, the optimist in them overtook the agitator as the Committee boasted of very prominent names as its members.

The lakhs of representations to the Committee - demanding the formation of Telangana State - underline this optimism that Justice Srikrishna will do justice to the beleaguered region at last. Telangana Development Forum (TDF), a not-for-profit, apolitical organization of Telangana citizens and Telangana NRIs worldwide, too submitted its report 'Deprivation to Telangana: Case for Separate Statehood' and TDF INDIA appeared before SKC & presented its case to the Srikrishna Committee on 7th May, 2010. The report, prepared by experts from diverse fields, was received with appreciation for its objectivity and professionalism. Following up the report, the members of TDF worldwide, held a video conference with the Committee on 16th June, 2010.

Like crores of fellow Telanganites, TDF members too awaited the Committee's report with a bated breath unknowing that they were in for a rude shock!

The Srikrishna Committee, wisely, ends its report with this quote of Sri Vallabhbai Patel: *"...it will be a folly to ignore realities; facts take their revenge if they are not faced squarely and well"*. But, the Committee itself ignores the facts and realities it discovered to produce a specious, pernicious, self-contradictory and a self-negating report.

Telangana, innocently, expected that the Committee would make public the naked unvarnished truth – the injustices meted out to the Region – for the whole world to see. Instead, the Committee, through its

disservice to the cause of Truth and contempt towards Telangana, heaped insult over injury.

Hence, TDF felt duty bound to bring to light the Committee's 'condone the culprit and vilify the victim' mindset. This book is an attempt to do what originally was the mission of SKC – Discover and Report TRUTH!

TDF expresses its deep reverence to the martyrs and appreciation to the Movement's real soldiers - the students, employees, farmers, and activists from all walks of life - who unflinchingly and relentlessly pushed forward the demand of Statehood for Telangana. They are a constant source of inspiration for us. We thank Sri Sujai Karampuri, Sri K Amar Nath, Sri Dileep Konatham, Sri Madhav Mudumbai, Sri M Narayan Reddy (Ex-MP), Sri CH Hanumantha Rao (Former Member, Planning Commission), Sri R Vidyasagar Rao (Retired Commissioner, Ministry of Water Resources, GOI), Dr. Gautam Pingle (Director, Administrative Staff College of India), Prof. Madabhushi Sridhar (NALSAR), Sri KP Reddy (Retired S.E.), Prof. S Sreedhara Swamy (Telangana Senior Citizens Association), Sri K Raghu (TEEJAC), Sri Subhash C Reddy, Prof. E. Revathi, Sri Ram, Sri G Bhiksham, for their invaluable and untiring efforts in making this book see the light of day. The long list is only indicative and not exhaustive. Many TDF members and Telangana NRIs (TNRI) worldwide chipped in with their insights.

This book would not have been possible without the moral and financial support from Telangana Vision Group of TDF Washington, D.C., Chapter.

Our Special thanks to Sri Viplav R. Putta President TDF -USA, Prof. Kodandaram, Chairman T-JAC and the Telangana Vidyavantula Vedika for their encouragement and support.

Lastly, we want to express our indebtedness to Justice L. Narasimha Reddy of the A.P. High Court for his refreshing streak of judicial independence in calling the SKC's confidential Report (Chapter 8), so the people can know what sorts of committees are appointed by the governments. This is precisely what TDF tries to achieve through this book.

D.P.Reddy



President, TDF-India

And

Coordinator, SKC Working Group



TELANGANA DEVELOPEMENT FORUM USA INC

815 Dow Road, Bridgewater, NJ 08807

www.telangana.org

Not-For-Profit TaxID 22-3674333

Viplav Reddy Putta, *President*

Dear Citizens of Telangana,

I choose to address every single citizen of Telangana after nearly 12 years of writing and addressing every single leader from Prime Minister of India down to the MLA elected by each of you to listen to the concerns of Telangana.

Our concern has been simple: that not every Telangana citizen is not heard of his or her concerns with regard to what they wanted all along, seeking the ability to define their own destiny and develop as a State within the context of Indian Republic.

We know now that we have reached a point of no return on our path to Separate State, which is what our forefathers desired to begin with. As I write this letter, every single living and breathing person in Telangana is fully awake and is taking the responsibility toward achieving exactly that destiny. We are closer than ever in achieving it.

I testified and tried my best to open the eyes to Srikrishna Committee with hope and trusted that our concerns will find equal placement in their report. Instead, their chose to ignore our reason and brought out a hidden agenda that is bought and paid for by the illegitimate establishment with colonialist mentality of Andhras. We totally reject their premise for any option other than forming the State of Telangana. As I told each of the member of the Committee very clearly, our struggle continues for the sake of our beloved land and its cherished past, to redeem the promise of our forefathers that have raised our crops, children and carried the burdens even in most trying circumstances.

I want our citizens to know that none of your efforts to be heard will go waste. We as the Non-resident Telanganites settled abroad will continue to have you in our prayers and will do every single bit as it is our duty to help mother land "Telangana".

We see this as our blessing to add value to our lives through this struggle and thank mother Telangana for providing us this historic opportunity.

Viplava Reddy Putta

President,
Telangana Development Forum-USA

CONTENTS

Chapter 1:

- 'Why India Should Reject Srikrishna Committee Report?'
By **Sujai Karampuri** 1

Chapter 2:

- 'Subjectivity, Irrationality and Prejudice in SKC Report'
By **K Amar Nath** 14

Chapter 3:

- 'Factual Errors in Srikrishna Committee Report'
By **Konatham Dileep and Madhav Mudumbai** 26

Appendix A:

- 'Srikrishna Committee Report on Telangana'
By **C.H.Hanumantha Rao** 35

Appendix B:

- 'A Critique of the Report of the Srikrishna Committee'
By **Dr. Gautam Pingle** 46

Appendix C:

- 'Intellectual Dishonesty in SKC Report'
By **Sujai Karampuri** 78

Appendix D:

- Parti - I 'Page 423 of Srikrishna Report'
Part - II Srikrishna's Principles of Injustice
By **Prof. Madabhushi Sridhar** 82

Appendix E:

- 'On Water Resources and Irrigation'
By **R.Vidyasagar Rao** 93

Appendix F:

- News Articles on Srikrishna Report
..... 100

Appendix G:

- News Reports on Srikrishna Committee Members
..... 106

CHAPTER- 1

'Why India Should Reject Srikrishna Committee Report?' By Sujai Karampuri

Srikrishna Committee Report is now being studied by the Central Government in New Delhi to provide a solution to the Telangana issue. Unfortunately, the report fails to provide a political solution to the current problem, and instead provides too many options thereby creating confusion. It provides six options which are self-contradicting making a mockery of itself. It has too many factual errors, and in some places downright supercilious when it calls entire people of Telangana lazy and subservient.

The report not only puts on record its prejudices against creation of new States in India but also callously dismisses a 54 year old struggle and a genuine aspiration of 35 million people as 'having some merit' and 'not entirely unjustified'. The report not only fails to deliver a practical solution to the impending problem in Telangana, but it poses a grave danger to Indian democracy by establishing an undemocratic yardstick for creation of new States in India.

Historical Precedents

Back in 1950s, the national leaders of the newly formed Indian Republic looked at the States divisions based on regional identity with strong suspicion. These leaders were still recovering from the aftermath of Partition and the recently concluded exercise of annexation of various reluctant kingdoms. Linguistic Provinces Commission under SK Dar and JVP Committee headed by Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramaiah rejected the idea of forming States based on language. The Dar Commission said 'Nationalism and sub-nationalism are two emotional experiences, which grow at the cost of each other' and therefore 'all sub-national tendencies in the existing linguistic provinces should be suppressed'. The JVP Committee held the security and unity of India paramount to caution that the 'language could equally be unifying and divisive force'.

However, the ethos that set democracy in motion in this country was guided not by such apprehensions expressed in these two commissions or committees but from practical experiences coming from dealing with expedient problems of that time. Certain events transpired in this country immediately after our Independence and solving them created a guiding benchmark for evolution of States in this country.

One such event is the demand of Andhra State. This demand influenced creation of Article 3 in Indian Constitution in the present form, led to constitution of States Reorganization Commission (SRC) that upheld the rationale to create linguistic States based on regional aspirations, led to rejection of recommendations from JVP and Dar Committee, and thus ultimately led to creation of a mature decision process in this country that dealt with many aspirations for Statehoods in India.

Many States, like Karnataka, Kerala, Andhra State, Maharashtra, Gujarat, were formed to satisfy the aspirations of people of India who have come together under the banner of one language. Many other States, like Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, were formed to satisfy

other regional aspirations. It is clear now that these benchmarks set forth during the early years of formation of India have resulted in creating a vibrant democracy in India contrary to the unfounded fears held by our leaders of that time that the country would disintegrate. It is apparent to any political observer now that the creation of new States to satisfy the aspirations of people based in regional identities actually strengthened Indian democracy, not weaken it. Rejection of recommendations of Dar Commission and JVP Committee are equally important for setting the above mature precedents.

A new benchmark for creation of States in India?

Another such committee now expresses apprehensions about creating States based on regional aspirations. Srikrishna Committee Report makes a clear departure from the innumerable precedents of the last sixty years that helped India become a mature democracy, strengthening its sovereignty, and setting a great example of staying united though extremely diverse. This report questions the legitimacy

of people's aspirations to demand a separate State and negates it in favor of keeping States united where majority will continue to suppress the minority.

Authors of Indian Constitution made extensive debates before they decided on steps to reorganize States in Indian Union. To make a case for Article 3 in the present form, they cite the example of then Andhras trying to create a State for themselves from Madras State. During those discussions, they made it clear that it is the will of the people which is paramount and that a majority should not be in a position to suppress a minority within a State. So that a minority group can form a State, they vested the powers to form a State only with Indian Parliament with clear implications that a 'consensus' may never be reached within the State.

SKC Report challenges the ethos of Article 3 that gives the will of the people the required legitimacy to form a State. It also challenges the SRC recommendations which considered the desire of a region to form a separate State, by asking 'whether a region can be allowed to decide for itself what its political status should be'. This is a dangerous observation, goes against the spirit of democracy in India, stops creation of States in future, making our country static in State boundaries. If the will of the people cannot decide the fate of a political status of a region, who else should decide?

SKC Report recommends Option 5 for creating a separate Telangana only if other two regions agree, thereby completely negating the very idea on which Article 3 was based. Their recommendations go against the vision of the authors of Indian Constitution and the spirit of SRC. Subjecting a minority to the tyranny of majority, the committee makes a mockery of Indian democracy.

If Srikrishna Committee Report becomes the yardstick to examine and satisfy aspirations of a region in India, then there is danger that we would reverse all these healthy precedents of the past. A minority group will never be in a position to form a State no matter how much they are suppressed or marginalized. All State formations would come to a halt in this country.

Are SKC members against creation of new States?

A constitutional democracy creates various safeguards to protect the interests of the minorities and underprivileged. When a majority colludes out of self-interest to form a single group, it can easily suppress the minority. To overcome this, Indian Constitution has provided various safeguards, like reservations for citizens of socially and educationally backward classes and women, and similarly it allowed for creation of new States out of regions.

Srikrishna Committee Report equates formation of new States within Indian Union to creation of new nations and goes onto provided 'economic' criteria to oppose such divisions. It cites the trend in the world 'towards economic integration with economic blocs consisting of many smaller nations being formed in the interest of enhancing economic opportunities' and discourages formation of smaller nations because they contribute to creating 'barriers to inter-State and intraState trade and movement of goods and services.'

What Srikrishna Committee misses out is that States are not nations. And that States are not formed on the basis of economic considerations but to fulfill regional aspirations. The report States that 'division of Andhra Pradesh can only be a negative factor which would inhibit the economic growth of the newly formed States.' It goes on to say that 'economically, the land locked region of Telangana may also lose out on access and opportunities to the eastern coastline which has a major port in Vishakhapatnam and many other sea ports.' The argument against 'land-locked' States has no merit. Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand, are all land-locked States.

The report negates the Statehood for Telangana on the grounds that it 'would only create a demand for a great number of small States resulting in problems of coordination and management.' Observing that one of the members is a retired judge, it is indeed a crooked way of delivering justice – to say that we cannot dole out justice because others would ask for the same.

While citing the recommendation of Fazal Ali' SRC, the SKC report cites only those remarks which were against formation of separate Telangana while omitting the remarks which supported the formation

of separate Telangana. Also, Srikrishna Committee members did not consider the rationale of how nearly thirteen States have come into existence in independent India. It is clear that Srikrishna Committee started out with a prejudice against creating smaller States, against creating Telangana. Such a Committee's report should not be allowed to become a benchmark because it would mean there can be no land-locked States or smaller States in India ever again and that economic considerations would prevail over democratic aspirations.

An unbiased arbiter?

Telanganas have been demanding a separate State since fifty years, with the current agitation going back 15 years. Telanganas have cited discrimination meted out to them on various aspects in the State, in empowerment, in irrigation, in jobs, in opportunities etc. The committee was formed to 'examine the situation' in the State with reference to 'demand for a separate State of Telangana' and to 'review the

developments in the State since its formation'. It was given a mandate to be an unbiased arbiter to examine if indeed Telangana was discriminated. The contention is between people of Telanganas who cite discrimination from Seemandhra-controlled Government of Andhra Pradesh. Justice Srikrishna seems to have forgotten what the role of a judge is. The committee, instead of donning the role of an unbiased judge between these two parties, has become a prosecutor on the side of Government of Andhra Pradesh. The Committee has used the facts given by the Government of Andhra Pradesh without questioning them, using the reports provided by Seemandhra leaders as 'evidences' while rubbishing all the facts and statistics provided by Telangana experts, economists, statisticians, professors, employee unions, engineers, poets, and scientists. If SKC were to believe the statistics provided by Seemandhra-controlled Government of Andhra Pradesh without questioning them, then why did we need the committee in the first place? If all these statistics are correct, and therefore there is no discrimination towards Telangana, then why did so many political parties, eminent leaders, including Home Minister support the Telangana's Statehood movement? It was egregious of SKC members to thank only a dozen Seemandhra VIPs at the starting of the Report but none of the Telangana members.

If such a report becomes a benchmark for resolving regional issues in this country, let it be known that privileged will always win over the underprivileged. This country will no longer stand for justice but for establishing the tyranny of the privileged.

Pathological contradictions

Not only does Srikrishna Committee Report fail to provide a political solution to the current Telangana issue, it does not even deserve the acclaim of an academic report. It has innumerable number of factual errors and is surfeit with obvious contradictions. Srikrishna Committee recommends six possible options for resolving the current problem in the State.

The Option 1 of keeping the State united as status quo is negated saying it is not possible to run the State the same without 'some intervention' on behalf of Telanganas. It cites the reason for Telangana movements in the past and the present as 'partial implementation of the Gentlemen's Agreement... the denial of fair share of water and irrigation resources, and perceived neglect in economic development of Telangana region.' And yet while recommending the Option 6 of keeping the State united with 'constitutional/statutory measures to address the core socio-economic concerns about development of Telangana region', it prescribes the same measures which are all considered to be failures in the history of Andhra Pradesh. It is an irony that Srikrishna Committee recommends Telangana Regional Council (TRC) without realizing a similar sounding Regional Standing Committee recommended by Gentlemen's Agreement failed miserably resulting in violent Telangana agitations of 1969. Telangana people are condemned into repeat history with the same experiments which stand failed.

The committee while giving the six options discusses the bogey of increase in Maoist activities in the State and keeps these discussions a secret. The committee believes that keeping the State in the present

condition (Option 1) is likely to give a filip to Maoist movement, and in another context it States that 'Telangana with or without Hyderabad is likely to experience a spurt in Maoist activity'. Since a spurt Maoist activities is an eventuality in this region no matter what the solutions is how does it matter which option is chosen?

Mohan Guruswamy writes: “...demand for a separate Telangana State [is] fobbed off taking recourse to the specious and nonsensical logic that the Naxalites will somehow take over Telangana in the end. If mal-governance becomes the only reason for the takeover by Naxalites, then it would seem the whole country is ripe for it”,

Why Option 4?

The mandate of Srikrishna Committee was to examine two options of creating separate Telangana and keeping the State united. The members have overstepped the mandate given to them and have raised several unnecessary options and issues creating more confusion. Also, some of these options suggest the deviousness of the members who wrote the report. For example, the inclusion of Option 4 in the report can only be seen as a revenge of Seemandhras to deprive and punish people of Telangana of some of prime assets. This option creates a new union territory for Hyderabad including many mandals and villages of Telangana. No evidence of people’s demand is given as to why certain tracts of Telangana lands are added to create a corridor, except for satisfying the Seemandhras desire to have access to this city. It should be noted that no mandals or villages from Rayalaseema or Coastal Andhra are added to this Union Territory.

While one of the biggest moot points for Telangana movement has been the deprivation of water, this option further exacerbates the sad plight of Telanganas by denying two of the biggest irrigation projects of this region. Both the Srisailem and Nagarjuna Sagar projects are included in the union territory of Hyderabad.

SKC report does not look at some relevant historical precedents while proposing Option 4. There are uncanny similarities between the debates on Hyderabad with those of Bombay and Madras. SKC completely and deliberately ignores these debates. Demands for union territory status for the city of Madras were made when Andhras separated from Madras State. The logic provided by the Andhras was that the city was developed by them and that a substantial size of population in Madras was Andhras. However, Madras remained with Tamil Nadu clearly rejecting the above logic provided by Andhras. While rejecting the claim it was Stated that such a precedent would lead to making most of the cosmopolitan cities of India into union territories.

In case of Bombay, the city was administered as a union territory for four years, and later made capital of Maharashtra, clearly rejecting the experiment as major failure. The demands made by Gujarati community were that Marathis were a minority in Bombay, that they were the investors and businessmen who built the city, that the city of Bombay was far more important to India as a port and a financial hub, that the city was cosmopolitan in nature and therefore should not be given to Marathis. In the end, these objections were rejected and cultural and geographical linkages were given the most importance overriding any apprehensions and fears over the future city and State.

This option creates 4 States out of Andhra Pradesh without admitting it – Telangana, Coastal Andhra, Rayalaseema and Hyderabad. While the committee rejects Option 5 on the grounds that it is hesitant to divide a linguistic State, it does not cite the same reasons to reject Option 4. Instead, it portrays Telangana man as a villain who would oppose this option.

Why India should reject Srikrishna Committee Report?

A jury's verdict is not supposed to satisfy everyone but deliver justice even when it faces stiff opposition from certain groups. The Srikrishna Committee report while trying to satisfy everyone has left victims dissatisfied. The best possible option recommended in the report is nothing but a rerun of failed history imposed onto Telangana people. The recommended steps are not original, lack creativity and lack maturity that is expected from a committee comprising of a retired judge, known bureaucrat, an economist and a social scientist. The report does not use the benchmarks used in creation of other States in India and does not provide a clear rationale behind its approach when dealing with case of Telangana.

The entire report is biased and has a tone which is objectionable. It is riddled with factual inaccuracies, mistakes and plain lies. The members resorted to frivolous and non-serious remarks during press meets, and partied with vested interests who wanted to derail Statehood to Telangana.

Indians clearly understood that India's strength lies in celebration of its diversity, allowing various groups to retain their identity within the confines of an overarching identity of being Indian. Creation of new States based on regional aspirations led to quasi-federalism in India thereby strengthening the democratic institutions in the country. These were possible because of application of recommendations of State Reorganization Commission while rejecting the recommendations Dar Commission and JVP Committee.

Srikrishna Committee report tries to create a new yard stick that reverses the norms and ethos used in creating new States in India. It puts a stop to creation of new States in this country. That will only push the desperate people in India to find solutions outside the purview of Indian constitution which will undermine India's democratic credentials and thereby threaten India's unity.

This report sets an ominous trend in Indian democracy and hence its rejection in its entirety is the duty of every Indian who believes in democratic values and deliverance of justice in this country. India should continue the path of creation of more States in India in accordance with regional aspirations of its people.

CHAPTER-2

'Subjectivity, Irrationality and Prejudice in SKC Report'

By K. Amarnath

A. Political

- 1 “The SKC Report says only this of the 1969 agitation: “The student agitation, as a result, passed into the hands of the politicians demanding separate Statehood, who formed themselves into what was called the “Telangana Praja Samithi”. The Samithi, thereafter, began to organize a planned agitation. The Government became tough with the agitating political leaders, while the agitation continued till November when there was a split in the Praja Samithi and slowly with the passage of time, normalcy returned to State”[Section 1.3.04, p.33].

“Telangana Praja Samithi” was not an obscure group. This was a nationally recognized party that fought the 1971 Parliamentary Election and out of 14 seats in Telangana, it won 10 when at the same time BJP won 20 seats in India. This electoral victory should not be brushed aside so easily. In late 1950s, during Samyukta Maharashtra Movement in Maharashtra which demanded separate Maharashtra for Maharashtrians, a political outfit called Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti won 101 seats out of 133, which resulted in creation of separate Maharashtra with Bombay as the capital. “And slowly with passage of time” TPS was merged with Congress Party, but Telangana agitation continued in the political circles

2. “Formation of Andhra Pradesh was the result of a protracted struggle for the cause of Telugu sub-nationalism seeking a separate identity.” [Section 1.3.04, p. 41] “The formation of united Andhra Pradesh was premised on the all inclusive Telugu ‘sub-nationalism’”. [Section 1.3.12, p.48]

While Telugu sub-nationalism could have been the basis for formation of Andhra State out of Madras State, this was not the basis on which Telangana merged with Andhra State to form Andhra Pradesh. Formation of AP happened because of political

developments after Fazal Ali Commission, rather than the struggle for Telugu sub-nationalism.

3. "Thus Telangana has a higher proportion of tribal communities and both Adivasi and other tribal groups have expressed strong opinions on the demand for Telangana." [Section 7.9.09, p.372]. "As discussed in detail later in this section, Adivasis residing in districts of Telangana prefer to remain in united Andhra or have their own State of Many Seema". [Section 7.9.10, p.373].

Contradiction. Said one thing in one place and said the opposite in another. Additionally, while talking about tribals, why did the SKC not mention anything about the Government of Andhra Pradesh (GoAP) commissioned "Report of Tribal Land issues in the Telangana Area" by J.M.Girglani IAS (retd.) to study the issue of Telangana Tribal Land rights in 2005? The Girglani report discussed in detail the violations done to Tribal land rights in Telangana by politically backed 'Andhra settlers'. Why did the SKC not see relevance?

- 4) "The matter should also be seen in the larger context of whether a region can be allowed to decide for itself what its political status should be, as that would only create a demand for a great number of small States resulting in problems of coordination and management". [Section 9.3.01(i), p.452].

Debates of authors of Indian Constitution and Fazal Ali's SRC recommendations clearly give credence and importance to aspirations of a region to create a new State. SKC report runs counter to the precedents of the past. What are the 'coordination and management' problems? Is the SKC implying creation of all new States has been a mistake and more importantly, is its suggesting a moratorium on creating any more States in India?

- 5) "Dalit groups from all the three regions, citing the viewpoint of Dr.B.R.Ambedkar, argued before the Committee that splitting of the State would break the domination of upper castes and provide opportunities for the SC, ST, and OBC communities in both the States ." [Section 7.9.02, p. 368].... separation will lead to these groups accounting for a much lower proportion at 68.6% in the Seema-

Andhra State. From the perspective of the disadvantaged groups in Andhra Pradesh, the separation may provide gains in one State, but will reduce their strength in the other State.” [Section 7.13.05, p.389]

The Committee overlooks that even after the division the socially disadvantaged groups would constitute around 70% of the population in Seemandhra, hardly 6% lesser than in AP. The basic point, however, is that given their large numbers, the weaker sections would be better able to articulate their problems and assert themselves in smaller and relatively homogeneous States because of their shared history and easy communicability (Ambedkar,1979; Rao, 2010).

- 6 **“Telangana groups argued before the Committee that political power is necessary for channeling resources and development benefits towards the region, that political domination by Seemandhra has adversely affected their prospects and that the only way out of this domination is to have a separate State.** The Committee examined this argument by merely counting the number of years for which the posts of CM, Deputy CM, and important portfolios were held by representatives from different regions, and observed that Telangana side can not claim total lack of representation as it held important portfolios of Home, Finance, Revenue and Irrigation for fairly long periods”. [Sections 7.17.03 – 10, pp. 406-10]

However, the matter is not so simple, as, even when the position of Chief Minister was held by ‘strong’ persons from Telangana, plenty of anecdotal evidence suggests that they felt helpless on vital issues and had to bow down to the wishes of Seemandhra. Political power for different regions flows basically from their respective numbers in the State legislature and not so much by the type of portfolios held or by the time period for which they were held. The latter are in fact determined by the former. SKC Report even got the number of CMs from Telangana wrong.

- 7 **“The Telangana movement can be interpreted as a desire for greater democracy and empowerment within a political unit. As Stated earlier, sub-regionalism is a movement which is not**

necessarily primordial but is essentially modern – in the direction of a balanced and equitable modernisation. Our analysis shows that cutting across caste, religion, gender and other divisions, the Telangana movement brings a focus on the development of the region as a whole, a focus on rights and access to regional resources and further, it pitches for a rights-based development perspective whereby groups and communities put forth their agendas within a larger vision of equitable development. There are strong indications that if Telangana does become a separate State, a movement for separation is likely to follow in Rayalaseema which remains the most backward region in the State.” [Section 7.18.02, p.413]

When there are such strong grounds for constituting separate Telangana State, it is not fair to withhold its formation simply for fear of its consequences for other regions in the country. Rayalaseema is backward, but its elite – political, bureaucratic and professional – is much stronger than its Telangana counterpart, thanks to its shared history with coastal Andhra and indeed with the rest of the South over a long period in the struggle for freedom, exposure to modern education and progressive land tenures when compared to Telangana. Rayalaseema can be assertive and succeed in protecting its rights and safeguards in the truncated and less heterogeneous Seemandhra after the separation of Telangana. But if it too fails in this and separation becomes inevitable, then this need not be a cause for alarm. The country, in any case, is in for an era of smaller States.

- 8 “A striking feature brought out by the Committee is the concentration of information technology (IT) and information technology enabled services (ITES) almost solely in Hyderabad accounting for 99% of the total exports from the State.” [Section 6.11.02, p.315]. While there are local investors in IT and ITES sectors, the composition of the firms established in the city is largely national and international in character. **Of the ninety four groups identified separately for investments in Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy, seventy four are from outside Andhra Pradesh, testifying to the breadth of investment linkages in the region. Even in Construction and Real Estate, Finance, Business**

Services, it appears that private A.P. based investors are not dominant. As such, the industry is connected more to the national (through investment) and global economy (through the market) than it is to the regional economy. Its private investments would be driven by the overall climate of certainty and availability of infrastructure, labour and other services.” [Section 6.11.02 - 04, 6.18.02 - 04, pp. 316, 330-32].

It is clear from the Committee’s findings that the adverse impact, if any, on the economy of Seemandhra on account of separation of Telangana with Hyderabad as its capital is not going to be significant. So why option 5 is not recommended?

B Public Employment

- 1 “We, therefore, suggest that there is no real need to have any additional administrative instrumentalities for protection of persons belonging to Telangana region in public employment. However, existing safeguards should be implemented with renewed vigour.” [Section 5.32.03, p.293]

How did the SKC arrive at this conclusion without discussing the Girglani Commission’s report which clearly noted the violations of safeguards given to Telangana people? From the individual figures cited by Girglani, the overall figure of Telangana jobs lost to non-locals is a minimum of 150,000. Even at a modest annual salary of Rs 1 lakh per annum (averaged over the thirty year span of the job), this amounts to Rs 45,000 crores of income loss to Telangana people! How did the SKC just ignore this?

- 2 “The Girglani Commission submitted its final report on 30.9.2004 with 126 findings and suggested 35 remedial measures.” [Section 1.3.11, p.47]

The report devotes a whole chapter to the Girglani Commission report without once mentioning even one of the 126 findings and that the figure for Telangana share of government jobs misallocated to non-Telangana persons varies from 1,00,000 to 2,00,000!! Total government jobs in the State are estimated at 12 lakhs, of which

Telangana should get a share of at least 4 lakhs. A loss of one quarter to one half of its entitlement would impact not only on Telangana incomes but also in alienation that the usual confrontation with non-locals in government employment brings. Why did the SKC not discuss this?

- 3 “As per the figures of Census 2001, the population of Andhra Pradesh was 762 lacs, out of which the working population was 348.65 lacs. The Employees Census, held in 2006, put the figure of total employees under the **State government (or in public employment)** at around 12.9 lacs. [Section 5.31.13, p. 290]

Public Employment includes not only State government employees but also employees working for Public Sector Industries, Panchayats or Mandals, Municipalities, and quasi-government organizations. There are almost 1200 Mandals (approx) and more than 16 Municipal Corporations whose employees are not included in the State government employee census. **In fact, State government employees constitute only half or less than half of ALL Public Employees.** In other words, we can double the number of the total State employees to get the full Public Employment population. Then how could SKC equate State government employees to total public employee number? Either SKC didn't care for accurate data or they had already made up their mind about their conclusions on the subject. At least 70% of jobs in organized labour are in public employment.

C Irrigation

- 1 “The Net Irrigated Area (NIA) in all the three regions of AP has increased over the years. In fact the NIA in Telangana has doubled (from 0.8 million hectares in 1956-60 to 1.7 million hectares to by 2006-09). Thus Telangana has experienced a **whopping** 113% increase; while coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema have experienced a much lower growth of NIA at 30% and 55% respectively. Telangana has experienced a remarkable increase in NIA after mid-1970s compared to the other two regions where there is a steady increase over time.” [Section 2.7.03, p.88]. “Tank irrigation has **reduced** from 4 lakh hectares in 1955-56 to around 2 lakh hectares at present.” [Section 4.4.08, p.189]

Why did the SKC avoid discussing how the “whooping” increase comes about? This was due to Telangana farmers who invested their own money to increase well irrigation over the same period ten-fold from about 1.30 lakh hectares to nearly 13 lakh hectares (overtaking, by far, tank- and also canal irrigation) as the major contribution to Telangana irrigation. SKC report plainly avoids mentioning that 76% of NIA in Telangana is at the farmers’ expense in bore well irrigation while the AP government went out of its way to pay and provide for the canal irrigation in Coastal Andhra.

D Backwardness

- 1 “While the farmers in all regions have shown stable income or income which has hardly changed; **the real income of the agricultural wage labour has declined considerably in Telangana**, whereas it has increased considerably in coastal Andhra region.” [Section 2.10.03, p.108, Figure 2.39, p.109]

Where are the figures? SKC did painstaking redefining and recalculations to show Telangana demand on weaker base (like to show Rayalaseema is worse off) but when statistics speak straight supporting the case, it will bury them in appendix. So we refer to Volume 2, Appendix Table 2-1 on page 121, the rural population is 182 lakhs in Telangana, 90 lakhs in Rayalaseema and 214 lakhs in Coastal Andhra. Thus 47% of the rural population being agricultural laborers in Telangana means that nearly 85.5 lakhs are in this category. SKC admits that the **“real income of the agricultural wage labour has declined considerably in Telangana” and refers us to another chart.** This Chart when closely examined indicates that in the decade between 1993-94 and 2004-05 this group of Telangana people (nearly 90 lakhs persons) **has seen a DECLINE of 35.9% in their income!!** Over the same period, the 42.7 lakhs of the Rayalaseema group have suffered a real income decline of ONLY 6.7%. Wonder of wonders is that the same group in the Coastal Andhra over the same period – no figures are given by SKC for their numbers – but SKC says it has ONLY increased by ONE percent in size. **However, the real income of the whole group in Coastal Andhra has INCREASED by a phenomenal 42.2%! So while real income (i.e., purchasing power) of**

Telanganas worst placed economic group amounting to nearly ten million persons fell by 36% that of the same group over the same time in Coastal Andhra ROSE by 42%!! So why was SKC not straightforward with these statistics?

- 2 **“Of the total 87% population covered by BRGF in Telangana, 46 % is covered under extremist affected districts selection criteria. Thus, a large percentage of population from Rayalaseema, relatively smaller percentage from Telangana and very small percentage from coastal Andhra were backward as per the BRGF backwardness identification criteria. Hence, the argument extended by some political parties and civil society groups from Telangana region does not get support from this analysis of the BRGF”** (Emphasis mine) p.81-82 **“Another factor considered as a special case (for BRGF) is the presence of left wing extremism. For example, five districts in Andhra Pradesh namely Nizamabad, Karimnagar, Medak, Khammam and Nalgonda, which are all from Telangana region, are included in the RSVY on the recommendation of the Ministry of Home Affairs. These left wing affected districts constitute 46 % population of Telangana (including Hyderabad) and about 19 % of the population of Andhra Pradesh. On the basis of other backwardness characteristics, four districts from Telangana, three from Rayalaseema and one from coastal Andhra are listed under BRGF. The BRGF population covered due to backwardness works out to be 41% (including Hyderabad) in Telangana, 74% in Rayalaseema and only 7% in coastal Andhra.”** [Section 2.6.07, p.81].

“Being the most backward region of the State, Rayalaseema is apprehensive of its fate in case an autonomous Telangana State is formed. The sentiment in this region, therefore, has been vehemently against the division of the State” [Section 7.2.12, p.353].

Parliament was told that 9 out of 10 Telangana districts were included in the under ‘Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF)’ initiated in 2006-07 to address the problem of regional imbalances. That covers 87% of population in Telangana. This is a devious and dishonest attempt of SKC to twist what the Government of India, Planning Commission and the Ministry of Panchayati Raj have Stated clearly. SKC is trying to convince its readers that Telangana was not backward by playing around with words that are not on record and

which make no sense. Even the expression “Backward Regions” is part of the title of the Central Scheme. Even by their logic “value of output per agriculture worker’, ‘agriculture wage rate’” are clear enough indicators of backwardness. And here SKC goes out of its way to give a spin to BRGF by redefining RSVY! This is what Planning Commission has to say about RSVY: 7.1.28.

The development of backward regions has been a major concern of planners in India. However, prior to the Tenth Plan, the issue of development of backward areas was approached as primarily one of development of StatesThe emphasis was on backwardness in terms of economic performance, though the impact of historical and social factors in economic matters was also recognized.... 7.1.29. The Mid-Term Appraisal of the Ninth Plan showed that despite these efforts, one of the most serious problems facing the country was the wide disparity and regional imbalances between States, and within a State between districts. It was these pockets of high poverty, low growth and poor governance that were slowing down the growth and development of the country. In the Tenth Plan, it was decided to have a new approach to target these areas through a specific programme for Backward Areas, and the Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana (RSVY) was introduced in 2003-04. (Emphasis mine) 11th Plan Document, Volume 1, pp.144-145.

“So it will be seen that that the BRGF is a fund for helping “pockets of high poverty, low growth and poor governance”, where “backwardness in terms of economic performance, though the impact of historical and social factors in economic matters was also recognized” and intended to rectify “the wide disparity and regional imbalances by a “novel approach towards tackling chronic regional backwardness”. Where is the reference to left-wing extremism in RSVY? So why did the SKC attempt the spin!?! It is clear it just attempted to show statistically that Rayalaseema is far worse and so Telangana shouldn’t complain!

E Economy

- 1 **“it is important to keep the city/district/urban agglomeration of Hyderabad accessible to people and businesses from any of the regions of AP or for that matter from any part of India and abroad. This can be accomplished irrespective of whether the**

political control over Hyderabad is wielded through a united AP or otherwise”. [Section 2.15.11, p.123]

As it is, we have a common national market in the country in which people belonging to several regions and States participate for mutual advantage. Restrictive practices in trade and business equally hurt those practicing them and, in any case, the Union Government cannot remain a mute spectator to such practices. **There can hardly be any basis for these fears when there is no evidence of restrictive practices in trade and business between the existing States in the country, including those recently created.**

F Culture

- 1 “Telangana experienced a long history of oppressive feudal rule which shaped the character of the people and also generated the resistance to it. ***Telangana people are often considered subservient and lazy*** and they feel that coastal Andhra people exercise a “veiled contempt” towards them. “[Section 7.15.12, pp.401 & 402]

Can any academic well-versed in history, sociology actually stereotype that a group of people are lazy and subservient! This is a stereotype propagated by chauvinist Andhriles and the SKC has got its report ghost-written by them.

- 2 *“The question of stereotyping and “being looked down upon” or “made fun of” is not peculiar to Telangana – unfortunately such stereotypes abound in all societies and are subject to change as the fortunes of such groups and sections of society improve. **The self-confidence has to come from within and cannot be legislated or dictated by policy.**” [Section 7.15.14, p.403].*

A pedestrian observation. How can a group of academics say that a people of a particular region lack self-confidence! Does that mean that Tamils lack self-confidence because Hindi movies make fun about them? Or that Jews lacked self-confidence in Hitler’s Germany when they were butt of all jokes!?! It is an embarrassment for this country that these are ‘observations’ of a central government’s team

of 'experts'. Why are laws and policies, if not for protecting the weak from the strong!?

G Options

- 1 Option II: "Only continued economic growth can lead to expansion of employment opportunities and therefore the current economic inter-linkages of Hyderabad with other regions need to be developed and preserved so that there is an assured climate of certainty and stable business environment." [Section 9.3.01(ii)(a), p.443].

Based on the above reason, Telangana with Hyderabad is rejected and the report recommends Option 2 – Hyderabad as UT. Again, the same report says "A positive aspect for Hyderabad is that regardless of the uncertainty engendered by the current political situation, investments in city infrastructure have continued. A number of major infrastructure projects have contributed to improve Hyderabad's capacity to absorb investments." (Page 319). The report so contradicting itself.

- 2 Option V: "(iv) even though water and irrigation issues can be handled by creating autonomous/semi-autonomous structures, the apprehensions of the people of coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema will continue to be voiced." [Section 9.3.01 (v)(b), p.451].

Option VI: "For management of water and irrigation resources on an equitable basis, a technical body i.e. Water Management Board and an Irrigation Project Development Corporation in expanded role have been recommended. The above course of action should meet all the issues raised by Telangana people satisfactorily." [Section 9.3.01 (vi)(a), p.456].

SKC report contradicts itself. In Option V, the SKC says Water and Irrigation issues cannot be handled alone by any autonomous or semi-autonomous bodies. In Option VI, we are told that the same bodies would handle these issues satisfactorily!

3. "In a nutshell, therefore, professional opinion was that the TRC could have been strengthened further in the post 1970 period. As events led to the formulation of the Six Point Formula, the TRC became redundant and was finally abolished in 1973." [Section 1.2.13, p.29]

How come the same formula which was rendered 'redundant', which was 'finally abolished' becomes a solution in Option 6? It is failure of Srikrishna for not studying why TRC failed in 1960s and 1970s. Recommending a failed experiment for addressing grievances of Telanganas is ridiculous.

4. **1.2.17** The Regional Committee brought it to the notice of the Government repeatedly that the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Rules, 1959, were not being implemented honestly and that non-Mulkis were being appointed to posts intended for Telangana Mulkis. It pleaded for the extension of the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957 by 5 years in 1964, and again in 1969. It also discussed the question of promotions and proper preparation of integrated seniority lists of the Andhra and Telangana employees. In a number of cases, the Government took whatever action was possible. [Section 1.2.17, p.30]

It shows futility of Regional Committee. Srikrishna Committee indirectly justifies the action with words 'Government took whatever action was possible'. By recommending same, whether this Srikrishna says Telangana should be satisfied with whatever action was possible on deliberations of proposed TRC? Is this the Constitutional safeguard, it is offering?

H Biased tone

- 1 "Over the years, there has been a *perceived sense of discrimination* in the Telangana region with regard to appointments in Government, making the issue highly emotional." [Section 5.1.01, p. 245]. "Although the zonal system has largely addressed regional employment disparities at lower levels, it is likely that coastal Andhra remains overrepresented at higher levels of the

State bureaucracy; this visibility of disparity at the higher levels contributes to the *perceived sense of discrimination* especially in the context of higher aspirations among Telangana natives.” [Section 7.17.12, p. 412]. In Option V, the report says “This option implies accepting the full demands of a large majority of Telangana people for a separate State that will assuage their emotional feelings and sentiments as well as the *perceived sense of discrimination and neglect.*” [Section 9.3.01(v)(a), p. 450].

SKC members dismiss the genuine grievances of Telangana people. While there are scores of accounts and books detailing discrimination meted out to Telangana people, SKC members maintain that it is a ‘perceived’ notion of Telanganas. There is far too much enthusiasm to add words like ‘perceived’ to discredit the legitimate grievances of Telangana people.

- 2 “The formation of the State was somewhat conditional; brought about through the “Gentlemen’s Agreement”, the objective of which was to bring the less developed region of Telangana on par with the rest of the State. This goal, which looked achievable at the time, however, was not fully realized.” [Prologue, p.ii]

It is wrong to qualify it as ‘somewhat’ conditional. Either it is conditional, or not. Gentlemen’s Agreement lists those conditions, which are very specific and mandatory, guaranteed by Constitution. It suggests, the goal is partially realized but never cares to **establish that.**

- 3 “...there was simultaneous and wide-spread agitation and violence in Telangana region for a few days, particularly on December 6-7, 2009, resulting in major damage to public and private property and loss of life including a number of suicides.” [Section 1.5.01, p. 55]. “The above announcement (Dec. 9, 2009), however, created a backlash in coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema regions, resulting in agitations and eruption of violence in many districts. The agitations included bandh calls by political parties, road blockages, fast-unto-death programmes, relay hunger strikes etc. A near total bandh was organized in all the districts of coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema on

December 11, 2009 at the call of political parties. The agitations continued during the second and third weeks of December, 2009.” [Section 1.5.03, p.56].

The prejudice in describing the ground realities is all there to see in two Statements above. When it comes to agitations of Telangana, they are described as ‘resulting in major damage to public and private property and loss of life’, but when describing agitations of Seemandhras, they are described as ‘total bandhs’.

- 4 “However, if one sees the margins, it would be noticed that despite the fact that the overall polling in these bye-elections had dipped by about two per cent (from 66% to 64%) as compared to the previous elections, the separate Telangana sentiment aggressively and vociferously aroused by the TRS had appealed to the people in very large measure.”[Section 1.5.09, p. 60].

Committee does not want to consider it as the desire of the people to form separate Telangana, but concludes that the sentiment for a separate State is “aggressively and vociferously aroused by the TRS”. During Samyuktha Maharashtra Movement, such electoral mandate was decided as a clear reflection of the mood of the people of the State. This reflects the prejudice of SKC members against Telangana Movement which gets reflected in the tone of the entire article

- 5 “..Per agricultural connection, for the year 2008-9, works out to be within a reasonable range in all the three regions, although it has been high in Rayalaseema at 6346 kwh compared with 5920 kwh and 5797 kwh for Telangana and coastal Andhra respectively. However, Telangana has experienced large gains, for example, the per agricultural connection consumption in 1974-5 was only 1898 kwh which increased to 5920 kwh by 2008-9, a 3 fold increase; as compared with coastal Andhra which has improved from 3323 kwh to 5797 kwh, only a 1.8 fold increase during the same period. Rayalaseema region which received least amount of rainfall in AP has also experienced just about three times growth in consumption of electricity per agricultural connection. Similar trend is noticed when electricity consumption per hectare of net area irrigated is

reviewed. In Telangana, the consumption has increased from 260 Kwh in 1974-5 to 4930 Kwh in 2008-9, thus registering 18 times increase; on the other hand in coastal Andhra the increase has been only 10 times. Rayalaseema has also registered a considerably larger sixteen times increase in consumption of electricity per hectare of irrigated land.” [Section 2.8.02, pp.93 & 94].

Consumption of electricity on extracting water from bore wells out of necessity because State has neglected to give the farmers water from canals is not an indication of ‘progress’ as SKC report tries to portray. When farmers in dry regions like Telangana and Rayalaseema spend their money to extract underground water through electricity, is it not indication of lack of resources? Whereas Coastal Andhra farmers need not spend any thing as they get water for three crops. Committee did not explain the reasons for this disparity. And deliberately shown this figure of backwardness as indication of progress. If honest, Committee should have justified higher consumption and Stated that indicates backwardness of these two regions. It is the dishonesty unexpected.

- 6 “Rayalaseema which is a relatively dry and rain-fed agricultural area has highest concentration of accounts at 127 accounts per thousand rural population, followed by coastal Andhra at 110 and Telangana at 85. But in terms of amount outstanding, coastal Andhra has considerable advantage over both Telangana and Rayalaseema.” “Given the fact that coastal Andhra is highly irrigated and most of the cultivable land is under multiple often 3 crops cycles per year, the need for credit and turnover can also be relatively higher. However, the amount outstanding in Telangana is just over ‘48 thousand per an agricultural account which is higher than in Rayalaseema at ‘43 thousand, but far lower than coastal Andhra at ‘59 thousand (See Figure 2.8). It was possible to estimate SCB credit availability per hectare of gross cropped area (GCA). One can find a clear advantage in coastal Andhra at ‘32 thousand per hectare compared with ‘21 thousand in Rayalaseema and only ‘18 thousand in Telangana.” [Section 2.5.02, pp.72 & 73].

This is the truth that Committee should have highlighted. Rich Coastal Andhra gets water for three crops, while two other regions starve of water. Committee, most unreasonably considers this as natural advantage of Coastal Andhra. And a crisp message that Telangana is losing out on water is lost in verbiage.

- 7 “It is interesting to note that, relatively speaking, the rural incomes in coastal Andhra region have improved over the reference period amongst all income categories, excepting the well-off. But in case of Rayalaseema, income growth has occurred amongst the most-deprived and the deprived whereas the relatively richer have experienced a decline in relative income over the reference years. On the other hand, in case of Telangana, the relative income growth is experienced only amongst the richest; whereas the poorer and the most deprived have suffered considerably large decline in relative income over the reference period.” [Section 2.10.02, p.107].

The SKC takes pains to avoid saying “the rural incomes in coastal Seemandhra region have improved while those in Telangana declined”! And we see gimmickry with words.

CHAPTER - 3

'Factual Errors in Srikrishna Committee Report'

By Konatham Dileep and Madhav Mudumbai

A Irrigation

- 1 "Andhra Pradesh is planning river lifts in a very major way, particularly from river Godavari." [Section 4.4.04, Table 4.5, pp.184 & 185]

Kalwakurty, Bheema, Nettempad, Koilsagar, AMRP Lift Irrigation Schemes are on river Krishna, **not Godavari**. And the projects are in execution stage, **not at planning stage**.

- 2 "...through the Rajolibunda Diversion Scheme on Tungabhadra, Telangana receives much less water than what was allocated by the KWDT specifically. This has perhaps not been taken up effectively by the Karnataka or the Tungabhadra Board." [Section 4.5.02(ii), p.208]

Tungabhadra Board **has nothing to do with the RDS** as it has no jurisdiction over the RDS.

- 3 "The irrigation potential created through major and medium projects after the formation of the State increased by 713% in Telangana, 390% in Rayalaseema and 101% in Andhra region." [Section 4.4.08, p.192] "In a nutshell, considering all sources together, the net irrigation in Telangana has increased from about 7 lakh hectares in 1955-56 to around 18 lakh hectares in 2008-09." [Section 4.4.08, p.189]

Another howler! Srikrishna Committee calculates 7 lakh ha to 18 lakh ha increase as 713% which should have been around 257%.

- 4 "**The Net Irrigated Area (NIA)** in Telangana has doubled (from 0.8 million hectares in 1956-60 to 1.7 million hectares to by 2006-09). Thus Telangana has experienced a whopping 113% increase; while coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema have experienced a much lower growth of NIA at 30% and 55% respectively. Telangana has experienced a remarkable increase in NIA after mid-1970s

compared to the other two regions where there is a steady increase over time.”[Section 2.7.03, p. 88]

This increase is NOT due to any spending by or support from the Government. This is entirely due to the hard work of Telangana Farmers. They borrowed money at usurious interest rates and invested in Wells and Bore Wells and installed Pump Sets. The Government spends more than Rs.1,50,000 to create irrigation facility to one hectare of land through canal irrigation. In Telangana, farmers have spent their own money to create irrigation facilities.

- 5 “The increase in irrigation intensity in coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema has increased by 16 percentage points and 10 percentage points, respectively, over the period of 53 years; whereas Telangana experienced over 33 percentage points increase during the same period. In fact, the irrigation intensity in Telangana doubled during the 23 years period beginning mid 1980s.”[Section 2.7.04, p. 88]

This is again same as point above. That is the period major investments have been made by farmers often with huge borrowings to dig the bore-wells and install the pump-sets. That is the period coincided with rural electrification, often funded by central programs.

- 6 “On the other hand, both the Telangana and Rayalaseema regions are not able to access river waters due to lack of gradient. But the natural advantage of ‘tank’ irrigation was present in case of Telangana.” [Section 2.7.05, p.89]

This is an utter lie. Surface water can be utilized by Telangana region. And it requires different approach. If gradient were the reason, how could they dig Sriram Sagar Project canals in Nizamabad and supplied water to farmers? How are Maharashtra and Karnataka, which are situated at a higher altitude able to harness Krishna and Godavari river waters?

B Electricity

- 1 “Government of India has allocated coal from Singareni coal mines to Kothagudam Thermal Power Station (KTPS) in Rayalaseema.” [Section 4.9.02, p.222]

KTPS is in Khammam district of Telangana, **not in Rayalaseema.**

- 2 “The Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board (APSEB) was formed at the end of 1956.”[Section 4.8.01, p.218]

Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board was formed in 1959, **not in 1956** Source: <http://www.aptransco.gov.in/About APTransco.html>.

- 3 “During 1955-56, at the time of its (APSEB) formation, there was no thermal generation installed capacity.” [Section 4.8.01, p.289]

Hussain Sagar Thermal Power Station in Telangana was built in 1920. Nizam released a stamp testifying this fact.

- 4 “At an economic power cost of Rs. 6 per KWh, the annual energy cost per year would be Rs. 536.5 crores per year... the total annual charges would be of the order of Rs. 60,000 per hectare per year... Thus, all such (lift) schemes require a much closer scrutiny.” [Section 4.4.04, p.185]

Committee argues that Lift Schemes are not viable for Telangana region by taking Rs. 6 per KWh as power cost. However, the Central Power Distribution of AP Limited site shows that the Government is charging only Rs. 2.60 per KWh. The Committee puts the annual electricity costs per hectare (under KLIS) at Rs. 35352. If we take the tariffs that are in vogue from October 2010, electricity costs for irrigating these 3.75 lakh acres would be Rs. 1965.60 million. Hence energy charges per hectare would be **Rs. 13104.00** and **not Rs.35352** as the Committee would want us to believe! Source: <http://www.apcentralpower.com/customer/retail%20tariffs-final-22072010.doc> [Consumer category HT IV-A, p.3]

- 5 “The lift involved is 298 m adding for friction losses assumed as 30m, the gross head will be 328 m. The theoretical power requirement will be 351.9 MW, and assuming a reasonable pump efficiency of 0.85, the actual average energy requirement will be 894195336.5 KWh.” [Section 4.4.04(ii), p.185]

The total lift involved in the Kalwakurthy Lift Irrigation Scheme - including losses - is 298 m. But the committee assumed an additional 30 m as friction losses to make it 328 m, which is wrong and misleading. The **minimum efficiency of pumps is 0.89**. So

the Committee's assumption of 0.85 as 'reasonable' pump efficiency is wrong. To pump the required quantity of water to irrigate 3.75 Lakh acres a year, the pumps have to run for 90 days and consequent energy consumption will be 350 x 90 x 24 x 1000 Units i.e. 75,60,00,000 Units (i.e. 756 MU). The committee puts it at 89,41,95,336 Units (i.e. 894.2 MU) which is a cool 18% higher than the actual figure!

- 6 "To this, an annual civil maintenance of Rs.1000/hectare, and an annual electro-mechanical maintenance of Rs. 4000/ hectare, needs to be added, giving the total annual operation and maintenance cost of Rs. 40,352 per hectare." [Section 4.4.04(ii), p.185]

As per irrigation authorities' norms, the maintenance charges will be about 360 lakhs per year.

Hence, the electro-mechanical maintenance charges per hectare per year will be about **Rs.240** and **not Rs.4000**. Also, based on the tariffs in vogue and irrigation department norms the annual operation and maintenance cost per hectare (under KLIS) comes to **Rs.13,344** and **not Rs.40,352**.

7. Out of total amount of Rs. 3787.49 crores of subsidy given during 2009-10 by the Government of AP for supply of free power to farmers... [Section 4.18.05, pp. 241 & 242]

This is not true. This figure is inclusive of cross-subsidy provided by other consumers from Telangana region. The Committee tried to mislead the people by equating cross subsidy provided by the Industry and Commercial consumers to government subsidy.

8. Power Consumption of High Tension Consumers in MUs (Table 4.17, p.233 of CCSAP report)

| Region | 2001-02 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Telangana | 3576.13 | 3576.13 | 3576.13 | 3576.13 | 3576.13 | 9251.50 |
| Rayalaseema | 882.19 | 882.19 | 882.19 | 882.19 | 882.19 | 2445.34 |
| Andhra | 2120.59 | 3140.14 | 3623.99 | 4674.57 | 5416.62 | 5831.05 |

Details of power consumption of high tension consumers are given in the above table. The power consumption in Telangana and Rayalaseema regions from 2001-02 to 2007-08 is shown to be same [Section 4.17.04, p. 233]

We may excuse it as a mistake by oversight. But the ridiculous part is that the Committee goes on to conclude based on this erroneous data that “This shows that during the year 2008-09, the sudden higher demand for HT connections has come in Telangana recently. If this pace continues, then Telangana region would make great progress in industrialization.” **One may understand the anxiety of the Committee to prove that Telangana region is flourishing.**

9. **Higher Per Capita Consumption of Electricity in Telangana:** The per capita consumption of Electricity in AP is presented in Table 4.20 of CCSAP report. [Section 4.17.08, p.235]

Per capita Consumption of Electricity in AP (2009-10)

| Region | Total Sales (MUs) | Population in Millions | Per capita Consumption of Electricity (KWH) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Telangana | 30949 | 30.9 | 999 |
| Telangana Excluding Hyd. | 26327.1 | 23 | 1445 |
| Rayalaseema | 9679.1 | 13.5 | 716 |

From the above, the committee concludes that the consumption of electricity in Telangana region is the highest as compared to other regions, indicating the prosperous status of the region.

Let us examine the data furnished by the Commission more closely. The above data is summed up in the following table:

Per capita Consumption of Electricity in AP (2009-10)

| Region | Total Sales (MUs) | Population in Millions | Per capita Consumption of Electricity (KWH) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Telangana (Excluding Hyd.) | 26327.1 | 23 | 1445 |
| Royalaseema | 9679.1 | 13.5 | 716 |
| Hyderabad | 4621.90 | 7.90 | 585 |
| Coastal Andhra | 18430.3 | 31.7 | 581 |

It is believed that the per capita consumption of electricity is the index of development. From the above table **we come to a ridiculous conclusion that Telangana and Rayalaseema are most prosperous regions and Coastal Andhra and the city of Hyderabad are most backward regions.** How far the above Statement is nearer to the reality is anybody's guess. These conclusions are drawn either due to ignorance of the power sector or could be deliberate attempt on the part of the Committee to show that there no injustice has been done to Telangana region.

10. "As per Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India, per capita consumption of electricity is estimated to reach 1000 units/Yr for the country, at the end of 11th Five Year plan. However, the per capita consumption of electricity during 2010-11 in Telangana worked out to be 1191 Units / Yr." [Section 4.17.09, p. 235]

Even though overall PCC appears to be high in Telangana region, actual standards of living of people is reflected not by the overall power consumption, but PCC of domestic sector which clearly reflects the real development of Telangana people.

While average PCC for domestic sector in AP is 126 units, PCC of domestic sector in Telangana region is much lower in many of its districts. PCC of domestic sector in 8 Telangana districts is summarized below:

Per Capita Consumption of Electricity for Domestic Sector in Telangana: (Table 3.8 of TEEJAC's Report)

| Name of District in Telangana Region | PCC of Domestic sector | State Average | % Excess/Less in comparison with State Average |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--|
| Mahabubnagar | 45 | 126 | -64.29 |
| Nalgonda | 73 | 126 | -42.06 |
| Medak | 89 | 126 | -29.37 |
| Warangal | 107 | 126 | -15.08 |
| Karimnagar | 110 | 126 | -12.70 |
| Khammam | 119 | 126 | -5.56 |
| Nizamabad | 111 | 126 | -11.90 |
| Adilabad | 93 | 126 | -26.19 |

It is clear from the above that the PCC in 8 out of 10 districts in Telangana region is significantly lower than the State average. However, the PCC of electricity in Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy districts camouflages the actual backwardness in Telangana districts. This is mainly because of inflated agricultural consumption figures and industrial consumption. Most of the industries located in this region belong to people of either Andhra or Other States and their consumption of electricity is increasing the overall consumption in Telangana region. Less than average PCC of domestic sector in Telangana region is also indicative of the fact that the benefits of development have not reached Telangana people.

C Agricultural distress

- 1 "...between May 2004 and November 2005, Telangana reported 663 suicides while Rayalaseema reported 231 and coastal Andhra stood at 174 out of a total of 1068 reported suicides." [Section 7.8, p.366]

Responding to an RTI application - **Appeal No. 12414 /CIC/2009** - the Government of AP confirmed 2,023 suicides in Telangana during 2005 of which it said 1,210 were "genuine". Also, the National Crime Records Bureau(NCRB), MHA puts the suicides at 2666 (for the year 2004) and 2490 (for the year 2005) <http://ncrb.nic.in/adsj/data/ADSI2004/atable%202.11.pdf>

[TABLE - 2.11, p. 242] <http://ncrb.nic.in/adsi/data/ADSI2005/atable%202.11.pdf> [TABLE - 2.11, p. 242] Who got it wrong – the Governments of AP and India or the esteemed Committee? Either way Telanganites stand – that the Committee’s report is, at best, shoddy - is vindicated.

D Education

- 1 A.P. Horticultural University is in Warangal, Coastal Andhra [Appendix 3.10, p.155]

The University is in Tadepalligudem, Coastal Andhra. Neither the University is in Warangal, nor is Warangal in Coastal Andhra!

E Population

- 1 Rural population (in lakhs) of AP - 48.6, Telangana - 8.2, Seema - 9, Coastal Andhra - 21.4 Urban population (in lakhs) of AP - 17.9, Telangana - 7.9, Seema - 2.7, Coastal Andhra - 7.3 [Appendix 2.1, p.121]

A ‘decimal’ in Justice Srikrishna Committee’s crown of blunders! The figures should not have had a decimal point.

F Polity

- 1 “...AP was the first linguistic State to be formed in the country...” [Section 7.14.03, p.392] “The present crisis points to the continuing disjunctions and fault lines within India’s first linguistic State.” [Section 7.1.02, pages 341 & 342]

“Andhra Pradesh, however, by and large, has a common culture and was constituted as the first linguistic (Telugu) State.” [Section 9.3.01(ii), p.443]

“Andhra Pradesh was formed in 1956 as the first linguistic (Telugu) State with the merger of two different regions...” Prologue Section 2, p. ii.

“The State was formed on October 1, 1953, after the Act of Parliament (the Andhra State Act of 1953) received the President’s assent on September 14, 1953. It was the first State constituted on linguistic basis after India’s independence.” [Section 1.1.02 p.1]

“... as mentioned in Chapter 1, the first linguistic State of “Andhra” was created in 1953.” [Section 9.1.06, p.428]

“After the formation of Andhra State in October, 1953, the demand for creation of other linguistic States gained momentum.” [Section 1.1.04, p. 3]

Self explanatory! Height of negligence and callousness! SKC doesn't seem to understand the difference between Andhra State and Andhra Pradesh State. The committee disputes, concurs and disputes its own point which is a historical fact!! Shows how inconsistent the report is.

G Political

- 1 The number of Chief Ministers of AP from Telangana is **SIX** [Section 6 7.17.04, Table 7.4, p.407]

Number of Chief Ministers of AP from Telangana is **FIVE**, even if one includes Jalagam Vengal Rao - a migrant from coastal Andhra.

- 2 “... numerous Joint Action Committees (JACs) have been formed, the most prominent among them being the one at Osmania University led by Prof. Kodandaram. Initially, all political parties were members of this JAC but subsequently most parties including the TRS left the fold.” [Section 7.2.05 p.349]

Joint Action Committee (JAC) at Osmania University was formed by the students of the University. It is not led by Prof. Kodandaram. He is heading the Telangana Political JAC. Telangana Rastra Samithi (TRS) and Bharatiya Janatha Party (BJP) are still part of the Telangana Political JAC.

This speaks volumes about how much SKC members understood about the ongoing agitation.

Appendix A: 'Srikrishna Committee Report on Telangana' By C.H.Hanumantha Rao

Former member, Planning Commission

Overview

The Committee headed by Justice SriKrishna, constituted by the government of India to examine the situation in Andhra Pradesh with reference to the demand for a separate State of Telangana as well as the demand for maintaining the present status of a united Andhra Pradesh, has submitted its Report after holding wide-ranging consultations with all the stakeholders and carrying out a comprehensive analysis of the relevant data on socio-economic aspects. Among other things, **the Committee examined the three basic issues bearing on the formation of a separate State of Telangana, viz., its economic viability, social inclusion and cohesion, and wishes of the people of Telangana, and found them strongly favouring the formation of a separate Telangana State with Hyderabad as its capital. But the Committee has been deterred by fears on three counts: Vehement opposition from the influential sections of Seemandhra, particularly to Hyderabad becoming the capital of Telangana; similar demands for creation of smaller States cropping up in the country; and the impact on internal security situation with the anticipated growth of Naxalism and religious fundamentalism** - discussed in Chapter 8 of the Report but withheld from public at large and submitted to the Ministry of Home Affairs in a separate cover along with the Report. The Committee tended to regard big States as strong and small as weak which could undermine national unity. It saw Naxalism essentially as a 'law and order' problem (which presumably can be 'faced effectively' in bigger States), rather than a socio-economic problem calling for inclusive development which can be better accomplished in smaller States.

Balancing various considerations, the Committee recommended keeping the State united by creating a statutorily empowered Telangana Regional Council, a Water Management Board and an Irrigation Project Development Corporation, as the most workable option under the circumstances (option 6 in the Report). As the second best option

(option 5 in the Report), the Committee recommended the bifurcation of the State into Telangana and Seemandhra as per existing boundaries with Hyderabad as the capital of Telangana, and Seemandhra to have a new capital. This option is to be exercised only in case it is unavoidable and if the decision can be reached amicably amongst all the three regions by instilling confidence in the people of coastal Andhra, Rayalaseema and others who have settled in Hyderabad and other districts of Telangana with regard to the safety and security of their investments, properties, livelihood and employment (Ch.9, PP.450-8).

The 'most workable' option recommended by the Committee basically amounts to restoring *status quo ante*, experimented but failed miserably as documented by the Committee itself. The Committee did not face the question squarely as to why this particular arrangement and several other assurances given to Telangana failed to work in the past and what prompts it to believe that a variant of such an arrangement would be workable in future. **The Committee did seem to take note of the basic lesson from the experience that in a democracy like ours such 'safeguards' cannot withstand the pressures**

exerted by the 'interest groups' from the politically dominant region but, apparently on balance of considerations, chose not to allow this to influence its recommendations.

Surprisingly, in none of the two options did the Committee recommend safeguards for Rayalaseema – rightly regarded by it as the most backward region in the State. Further, whereas **in the case of the 'first best' option it elaborated the recommended safeguards for Telangana in great detail, in the case of the 'second best' option it did not recommend any plan of action and a road map in regard to the assurances for the people from coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema settled in Telangana.**

Growth and Inequality

At the time of the formation of Andhra Pradesh, average per capita GSDP (Gross State Domestic Product) for Telangana was significantly lower than for coastal Andhra as well as for Rayalaseema. **Starting with a low base, Telangana showed a 'catching-up process' resulting in**

a higher growth rate than the other regions but the *level of its per capita GSDP continued to be lower than in the other two regions for at least four decades after the formation of the State. It is in the post-reform period that it overtook Rayalaseema*, and now its per capita GSDP (excluding Hyderabad) stands above that for Rayalaseema and is next to coastal Andhra (Rao and Shastry, 2009). The analysis of growth by the Srikrishna Committee indicates a similar trend. The Committee does note, however, some continuing concerns in Telangana regarding public employment, education, and water and irrigation.

An important factor contributing to the catching-up process in Telangana is the in-migration of capital, enterprise and skills from Seemandhra - more so in the post-reform period - especially from coastal Andhra, into different districts of Telangana, prominent among them being Hyderabad and the adjoining areas. This is amply borne out by the data on interregional migration (Rao and shastry, *op.cit*). **Therefore, an analysis of how the benefits from rising GDP growth and employment have been shared between different social groups is essential to understand the rising discontent in Telangana, especially in the post-reform period. It is also necessary to understand the other qualitative aspects of growth such as costs of investment, uncertainty of returns and sustainability.** For example, as pointed out by the Srikrishna Committee, agriculture in Telangana has become heavily dependent on well irrigation which is both costly and uncertain. This indeed accounts for the disproportionately large number of suicides by farmers in Telangana (Galab, Revathi and Reddy, 2009) - also documented by the Srikrishna Committee.

The Committee notes the rising inequality in rural Telangana in the post-reform period (between 1993-4 and 2004-5, based on the sample surveys conducted by the National Council of Applied Economic Research) when the SCs, STs, and minorities have suffered a decline in income: **“Such deepening inequality in Telangana can not only sustain the separatist agitation but it can also carry it further and increase its intensity.....Contrastingly, the evidence suggests that the inequality in income has, in fact, declined in coastal Andhra”** (Ch.2, P.119). **But, over this period, the affluent farming sections from the rural coastal Andhra have been increasingly shifting to non-farm occupations by leasing out**

their land, thanks to their command over capital and proliferation of lucrative non-farm opportunities. On all accounts, the area under tenancy has increased phenomenally in coastal Andhra in the recent period. This out-migration could well have led to a decline in rural inequality there, while at the same time contributing to the rise in inequality in areas of their destination, including Telangana and Rayalaseema.

Economic Viability of Telangana State

Viability of a State is usually assessed in terms of its area, population, and size of GSDP and public revenues. Area and population assume particular relevance from the governance angle, whereas sizes of GSDP and public revenues have a bearing on economic viability. Tax and non-tax revenues are largely determined by the size of GSDP. **In the early years of development with low levels of per capita GSDP, the compulsions of a critical minimum of public revenues for maintenance of general administration, police, judiciary and other essential services did not, in general, favour smaller States. In fact, at the time of the formation of Andhra Pradesh, a strong consideration favouring integration of Telangana with the Seemandhra was the persisting revenue deficit of Seemandhra and existence of revenue surplus for Telangana.** Over the last half a century, however, with the steady growth in per capita income and tax revenues, economic viability in terms of public revenues is no longer a binding constraint in many cases. Therefore, the Srikrishna Committee has done well by focusing on GSDP and not getting into the issue of public revenues (except for a passing mention in the Report) while discussing viability.

The Committee observed that “Telangana region (excluding Hyderabad) ranks 15th in the list of 28 States (excluding A.P.) in terms of the absolute amount of GDP, and is listed above the States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Goa and all the North eastern States(Appendix 2.25). In terms of per capita income, Telangana (excluding Hyderabad) ranks 13th in GSDP as well as in per capita income.....Thus, from the point of view of sheer size of economy, Telangana as a new State can sustain itself both with and without Hyderabad”(Ch.2, P.121).

Having said this, the Committee duly noted the apprehensions of Seemandhra concerning its own economic prospects and viability in case Statehood for Telangana is conceded: Fear of local entry taxes and cess scuttling free trade and enhancing cost of business and increasing prices of goods and services; local laws constraining physical movement of goods and services between neighbouring regions and States; and losing a major market inherent in huge population, business and market concentration of the city of Hyderabad (P.122).

The Committee after simply observing that, “on this count, separation of AP can be a negative factor which inhibits economic growth of newly formed States” (P.122), goes on to suggest that **“it is important to keep the city/district/urban agglomeration of Hyderabad accessible to people and businesses from any of the regions of AP or for that matter from any part of India and abroad. This can be accomplished irrespective of whether the political control over Hyderabad is wielded through a united AP or otherwise”** (P.123).

As it is, we have a common national market in the country in which people belonging to several regions and States participate for mutual advantage. Restrictive practices in trade and business equally hurt those practicing them and, in any case, the Union Government cannot remain a mute spectator to such practices. **There can hardly be any basis for these fears when there is no evidence of restrictive practices in trade and business between the existing States in the country, including those recently created.**

Social Inclusion

The Srikrishna Committee Report contains **an illuminating analysis** of the issues bearing on social inclusion, based on the data assembled by the Committee from the authentic sources on several indicators of development according to regions, castes, religion and gender, supplemented by the extensive field visits and interviews by the members of the Committee(Ch.7).An important fact emerging from these data - not widely known so far - is that **the upper or high castes account for as high as 32% of total population in coastal Andhra and 24.2 % in Rayalaseema, as against a low level of 10.7% in Telangana (including Hyderabad).** Thus the socially disadvantaged

sections comprising **SCs, STs, Muslims, Other Minorities and OBCs** constitute as high as nearly **90% of total population in Telangana**, a little over **three-fourths and two-thirds of total population in Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra** (Table 7.1, P.360).

Since the upper castes would, in all probability, predominate among the migrants from Seemandhra into Telangana, this may be contributing to reinforcing the existing inequalities in Telangana, characterised by feudal antecedents. It is pertinent to note, at this stage, the following observations of the Committee:

“The Upper castes in Rayalaseema and coastal Andhra are vehemently against the idea of dividing the State; their greatest fear being the loss of Hyderabad. The accommodation between these two regions has been in terms of political domination by Rayalaseema and economic domination by coastal Andhra. Together the two regions have ruled the State through Congress and TDP political formations. Telangana feels dominated by the upper castes of these regions and its struggle is primarily to shake off their yoke.”(P.390).

According to the Committee, Telangana separatists argued before it that because of its higher proportion of disadvantaged social groups, Telangana will be a more socially, economically and politically equitable and inclusive State (P.389) **Dalit groups from all the three regions, citing the viewpoint of Dr.B.R.Ambedkar, argued before the Committee that splitting of the State would break the domination of upper castes and provide opportunities for the SC, ST, and OBC communities in both the States** (P.368). But the Committee tries to counter this argument by saying that the division of the State may reduce the proportion of the disadvantaged groups in Seemandhra when compared to the unified State. They could thus lose out in Seemandhra (P.389).The Committee overlooks that even after the division, the socially disadvantaged groups would constitute over 70% of the population in Seemandhra. The basic point, however, is that given their large numbers, the weaker sections would be better able to articulate their problems and assert themselves in smaller and relatively homogeneous States because of their shared history and easy communicability (Ambedkar, 1979; Rao, 2010).

Telangana groups argued before the Committee that political power is necessary for channeling resources and development benefits towards the region, that political domination by Seemandhra has adversely affected their prospects and that the only way out of this domination is to have a separate State. The Committee examined this argument by merely counting the number of years for which the posts of CM, Deputy CM, and important portfolios were held by representatives from different regions, and observed that Telangana side cannot claim total lack of representation as it held important portfolios of Home, Finance, Revenue and Irrigation for fairly long periods (PP.406-9). However, the matter is not so simple, as, even when the position of Chief Minister was held by 'strong' persons from Telangana, plenty of anecdotal evidence suggests that they felt helpless on vital issues and had to bow down to the wishes of Seemandhra. Political power for different regions flows basically from their respective numbers in the State legislature and not so much by the type of portfolios held or by the time period for which they were held. The latter are in fact determined by the former.

The following observations of the Committee are telling on how Telangana, as conceived by its protagonists, can be socially inclusive, modern, progressive and even trend-setting:

“The Telangana movement can be interpreted as a desire for greater democracy and empowerment within a political unit. As Stated earlier, sub-regionalism is a movement which is not necessarily primordial but is essentially modern – in the direction of a balanced and equitable modernisation. Our analysis shows that cutting across caste, religion, gender and other divisions, the Telangana movement brings a focus on the development of the region as a whole, a focus on rights and access to regional resources and further, it pitches for a rights-based development perspective whereby groups and communities put forth their agendas within a larger vision of equitable development. There are strong indications that if Telangana does become a separate State, a movement for separation is likely to follow in Rayalaseema which remains the most backward region in the State” (P.413).

When there are such strong grounds for constituting separate Telangana State, it is not fair to withhold its formation simply for fear of

its consequences for other regions in the country. Rayalaseema is backward, but its elite – political, bureaucratic and professional – is much stronger than its Telangana counterpart, thanks to its shared history with coastal Andhra and indeed with the rest of the South over a long period in the struggle for freedom, exposure to modern education and progressive land tenures when compared to Telangana. Rayalaseema can be assertive and succeed in protecting its rights and safeguards in the truncated and less heterogeneous Seemandhra after the separation of Telangana. But if it too fails in this and separation becomes inevitable, then this need not be a cause for alarm. The country, in any case, is in for an era of smaller States.

Hyderabad Metropolis

The two major issues of concern for Seemandhra in the event of creation of Telangana State with Hyderabad as its capital are: (a) the possible impact of its separation from Hyderabad on Seemandhra's economy (b) the prospects for education and employment of youth in Hyderabad; and security of investments, properties, jobs and livelihoods of those from Seemandhra settled in Hyderabad and other districts of Telangana.

The growth of Hyderabad is marked broadly by three phases: The first phase ends with the formation of AP when the new State inherited the city which ranked fifth and continues with this rank even to this day, among the major cities in the country with its unique location and a highly developed infrastructure built during the Nizam's rule. In fact, this was a major attraction and determining factor behind the integration of Seemandhra with Telangana. It may be recalled that Marathwada and Karnatak which were constituents of the Hyderabad State for a long period contributed, in no small measure, to the development of Hyderabad city but had no claims to it because of its organic link with Telangana. Over the second phase stretching up to the start of globalisation, Hyderabad continued to grow linked basically with the regional economy. In the third phase covering the period of globalisation over the last two decades, the character of the city underwent a major change with its phenomenal growth and increased links with the national and global economy which, as brought out by the Srikrishna Committee, now predominate over its links with the State economy.

This on-going third phase is of special interest. A striking feature brought out by the Committee is the concentration of information technology (IT) and information technology enabled services (ITES) almost solely in Hyderabad accounting for 99% of the total exports from the State (Ch.6, P.315). While there are local investors in IT and ITES sectors, the composition of the firms established in the city is largely national and international in character. **Of the ninety four groups identified separately for investments in Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy, seventy four are from outside Andhra Pradesh, testifying to the breadth of investment linkages in the region. Even in Construction and Real Estate, Finance, Business Services, it appears that private A.P. based investors are not dominant. As such, the industry is connected more to the national (through investment) and global economy (through the market) than it is to the regional economy. Its private investments would be driven by the overall climate of certainty and availability of infrastructure, labour and other services. (PP. 316, 330,332).**

As regards labour, the traditional out-migrating States of Eastern India, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, which accounted for 23% of the migrants earlier, are now contributing 40%. Thus, according to the Committee, Hyderabad's pattern is beginning to look more like Mumbai's. This is consistent with Hyderabad's greater integration with national and international markets and its growth as a national and global city (PP.323-4).

The Committee's narrative of key cities in AP State suggests that the economic interdependence between them may be limited. Hyderabad and each urban centre in coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema appear to have their own economic base hinterland and growth drivers. While Hyderabad is much larger than the other cities in the State, it appears that other cities across AP do not seem to be solely dependent on it for market linkages and other services (PP.336-7).

It is clear from the Committee's findings that the adverse impact, if any, on the economy of Seemandhra on account of separation of Telangana with Hyderabad as its capital is not going to be significant.

The second issue, viz., the protection of the interests of Seemandhra migrants in Hyderabad and other districts of Telangana is

going to be **extremely important and challenging**. As the Srikrishna Committee points out, migrants from the three regions, especially from coastal Andhra, have contributed substantially to the economic growth of the city and continue to hold a stake in important businesses (P.338).

Access to educational institutions and employment in Hyderabad is important to youth from all the three regions of the State. Small trade persons and semi-skilled workers from all over the State also find a niche in the city. People from the three regions have developed strong material and emotional attachment to the metropolis and fear loss of access in case of changes in the State's contours (P.339). In view of this, the Committee's suggestions in the second best option (option 5) regarding the protection of the interests of Seemandhra migrants in Hyderabad and other districts of Telangana deserve serious consideration.

Summary and Conclusion

According to Srikrishna Committee, Telangana has shown growth dynamism but income inequalities have been increasing. There are also continuing concerns about irrigation, education and employment. Telangana can be economically viable as a separate State with or without Hyderabad. Telangana would also be socially inclusive, facilitating equitable development. Statehood for Telangana is demanded by a large majority of people in the region cutting across caste, religion and gender. **Hyderabad Metropolis has acquired a growth momentum of its own, driven largely by investments from the rest of the country and serving the national and global market. Hyderabad becoming the capital of Telangana may not adversely affect the economy of Seemandhra.**

Given these findings, it appears the Srikrishna Committee has very narrowly missed recommending Statehood for Telangana with Hyderabad as its capital, as the 'first best' option. Scales of justice got tilted against Telangana on account of vehement opposition from Seemandhra and Committee's own fears about the demands for smaller States cropping up as well as Telangana becoming a stronghold for Naxalism and Religious Fundamentalism. Above all, it shows that in our system opting for a radical change by moving away from *status quo* is not easy.

Of all these fears, the concerns of Seemandhra, especially those centering on the prospects for its youth in Hyderabad, are most legitimate. Addressing these concerns seriously is critical to the resolution of the crisis so as to pave the way for the formation of Telangana State. This calls for a constructive dialogue between the leaders of both the regions with understanding, spirit of accommodation and Statesmanship.

C.H.Hanumantha Rao (*chhrao9@yahoo.com*) is Honorary Professor at the Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad.

REFERENCES

Ambedkar, Dr. Babasaheb (1979). *Writings and Speeches, Vol.I* (Part II - On Linguistic States), Education Department, Government of Maharashtra.

Galab, S., E.Revathi, and Prudhvikar Reddy, "Farmers' Suicides and Unfolding Agrarian Crisis in Andhra Pradesh", in D.Narasimha Reddy and Srijit Mishra (Ed.), *Agrarian Crisis in India*, Oxford University Press, 2009, New Delhi.

Rao, C.H.H. (2010). *Regional Disparities, Smaller States and Statehood for Telangana*, Academic Foundation, New Delhi.

Rao. S. Kishan and Rahul A.Shastry (2009) .*Andhra Pradesh Economy -Dynamics of Transformation With a Focus on Regional Disparities*, National Academy of Development, Hyderabad.

Appendix B: 'A Critique of the Report of the Srikrishna Committee'

By Dr. Gautam Pingle

Director, Administrative Staff College of India

"A much talking judge is an ill-tuned cymbal": Francis Bacon

Introduction

The five member Srikrishna Committee (SKC) ("Committee for Consultations On the Situation in Andhra Pradesh") under the Chairmanship of Mr Justice B. N .SriKrishna, former Judge of the Supreme Court of India was constituted by the Ministry of Home Affairs, to bring clarity to the Government of India, over the issue of separate Statehood for the Telangana region of Andhra Pradesh.

The Government had earlier acceded to the All-Party request and support for such a separate State backed up by a unanimous resolution of the Legislature Congress Party leaving the decision to the central Government. However once that decision to accord Statehood to Telangana was announced widespread agitation by the Andhra region resulted in a stay of execution and status quo was ordered pending the Srikrishna Committee 's report which was to take 11 months. That Report of 505 pages of the main Volume with another 183 pages of Appendix Volume has now been issued and this is an analysis and critique of it.

Part I. Honesty within Dishonesty: SKC makes the case for Telangana

palku rAvaNuDu teliya lEka pOye (Ravana, could not understand this truth.), "Sarasa Saama Dhaana" by Saint Thyagaraja

The Srikrishna Committee report is a product of eminent persons told to decide what in all honesty they could not; as a result they have concluded in confusion - which serves no one. Among 505 pages and 146,071 words, they had to say some honest things even then, which were obvious to all.

It is difficult for an ordinary person to obtain, let alone read with patience and understanding the Report. The following is a set of 25 extracts in inverted commas (with page references, important parts highlighted by me) from the Report which when placed in sequence. Readers need to understand that SKC was under extreme pressure to do the wrong thing and while so doing it still could not avoid stating the case for Telangana. It did leave out significant issues, which will be highlighted later, but what it said is enough to make a solid case for separation. Read on and decide for yourself!

Status Quo Opposed- Telangana Deprived

1. “Overall, in spite of 50 plus years of policy protected planning and execution, **one finds regional variations** in the economic development of AP” (p.118).
2. The SKC noted that the **Planning Commission notified as backward nine of the ten Telangana districts** – with the exception of Hyderabad and resources have been allocated under its Backward Region Grant Fund (BRGF). These districts contain, as the SKC says, 87% of the population of Telangana (p.81)
3. Considering the allegation that, “Telangana has low per capita income, lower access to employment, lower business opportunities and low access to education and so on”, SKC says, **“At the outset, some or all such allegations appear true when absolute amounts, numbers and percentages are reviewed”** (p.117).
4. (In Telangana the), “net irrigation by canals has increased only slightly from about 1 lakh hectare to around 2.5 lakh hectares. **Tank irrigation has reduced from 4 lakh hectares in 1955-56 to around 2 lakh hectares at present.**” (p.189)
5. **“The implementation of G.O. 610 during 1985 to 2005 was, at best, tardy, which remains a grievance of Telangana employees.** This issue continues to be highly contentious even today (p.48).”
6. “However, the data received from the State Government shows (Appendix 3.16) that the combined amount released to government and aided colleges **together is Rs. 93 crores in Telangana while**

it is 224 crores in coastal Andhra (with college going population similar to that in Telangana) and 91 crores in Rayalaseema (with population share being less than half that in Telangana)” (p.153)

7. **“The real income of the agricultural wage labourers has declined considerably in Telangana whereas it has increased considerably in coastal Andhra region. Similarly, the SCs, STs and minorities in Telangana region have suffered a decline in income during the past about decade or more, whereas these communities have gained substantially in coastal Andhra (p.119)”.**

The Movement

8. **“The present agitation, however, shows that the demand only lay dormant and could get re-ignited under specific circumstances. While the issue of rightful shares in public employment remains the key point of discord even in the current agitation, a new turn has been given to the demand by Telangana region asserting that it has a separate cultural identity which is distinct from that of Andhra and Rayalaseema regions (p.342).**
9. **“The movement has also successfully performed the function of educating the people about Telangana’s grievances to the extent that even school children have now been made conversant with issues around the demand for a separate State. Equally helpful to this cause have been NRI Telanganites (NRIs from the opposite side have participated by opposing formation of Telangana) who are known to be supporting the movement in several ways and who have also represented to the Committee. The present movement is considered to be much more extensive than the one in 1969 (which was mostly confined to urban locations), a process in which modern technologies of communication and modern ways of conducting politics have surely helped” (p.352).**
10. **“While the JACs have sprung up in all the three regions, the most vibrant and numerous are in Telangana region with their reach going down to Mandal and even village level. The JACs have successfully mobilized the common people who have articulated their particular interests through the movement” (p.359).**

Power Groups

11. **“The dominant upper castes, the Reddys, Kammas, Velamas and Kapus, continue to hold the reins of power in the State.** The Brahmins are much less influential politically due to smaller numbers; **however, coastal Andhra Brahmins played a historic role in forging a Telugu identity through their writings, eventually leading to the birth of Andhra State.** They were equally important in intellectual articulation of the cause of economically oppressed social groups and contributed to the extreme left movement to which major support was provided by coastal Kammas” (p.380).
12. **“The upper castes in Rayalaseema and coastal Andhra are vehemently against the idea of dividing the State; their greatest fear being the loss of Hyderabad.** The accommodation between these two regions has been in terms of **political domination by Rayalaseema and economic domination by coastal Andhra. Together the two regions have ruled the State through Congress and TDP political formations.** Telangana feels dominated by the upper castes of these regions and its struggle is primarily to shake off their yoke.” (p.390)
13. **“Large scale involvement of students including those from Dalits and Backward Castes in the current movement for Telangana seems to testify to this.** A large proportion of student leaders of the movement located in Osmania and Kakatiya Universities is known to be from Dalit/BC background. According to many sources, purported student suicides during the course of the agitation are also largely by Dalit and Backward Caste students” (p.163).
14. “The Madiga caste, which is predominant in Telangana and more numerous on the whole, has had less access to reservation benefits than the Malas who predominate in coastal Andhra. The former would certainly benefit from a separate Telangana but then their brethren in the coastal State would lose out without sub-categorisation. **The economic disaffection of SCs in Telangana versus their rapid strides in education form a potent mixture for agitation politics as is seen from the extensive**

participation of Dalit youth in the student movement. This is the very same constituency which may feel attracted towards and become co-opted by extreme left ideologies.” (p.415)

15. **“The Muslims in Telangana, contrary to common belief, are doing well on consumption (improvement by 76%) and poverty reduction levels (33 points)”** (p.363).
16. **“In 2007, literacy rates for the youth population aged 8-24 for SCs and Muslims in Telangana are ahead of or at par with those in the other two regions”** (p.131).
17. **“For example, it is possible that the ST community and the Muslims in AP may get a relatively better say in governance on separation in the State of Telangana”** (p.122).

Logic of the Movement

18. **“Although as a sub-regional movement, the Telangana movement does not pose a threat to national unity”** (p.344).
19. **“The Telangana movement can be interpreted as a desire for greater democracy and empowerment within a political unit. As Stated earlier, sub- regionalism is a movement, which is not necessarily primordial but is essentially modern – in the direction of a balanced and equitable modernization. Our analysis shows that cutting across caste, religion, gender and other divisions, the Telangana movement brings a focus on the development of the region as a whole, a focus on rights and access to regional resources and further, it pitches for a rights-based development perspective whereby groups and communities put forth their agendas within a larger vision of equitable development”** (p.415).
20. **“However, given the long-standing history of the demand for a separate State, the deep penetration of the sense of grievance and the widespread emotion around the issue, unless genuine steps are taken to address both real and perceived disparities, the demand is unlikely to go away permanently even if it is subdued temporarily”** (p.417).

21. “Thus, from the point of view of sheer size of economy, **Telangana as a new State can sustain itself both with and without Hyderabad**. The other combination of regions – coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema together can also sustain themselves as a State; **in fact they can also sustain themselves separately” (p.121).**

Summing Up

22. “In view of the complex background of the situation and the rather serious and sensitive emotional aspects involved, the **Committee is of the unanimous view that it would not be practical to simply maintain the status quo in respect of the situation” (p.442).**
23. “Given the above first hand observations of the Committee during its tours of the regions, **the Committee feels that the issue of sentiment has to be considered only as one among several factors to be evaluated**. While not discounting people’s wishes or sentiments, the overall implications of bifurcation (or trifurcation as the case may be) have to be carefully delineated to arrive at a responsible recommendation”(p.352-353).
24. “The Committee is of the view that given the long history of the demand for a separate Telangana, **the highly charged emotions at present and the likelihood of the agitation continuing in case the demand is not met** (unless handled deftly, tactfully and firmly as discussed under option six), consideration has to be given to this option. The grievances of the people of Telangana, such as non-implementation of some of the key decisions included in the Gentleman’s Agreement (1956), certain amount of neglect in implementation of water and irrigation schemes, inadequate provision for education infrastructure (excluding Hyderabad), and the undue delay in the implementation of the Presidential order on public employment etc., have contributed to the felt psyche of discrimination and domination, with the issue attaining an emotional pitch. **The continuing demand, therefore, for a separate Telangana, the Committee felt, has some merit and is not entirely unjustified” (p.453).**

25. “Therefore, after taking into account all the pros and cons, the Committee did not think it to be the most preferred, but the second best option. **Separation is recommended only in case it is unavoidable** and if this decision can be reached amicably amongst all the three regions” (p.453).

Conclusion: What is “second best” for the Andhra is “first best “for Telangana!

Part II: Dishonesty *Maunnat Satyam Vishishyete* **(truth is superior to silence): Manu**

Introduction

We have seen how honesty lies like a pearl in an oyster of 505 hard pages of the SKC Report. Now it is necessary to deal with the dishonesty of it all. This is not your ordinary lying that comes to any one of us. As these are eminent persons and assisted by a barrage of ex-civil servants of the rank of Chief Secretary to State Governments and Secretary and Additional Secretary to Government of India, it is more subtle. They do not tell lies – they suppress the truth.

Andhra State

First, the saga of the Andhra State is told as if the Andhras wanted separation only for “promoting their own distinct culture” (p.1). This is a travesty of the history of the more than 20-year struggle of the Andhras to come out from under the majority Tamil influence. They came out even when they had to face financial bankruptcy. The question for Andhra was how was it to survive. That solution then unfolds like a tragedy for Telangana.

SRC

Next, the SKC tells a devious tale of the SRC report, with selective quotations and extracts from it. Yet the SRC said many other things not quoted by SKC. Even Nehru’s objections to trifurcation of Hyderabad are not mentioned nor his support for a separate Telangana!

The SRC noted that Telangana was financially stable and viable while Andhra was not: “The existing Andhra State has faced a financial

problem of some magnitude ever since it was created and in comparison with Telangana the existing Andhra State has low per capita revenue. Telangana, on the other hand, is much less likely to be faced with financial embarrassment". (SRC, op.cit, para 376)

It Started Telangana's fears: "The real fear of the people of Telangana is that if they join Andhra they will be unequally placed in relation to the people of Andhra and in this partnership the major partner will derive all the advantages immediately, while Telangana, itself may be converted into a colony by the enterprising coastal Andhra (SRC, op.cit, para. 378)

And it concluded: "After taking all these factors into consideration we have come to the conclusions that it will be in the interests of Andhra as well as Telangana, if for the present, the Telangana area is to be constituted into a separate State, which may be known as the Hyderabad State" (SRC, op.cit, para 386)

Telangana Surpluses

SKC deals with the critical "Surpluses" issue in passing and only noted the appointment of Justice Bhargava who gave a figure of Rs 28 crores diverted from Telangana over 1956-68. No details of the estimation of Surpluses diverted from Telangana are given by SKC; no references to the earlier Kumar Lalit Report estimation of "surpluses" (Rs 38 crores). This after all was the crucial issue in the 1969 agitation. Neither did SKC refer to the figures of diversion over more recent years.

1969 Agitation and TPS

Then comes the unkindest cut of all. The SKC Report says only this of the 1969 agitation: "The student agitation, as a result, passed into the hands of the politicians demanding separate Statehood, who formed themselves into what was called the "Telangana Praja Samithi". The Samithi, thereafter, began to organize a planned agitation. The Government became tough with the agitating political leaders,

while the agitation continued till November when there was a split in the Praja Samithi and slowly with the passage of time, normalcy returned to State" (p.33).

Notice the inverted commas around the TPS...”so called” it seems. This was a nationally recognized party that fought the 1971 Parliamentary Election and out of 12 seats in Telangana, contested 11 and won 10 – a score half of the 20 seats won by the BJP. “And slowly with passage of time” – forgotten is the TPS merger with Congress, P. V. Narasimha Rao as CM; all lost on (by?) SKC. The only other reference is: “On the political side, P.V. Narasimha Rao became the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh in September 1971, as the first Telanganite to assume the coveted office” (p.33). “PV” is not in fashion these days.

Unrecorded Deaths

As for the long agitation, the number of those killed in police firing, all that is old hat to SKC as “slowly, with passage of time, normalcy returned to the State” - normalcy but not to the mourning families whose children sacrificed themselves for ...what?

But this amnesia is not just because it was 40 years ago. See what they have to say about recent times: “between May 2004 and November 2005, Telangana reported 663 suicides while Rayalaseema reported 231 and coastal Andhra stood at 174 out of a total of 1068 reported suicides” (p.366). Just this many tragedies?

On an RTI application, the Government of AP confirmed 2,023 suicides in Telangana during 2005 of which it said 1,210 were “genuine”. If SKC can make a hash of such tragic voluntary deaths, what it could do with statistics is to be imagined.

Presidential Order and GO 610

As for the infamous GO 610 and its non-implementation, this is what SKC has to say about the all too revealing Girglani Report; “The Girglani Commission submitted its final report on 30.9.2004 with 126 findings and suggested 35 remedial measures.” (p.47-48). It then devotes a whole chapter to the issue without once mentioning even one of the 126 findings and that the figure for Telangana share of government jobs misallocated to non-Telangana persons varies from 1,00,000 to 2,00,000. Total government jobs in the State are estimated at 12 lakhs, of which Telangana should get a share of at least 4 lakhs. A

loss of one quarter to one half of its entitlement would impact not only on Telangana incomes but also in alienation that the usual confrontation with non-locals in government employment brings.

Irrigation

Now to irrigation - that critical subject for Telangana! SKC brought in an ex-Chairman of the Central Water Commission of the rank of Additional Secretary to Government of India – a Dam person. CWC does not deal with small tanks or wells only dams. See what he has to say: “The Net Irrigated Area (NIA) in all the three regions of AP has increased over the years. In fact the NIA in Telangana has doubled (from 0.8 million hectares in 1956-60 to 1.7 million hectares to by 2006-09). Thus Telangana has experienced a **whopping** 113% increase; while coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema have experienced a much lower growth of NIA at 30% and 55% respectively. Telangana has experienced a remarkable increase in NIA after mid-1970s compared to the other two regions where there is a steady increase over time.” (p.88).

So what have you to bother about, all deprivation is ephemeral, product of diseased imagination. Hold on - when percentages are used, reach for your calculator. Farmers don't deal in percentages they deal in acres and hectares irrigated. Where are those figures? SKC Report reports 100 pages later that: “Tank irrigation has reduced from 4 lakh hectares in 1955-56 to around 2 lakh hectares at present.” (p.189). My calculations (based on GoAP figures) are that during the 53 year period, 1956-2009, Telangana has lost 2.92 lakh hectares of tank irrigation. This implies a loss of nearly Rs. 30,000 crores in government investment in irrigation.

Tank irrigation was out of fashion as SKC seems to think: “A cause of concern is that surface water irrigation through tanks has declined significantly from over 64% in 1955-56 to just 12% in 2008-09 in Telangana. The trend is similar in Rayalaseema with respect to decline in irrigation from surface/tanks.” But wait a minute – even this eminent expert has a problem: “The puzzle is in coastal Andhra, where the canal and tank irrigation has declined by about 10 percent, each over a period of 53 years” (p.89). What is the puzzle? The Government takes care to invest and repair the tanks and canals in Coastal Andhra and not in Telangana or Rayalaseema (where rain and Krishna water is scarce also)

Added to this is the loss of nearly 2 lakh hectares (or 5 lakh acres) of Telangana canal irrigation from the peak of 3,38,276 hectares in 1990-92 to a low of 1,16,203 hectares for 2004-05. The loss of another Rs. 20,000 crores of investment in this government irrigation is a major one

Thus despite the loss of 5 lakhs hectares of government irrigation in tanks and canals, “the net irrigation in Telangana has increased from about 7 lakh hectares in 1955-56 to around 18 lakh hectares in 2008-09.”(p.189). So Telangana is OK.

So how did the “whooping” increase come about? Thereby hangs another tale. This was due to Telangana farmers who invested their own money to increase well irrigation over the same period ten-fold from about 1.30 lakh hectares to nearly 13 lakh hectares (overtaking, by far, tank- and also canal irrigation) as the major contributor to Telangana irrigation. At an (estimated minimum) cost this was Rs 150,000 crores of farmer’s money. More than Jalaygnam!

Invidious Comparison

What is the trick SKC plays? Whenever Telangana is seen to be deprived, SKC compares it with Rayalaseema as if say you are better off without shoes because the other man has no legs! Then why not give Rayalaseema Statehood also. They may be able to manage better on their own. That is only hinted at in SKC but not really addressed. Is Rayalaseema so desperate that it prefers to be a worse deprived region than Telangana by remaining in the unified State? Are they men or mice out there? Can they not stand on their own?

Summing Up

SRC tried to do both an honest and dishonest job at the same time .It admitted that the united State would not work as usual (Option 1). It played the fool with Options 2 to 4 and rejected them itself. It wants Option 6 – a united State with a Telangana Regional Committee, a River Water Development Board and Constitutional Amendment. This is history and it was a tragedy. The TRC was set up along with a similar one for Punjab by amending the Constitution. When the Punjab model

did not work the State was separated. When the TRC was abolished we did not get a State. What was good for Punjab was not good for Telangana. Now SKC wants to repeat that history, now as a farce. What sort of eminence have these person exercised in such a crucial matter.

Part III. SKC did not consider at all: Views Across the National Political Spectrum on Telangana Statehood .

This data for this section as kindly provided by Mr M Narayan Reddy, former MP who has been of great support in this endeavor

These views were solicited in writing by the Pranab Mukherjee Committee set up in 2004 to consider demand for separate Telangana State. They were as follows:

1. The U.P.A. Government will consider the demand for 'formation of Telangana State' at an appropriate time after due consultations and consensus. **U.P.A. Common Minimum Programme adopted in 2004**
2. The UPA Government will consider the demand for the formation of a Telangana State at an appropriate time after due consultations. **President of India's Address to the Joint Session of Parliament, 7th June, 2004. Responses of National Leaders to the UPA Sub Committee on Telangana Statehood – Chairman Pranab Mukherjee**
3. The demand for Telangana State is a genuine demand emanating from the aspirations of the people.....It is my strong belief that Telangana has all the qualities that a self-sustaining State needs:

Economic viability, public support, unique cultural traditions optimum geographical size and relevant historical context...I, therefore, feel that this long standing people's demand should be considered at the earliest; so that further bickering could be avoided. **Chandrasekhar, Ex PM , 21st May 2005**

4. The UP Government made this promise nearly a year ago and has formed a sub-committee headed by Sri Pranab Mukherji for this purpose. It is high time that the assurances given to the people are

fulfilled without any further loss of time. I am of the opinion that the demand of the people of Telangana for a separate State is genuine and needs to be considered at the earliest. I am confident you will do the needful. **V.P.Singh Ex PM, 25th May 2005 to Sonia Gandhi**

The consensus expressed in favor of formation of Telangana State is unique and unprecedented. It has, thereby, made the formation of the State an inescapable necessity for the UPA Government. Any delay in clinching the issue will not only cause erosion of credibility of the present Government but will also force the people of Telangana to go back to the agitation mode. I, therefore earnestly feel that steps should be taken to form the State of Telangana without any further loss of time. **V.P.Singh, Ex PM, 9th August 2006 to Sonia Gandhi**

5. In my speech of 15th August 1996, from Red Fort, as Prime Minister, I had announced the formation of a new State of Uttaranchal. With regards to the formation of the State of Telangana, I had participated in a rally organized by Sri Chandrasekhkar Rao and I publicly made an announcement as per recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission set up in the early 1950s. Even now I am of the same opinion. **H D Deva Gowda , Ex PM , 8th May 2005**
6. I am aware of the background of this demand that has my full support. ..Over the years – ever since the Indira Gandhi era – I have felt that formation of this State would go a long way to end many agonies and sufferances of the people in this region and provide opportunities for their socio-economic development . **I K Gujral ,Ex PM, 24th May 2005**
7. The NCP Working Committee resolved that the demand of the people of Telangana for a separate State is not a new or sudden development. It has been there for more than five decades. The grievances of the people of the region are real and their demand for a Telangana State is genuine. The NCP is, therefore, of the opinion that the State of Telangana should be created without further loss of time. **Sharad Parwar, President, NCP , 2nd May 2005**
8. As already committed by us in the Common Minimum Programme, the Rastriya Janata Dal extends it full support for creating Telangana

State. We earnest feel that the creation of Telangana State cannot be delayed any longer. The people of the region have been fighting for it for more than a half-a-century. It is a people's movement in real sense. This movement has always been solidly backed by every section of the people of the region. Intellectuals, government employees, students remained all though, as the Backbone of the movement. And now, it has percolated down to the agrarian sector and the working classes.... The people of this region strongly feel and they have every reason to feel so - that they can no longer live in the integrated State of Andhra Pradesh with self respect and dignity.....The electoral verdict of 2004 is of great significance in this regard. The Congress Party forged an alliance with the Telangana Rashtra Samiti clearly assuring the people of the region that the State of Telangana will be carved out if they were voted back to power. On the other hand, the Telugu Desam Party in alliance with the Bharatiya Janata Party staked its claim clearly opposing the creation of Telangana and we have seen the result....There cannot be a clearer verdict than this in favor of creating a Telangana State. Any interpretation given the contrary to it will amount to subverting the people's verdict. In a democratic polity, we cannot escape from honoring the people's wishes. The Rashtriya Janata Dal , therefore wholeheartedly suggest that the State of Telangana be created without delaying it any longer. **Lalu Prasad, President, Rastriya Janata Dal , 20th May 2005**

9. The Bahujan Samj Party welcomes the initiative taken to fulfilling the assurances given to the people of Telangana and wholeheartedly supports the formation of Telangana State. The demand of the people of Telangana for a separate State is not a new or sudden development. It has been there for the last five to six decades.... The UPA government has rightly taken up on its agenda the proposal for the formation of Telangana State. It is nearly one year since this promise was made to the people and should have been fulfilled by now. Any further delay in forming the State of Telangana will send wrong signals to the people. Therefore, the Bahujan Samaj Party suggests that the State of Telangana be formed very soon. **Km. Mayawati President, Bahujan Samaj Party, 8th May 2005**
10. It would be in the fitness of things to recall that the merger of Telangana with Andhra to form the present State of Andhra Pradesh

was done ignoring a categorical recommendation made by the States Reorganization Commission. It was also much against the wishes of the people of Telangana and contrary to the views of the tallest leaders of the time Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru....The merger of Telangana with Andhra was however, not unconditional. ...No less a person than Jawaharlal Nehru himself compared it to a matrimonial alliance with the provision of divorce.

The demand of the people of Telangana for a separate State has many dimensions – economic, political, cultural, linguistic, social and so on. Deprived of their legitimate share in the fruits of development, marginalized in the political process and administrative set up, looked down on the cultural and linguistic fronts, they feel that they have been reduced to a status of second rate citizens in their own homeland. In fact, it is not just a problem of economic development. It is essentially a problem involving self-respect of the people of the region...It is already one year since this promise was made and it is high time to redeem forth the assurance given to the people.
Prakash Singh Badal, President, Shiromani Akali Dal, 12th June 2005

11. I wish to convey to you on behalf of our Party that we support the demand for a separate Telangana State.**George Fernandes, President, Janata Dal (United) , 5th July 2005**
12. The People's Democratic Party categorically supports the formation of Telangana State which is just demand of the people of that region. We feel that this matter has already been delayed, even after attaining broad consensus among several political parties across the nation. Having promised to consider the demand of the people for the creation of a separate State , we cannot afford to delay it any further. Creating the State of Telangana forthwith would, therefore, be in the larger interests of ensuring political stability in that part of the country, in particular, and in the entire country in General.
Mahbooba Mufti, President , J&K People's Democratic Party
13. We had also backed the formation of separate Telangana, to be carved out of Andhra Pradesh and Vidharbha, to be formed out of Maharashtra. Indeed the formation of these (five) States was an important commitment in our party's election manifesto in 1998.

A peculiar situation has arisen in the case of the demand for a separate Telangana, a demand which is as old as the formation of Andhra Pradesh in 1956. The BJP has backed this demand. However, we could not do anything in this regard since Telugu Desam, which supported the Vajpayee government between 1998-2004 was opposed to it. Since Telugu Desam was in power in Andhra Pradesh at the time there was no possibility of the AP Assembly passing a resolution in favour of Telangana. As soon as the Telugu Desam severed its ties with the BJP, our party has unequivocally reiterated our support to the formation of a separate Telangana. **L K Advani, Former Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister**

Minutes of the Meeting of Floor Leaders of the AP Legislative Assembly

Again in 2009, as we have seen the views of the State level leadership was requested and they were given as under by the **Minutes of the Meeting of Floor Leaders of the AP Legislative Assembly**, 7th December 2009, 8 pm as faxed to the Home Minister, Government of India by the Chief Minister of the State.

14. The representative of TDP has informed that the stand of TDP was made abundantly clear in their Election Manifesto of the 2009 Elections and that there was no change in the Party's professed stand. He categorically Stated that if Government brings Resolution for separate Telangana, the TDP will support the Resolution. **Telugu Desam Party**
15. The representative of CPM has reported that their party has made their stand clear to the Committee headed by Mr Pranab Mukerjee. **Communist Party Marxist**
16. Representative of Loksatta observed that the Congress Party has been keeping Telangana issue unsettled for 6 years. The Core Committee of Mr Pranab Mukerjee or the Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr Rosiah also has not given clarity to the issue..... He has informed that his party would support the Congress Party, if decisions are evolved carefully, keeping in mind the issues he has referred. **Lok Satta Party**

17. The representative of the CPI has Stated that their party has adopted a political resolution favoring Telangana in the National Conference held in Hyderabad. **Communist Party of India**
18. The representative of the Praja Rajyam Party observed that even though Telangana issue is a complex one, yet his party would support the resolution for separate Telangana, if it is brought before the Assembly. **Praja Rajyam Party**
19. The representative of TRS has observed that in view of the opinions/views communicated by all political parties to the Committee headed by Sri Pranab Mukharjee; as well as the unanimity that is obtaining today, the Telangana Resolution shall be introduced and be passed in the Assembly immediately. **Telangana Rashtra Samithi**
20. The representative of the BJP exhorted that their National Executive in 2007 has categorically supported formation of separate Telangana State. Since the BJP is supporting this cause, Congress need not wait for securing support from other UPA partners , but go ahead with the passing of the bill in the Parliament as was done in the case of bill for revival of AP Legislative Council. **Bharatiya Janata Party**
21. The representative of the MIM observed that as the Assembly is in Session , the proper forum to express his views is the floor of the house and suggested that such discussion may be taken in the current session of the Assembly. **Majlis Ittehad e- Musaleem**
22. The representatives of the Congress Party has informed that since the Congress is a national party, the decisions are to be taken by the party's central leadership, as resolved in the CLP meeting of the Congress Party held today.

Congress Party

23. The Process of forming the State of Telangana will be initiated. An appropriate resolution will be moved in the State Assembly.

Home Minister of India, December 9, 2009

24. On 5th March, 1956, Prime Minister Nehru declared at Bharat Sevak Samaj Conference at Nizamabad, that Government of India had decided to merge Telangana with Andhra State. Nehru made the following observation to pacify the people of Telangana, "*ek masoom ki bachchi (Telangana) ka, ek natkhat (Andhra) ke saath shadi ho raha hai. Kai din ke bad me ittefaq nahi hone ke vaje se talaq de sakthe hain*". (An innocent girl (Telangana) is married off to a delinquent (Andhra). If they are dissatisfied they could seek separation at a later date. **Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, 5th March 1956** (Indian Express 6-3-1956).
25. At the inauguration of the State of Andhra Pradesh Pandit Nehru at Hyderabad, observed as follows: "From this day Andhras are on trial regarding treatment of Telangana People. If people of Telangana are ill-treated then they will have the right to seek separation". **Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, 1 November, 1956.** (Deccan Chronicle 02-11-1956)

Part IV: SKC ignores Girglani Report Findings: A loss of Rs 45,000 crores

Srikrishna Committee (SKC) dealt superficially with many of the assurances given to Telangana intended to avoid unfairness and injustice to its people. The failure to protect Telangana jobs for locals has been the most important grievance of the Region. Yet the SKC has not gone into the matter despite the knowledge of a through going detailed exercise by J. M. Girglani, IAS.

Girglani Report (One Man Commission)

J.M. Girglani Commission (2003) or the One Man Commission (OMC) was set up examine the non-implementation of the GO 610 which reserved government jobs in Telangana for locals. This GO 610 was issued ten years after the Presidential Order of 1975 and yet was not implemented even after two decades

The Girglani Commission revealed the current situation regarding these solemn assurances and guarantees agreed nearly three decades ago by all political forces in the State and Center in the shape of a Presidential Order of 1975 safeguarding Telangana interests.

We need to bear in mind that the Girglani Report was commissioned by the TDP government and has been accepted by succeeding Congress Government. A House Committee of the Legislature and a Group of Ministers has extensively discussed it. There is, therefore, nothing controversial about it except the discoveries it has made and the revelations. None of these findings were taken into account by the SKC

Girglani set out 126 findings and 35 sets of remedial measures. Let us consider only a few of the 126 issues that he examined in light of the Presidential Order and the consequent GO 610.

Heads of Departments

The first is related to the exemption from the Presidential Order of the offices of the Heads of Department (HOD's) of 51 Departments in the State Government from the operation of the Order. The idea, sensibly,

was that since the HOD's offices service the whole of the State their staffing would be Statewide. As he writes:

“ Thus, the 51 Heads of Departments listed in the Annexure to G.O.P.No. 728 of 1- 11-1975, 54 in the Budget Manual, 66 in Financial Code and 78 in Fundamental Rules – got multiplied into 288 (Planning Department's List), 174 (Finance Department's List) and to 145 (GAD's List). Even the Heads of Projects are treated as HODs.... However, the Report has listed out 102 HOD offices that alone are legitimately entitled to exclusion from localization of cadres under item (b) of Para 14 of the Presidential Order.” (See Chapter 1 in the Summary of the Report enclosed).

A Department can have only one single Head, while it may have many wings. Yet the Head of Wings were designated as Head of Departments -wings flew high, as it were, and became heads – an almost mythological exercise. The Departments of Irrigation, Roads and Building, Panchayat Raj Engineering, Health - all became, like Ravana, hydra headed. The Irrigation and Command Area Department even outdid Ravana with 16 Heads, while R&B has 5, and PR Engineering and Health 7 each!! In order to facilitate the posting of non-Telangana officers and staff, State Governments had opted to dismantle its command and control structure and set up multiple HODs. (Chapter 2)

Work Charged Establishment

This group largely consists of manual labour in a casual capacity without any tenure, perks and salaries of normal government employees. They are mainly employed in the Departments of Irrigation, Panchayat Raj and Road & Building. Their employment was exempted from the operation of the Presidential Order as they were temporarily employed and did not constitute a regular government cadre. (Chapter-7)

Yet the Girglani Commission recorded that the Irrigation Department regularized 17,161, Road & Building 5,984, Panchayat Raj 7,860 – a total of 40,870 who were non-local (i.e., not Telangana persons) in the Telangana region. They were given permanent government employment, circumventing the spirit of the Presidential Order. Girglani Stated: “This was only the tip of the iceberg as many more non-locals were employed as Work Charged Employees in Departments which did not furnish figures to the Commission”. As Girglani says: “Such exclusion is even more unjustifiable. These have to be brought under the Local Cadres” (Chapter 7)

Gazetted Employees

The third is the exemption in the Presidential Order for Gazetted employees. This was neatly circumvented by including previously non-Gazetted posts in the gazette with or without changing the designations of the posts. Girglani Stated: "Thus by this ingenious method the local candidates were deprived of the preferential treatment under the Presidential Order. By resorting to these methods the estimated number of posts that were Gazetted after 18.10.1975 (date of Order) cannot be less than a lakh of vacancies which otherwise would have been filled by local candidates." (Chapter 8)

Part-time Junior Lecturers

The fourth is the elaborate and systematic procedure adopted in the polytechnics. Non-locals were appointed as part-time junior lecturers, though even these temporary jobs are direct appointment and are covered by the Presidential Order. Subsequently, the Order is again violated for the second time by regularizing these non-locals as Part-time Junior lecturers. Thereafter, the regularized Part-time Junior lecturers were "transferred" to their "native districts" and given seniority as of a particular date instead of being put at the last rank thus disturbing the seniorities of those selected by the AP College Service Commission /AP Public Service Commission. (Chapter 16)

"Free Zone"

Lastly, there is the neat invention of a "Free Zone". Girglani says,

" There is no territorial stipulation for the organizations that are excluded from the Presidential Order. They may be located anywhere. It is just incidentally that they are located in the Hyderabad City Area, which gives us the impression that Hyderabad City is Free Zone. Therefore, the Hyderabad City or Hyderabad District should not be defined as a Zone VII or a Free Zone which is totally wrong... The Presidential Order does not mention Zone VII and therefore, there cannot be a separate cadre for Zone VII which does not exist." (Chapter 10)

Girglani goes on and on about another 121 issues...the litany is endless, it seems.

The expressions used by this experienced administrator in this Report sums up the conduct of successive administrations over nearly 30 years:

- ◆ “Government may devise some means by which the HOD’s will cooperate in giving information required by the Commission in matters of deviations” (16.2.5)
- ◆ “Perhaps the government may also consider taking action against those who are responsible unless it has been permitted at the Government level itself.’ (16.15.4)

It is very obvious that such a blatant disregard of the Presidential Order over three decades and under different political administrations – even of different political parties - could not have been affected without the active connivance, ignorance, and initiative of the bureaucratic administration of the State. **Which brings us neatly to the point that in the two years that Girglani worked on this job, only 52 Departments have responded to his requirement for data – so much for the writ of the Government!**

The refusal of nearly half the HOD’s to provide data to the Commission appointed by the State government itself shows the level of utter disregard for the established law and its safeguards. Almost all HOD’s are All-India Cadre officers with a responsibility to conduct the business of government as per the Constitution and in conformity to the law and regulations in force. As indicated generally by the Commission and in successive instances, senior All India Cadre officers would have to be party to decisions to violate the Presidential Order. If this could be done then, how is anyone to expect they will do better in any new scheme of guarantees even with Presidential Orders and Constitutional Amendments as before given as proposed under Option 6 – the best and first option of the SKC!

From the individual figures cited by Girglani, the overall figure of Telangana jobs lost to non-locals is a minimum of 150,000. Even at a modest annual salary of Rs 1 lakh per annum (averaged over the thirty year span of the job), this amounts to Rs 45,000 crores of income loss to Telangana people and undue gain to Andhras. Bearing in mind that these government jobs are entitled to pensions till the holder dies and

then thereafter the widow getting her pension till she dies, the loss to Telangana is horrendous. The SKC ignored all this.

It is a matter of almost criminal negligence for the SKC to ignore the extraordinary findings of Girglani's hard work and analysis. It makes no sense for SKC to then go on and say:

"We, therefore, suggest that there is no real need to have any additional administrative instrumentalities for protection of persons belonging to Telangana region in public employment. However, existing safeguards should be implemented with renewed vigour." (p.293)

If there was "no real need" then why should SKC recommend implementation with renewed vigour? The conclusion is that the SKC did not read nor let alone want to understand the Girglani (OMC) report at all. SKC ignored this basic document without analyzing its findings - for if it did, it would come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to maintain further safeguards in a united State dominated by Andhra politicians and bureaucrats.

Part V: WHO IS BACKWARD – TELANGANA OR SRIKRISHNA?

Introduction

It is never a nice thing to be called "backward". In my school days, a student who was called "backward" was one who could not keep pace with either the curriculum or the rest of the students. Next year, he (mine was a boys-only school) would have been kept back in class to repeat the curriculum and to find his true and comfortable place. But let that pass - today being Backward is something else and now allows you to fight for double promotion. And woe is it to them who suggest that he take a back seat where he belongs.

But the Srikrishna Committee (SKC) thought that Telangana deserves a double – maybe even a triple – promotion. So it declared that Telangana was not only NOT "backward" but also in fact better than Rayalaseema!

Government of India's Views and Actions

Parliament was told that 9 out of 10 Telangana districts were included in the under 'Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF)' initiated in 2006-07 to address the problem of regional imbalances. In his written reply to a question in the Lok Sabha put by Mr Suresh K Tawar Minister of State for Rural Development, Pradeep Jain Aditya said regional imbalances result from varying factors such as "differences in resource endowment, geographical and historical characteristics and also availability of infrastructure".

But SKC wrote in their report that:

"The Government of India undertakes a review of the development of districts across India on a regular basis. The intention is to identify the most backward districts and infuse additional funds so as to make the backward districts catch up with other progressive areas across India. The National Planning Commission identifies such districts under the Backward Region Grant Fund (BRGF) scheme:

.....The backwardness of a district is normally defined using three main parameters; 'value of output per agriculture worker', 'agriculture wage rate' and 'percentage of SC/ST population' of the district.

Another factor considered as a special case is the presence of left wing extremism. For example, five districts in Andhra Pradesh namely Nizamabad, Karimnagar, Medak, Khammam and Nalgonda, which are all from Telangana region, are included in the RSVY on the recommendation of the Ministry of Home Affairs. These left wing affected districts constitute 46 % population of Telangana (including Hyderabad) and about 19 % of the population of Andhra Pradesh. On the basis of other backwardness characteristics, four districts from Telangana, three from Rayalaseema and one from coastal Andhra are listed under BRGF. The BRGF population covered due to backwardness works out to be 41% (including Hyderabad) in Telangana, 74% in Rayalaseema and only 7% in coastal Andhra.

Of the total 87% population covered by BRGF in Telangana, 46 % is covered under extremist affected districts selection criteria.

Thus, a large percentage of population from Rayalaseema, relatively smaller percentage from Telangana and very small percentage from coastal Andhra were backward as per the BRGF backwardness identification criteria. Hence, the argument extended by some political parties and civil society groups from Telangana region does not get support from this analysis of the BRGF” (Emphasis mine) p.81-82

SKC reports that: “Being the most backward region of the State, Rayalaseema is apprehensive of its fate in case an autonomous Telangana State is formed. The sentiment in this region, therefore, has been vehemently against the division of the State” (p.353). What is it with Rayalaseema – if it is more backward it should want to separate and stand on its own feet – not live off other regions. What happened to the successors of those great leaders who had to be persuaded to sign the Sri Bagh Pact with false assurances from their Coastal cousins!

This a devious and dishonest attempt of SKC to twist what the Government of India, Planning Commission and the Ministry of Panchayati Raj have Stated clearly. SKC is trying to convince its readers that Telangana was not backward by playing around with words that are not on record and which make no sense. Even the expression “Backward Regions” is part of the title of the Central Scheme. Even by their logic “value of output per agriculture worker”, ‘agriculture wage rate” are clear enough indicators of backwardness.

Anyway, what SKC is trying to convince by this devious and dishonest argument is that out of the 9 districts – 4 (Nizamabad, Karimnagar, Medak, Khammam and Nalgonda) are not backward but Naxalite infected. So only 5 districts are truly backward and these districts contain only 46 % of the population but, it also agrees that if the other 4 are included, the population living in backward districts is 87%! Only the Hyderabad district is forward!!

Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF)

But unfortunately despite all the twists and turns of the SKC argument *satyam eva jayate*. This is what Planning Commission has to say about RSVY and BRGF:

7.1.28. The development of backward regions has been a major concern of planners in India. However, prior to the Tenth Plan, the issue of development of backward areas was approached as primarily one of development of StatesThe emphasis was on backwardness in terms of economic performance, though the impact of historical and social factors in economic matters was also recognized....

7.1.29. The Mid-Term Appraisal of the Ninth Plan showed that despite these efforts, one of the most serious problems facing the country was the wide disparity and regional imbalances between States, and within a State between districts. It was these pockets of high poverty, low growth and poor governance that were slowing down the growth and development of the country. In the Tenth Plan, it was decided to have a new approach to target these areas through a specific programme for Backward Areas, and the Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana (RSVY) was introduced in 2003–04. (Emphasis mine) 11th Plan Document, Volume 1, pp.144-145

So much for RSVY!

The Ministry of Panchayati Raj administers the BRGF, as the idea is to leapfrog State capitals and send the funds directly to the Panchayats in the Backward Regions. Obviously the Center does not trust the States to distribute the funds to those areas most in need! The Ministry says:

1.1. The Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) is designed to redress regional imbalances in development. The fund aims to supplement and converge existing developmental inflows into identified districts,

1.3. The Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) represents a novel approach towards tackling chronic regional backwardness by entrusting a central role in planning and implementation of the programme to Panchayats in rural areas, municipalities in urban areas and District Planning Committees (DPCs) at the district level to consolidate Panchayat and Municipality plans into the district plan” (emphasis mine) “Handbook on monitoring of the Backward Regions Grant Fund”, p.1

So it will be seen that that the BRGF is a fund for helping “pockets of high poverty, low growth and poor governance”, where

“backwardness in terms of economic performance, though the impact of historical and social factors in economic matters was also recognized” and intended to rectify “the wide disparity and regional imbalances by a “novel approach towards tackling chronic regional backwardness”

Conclusion

What SKC has tried to prove by ingenious twists and turns, is that what is real is only a mirage! SKC is the mirage and which has kept Telangana occupied for a year and wasted precious time, which was needed to accelerate development of this Region. SKC has only succeeded in making a fool of itself, when it wanted to fool Telangana.

Part VI : SRIKRISHNA COMMITTEE IGNORES TELANGANA LANDLESS LABOURERS

The Srikrishna Committee while speaking about the poorest of the poorer - the landless agricultural laborers - in Telangana - says the following:

On the other hand, the Telangana region is **experiencing a considerable erosion of relative income amongst the relatively poorer sections**, although the richest seem to have gained during the reference period. (p.107)

This analysis provides credence to the fact that **the most of the deprived communities in Telangana are facing hardship**. (p.108)

Such deepening inequities in Telangana can not only sustain the separatist agitation but it can also carry it further and increase its intensity. (p.119)

But, what is revealing is the fact that **considerably larger proportions have reported themselves as agricultural labourers in Telangana, which has increased from 38% to 47%**, and in Rayalaseema this share has increased from 24% to 39%. In coastal Andhra region, the share of agricultural labour has increased only by about one percent (p.101).

While the farmers in all regions have shown stable income or income which has hardly changed; **the real income of the agricultural wage labour has declined considerably in Telangana**, whereas it has increased considerably in coastal Andhra region (See Figure 2.39). (p.108)

However, while it refers one to charts etc, it does not deal in the text with the real figures – instead it hides them in the Appendix Volume. Here they are:

In Volume 2, Appendix Table 2-1 on page 121, SKC says the rural population in Telangana is 18.2 lakhs, in Rayalaseema 9.0 lakhs and in Coastal Andhra 21.4 lakhs. Actually the figures are wrong - SKC missed a decimal place! They are 182 lakhs for Telangana, 90 lakhs for Rayalaseema and 214 lakhs for Coastal Andhra - small mistake!!! Thus 47% of the rural population being agricultural laborers in Telangana means that nearly 85.5 lakhs are in this category. SKC admits that the **“real income of the agricultural wage labour has declined considerably in Telangana”** and refers us to another chart.

This Chart when closely examined indicates that in the decade between 1993-94 and 2004-05 this group of Telangana people (nearly 90 lakhs persons) **has seen a DECLINE of 35.9% in their income!!**

Over the same period, the 42.7 lakhs of the Rayalaseema group have suffered a real income decline of ONLY 6.7%. Wonder of wonders is that the same group in the Coastal Andhra over the same period – no figures are given by SKC for their numbers – but SKC says it has ONLY increased by ONE percent in size. **However, the real income of the whole group in Coastal Andhra has INCREASED by a phenomenal 42.2%!!!**

So while real income (i.e., purchasing power) of Telangana’s worst placed economic group amounting to nearly ten million persons fell by 36% that of the same group over the same time in Coastal Andhra ROSE by 42%. Even trying to discount the deprivation in Telangana by comparing it with Rayalaseema (the SKC’s standard method) does not work, as the decline in Rayalaseema is one-fifth of that in Telangana

NREGS Data

The SKC toys with the idea of using the National Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) operations to see if Telangana is really backward as it tends to believe it is not. So when they examined the figures they found:

It is clear from Figure 2.16 that NREGA **implementation is relatively better in Telangana compared with coastal Andhra. The number of job cards issued, wage employment provided and also expenditures is considerably higher than the share in rural population in case of Telangana and Rayalaseema.** Whereas these shares are considerably lower in coastal Andhra. (p.82)

Obviously if the real wage rate in Telangana has fallen by 36% in the previous decade compared to a negligible fall in Rayalaseema and a 42% INCREASE in Coastal Andhra, more Telangana agricultural labourers will naturally opt for NREGS wage work. In Coastal Andhra with wages higher than NREGS wages it is surprising that even that much of “progress” there is in NREGS – this could have other implications.

This shows up clearly when you examine the total number of individuals included in the NREGS job cards since inception of the Scheme: for Telangana there are 122 lakh persons, for Rayalaseema 60 lakhs and for Coastal Andhra 101 lakhs. This clearly indicates the extent of distress in both Telangana and Rayalaseema. See (<http://www.nrega.ap.gov.in/Nregs/FrontServlet?requestType=NewReportsRH&actionVal=Abstract>)

How does SKC explain all this? They avoid it altogether and tell us stories of Telangana region GDP being great (Appendix 2.4 shows increases between 1993-94 and 2000-01 of 38%!), that the region is not backward (despite Government of India identifying 9 of the 10 Telangana districts for relief through the Backward Region Grants), irrigation increase is “whooping” (despite the fact that government irrigation acreage fell by 11 lakh acres) and crop productivity is as high or higher than in Andhra or Rayalaseema. They should tell all this to the ten million agricultural laborers whose real income fell by a third while

their Andhra cousins saw an increase of 42%. No wonder their children are in revolt and their parents are solidly behind them and the cause for a Telangana State.

Who did SKC talk to when they wandered around Telangana? Not, apparently to landless agricultural laborers or NREGS beneficiaries!

Data Sought and Hidden

As reported in the Deccan Chronicle on April 24th, 2010 that

The committee sought the district-wise data of fund flow and expenditure pattern since inception of Andhra Pradesh in 1956. The State officials, however, offered data pertaining to last 10-12 years. Incidentally, the successive governments have been spending funds in Telangana region higher than the two other regions in the past 15 years in view of the revival of the T struggle.

“The Accountant General and State treasury officials informed the member that the data could be available from the year of computerisation 10-12 years ago,” a senior official said. Dr Shareef, however, wanted the officials to give as much data as possible and make extra efforts to collect old data.

Dr Shareef handed over a seven-page proforma seeking details of district-wise expenditure in social sector, land development, irrigation, panchayats and urban development, plan and non-plan expenditure, revenue from taxes, land revenue, central grants and State government and cultivable area.

With the bifurcation issue largely revolving around the State capital, the panel wanted the data of Hyderabad to be separated in the revenue and expenditure. (<http://www.deccanchronicle.com/hyderabad/SriKrishna-panel-fails-get-economic-data-767>)

Where is this data and why did SKC not use or even refer to it after it was so laboriously collected over nine months by the State Government through its District Pay and Accounts Offices which maintain a manual record for the last 54 years expenditure and revenue?

Missing Chapter

In the SKC Main Report, Chapter 8, entitled “Law and Order and Internal Security Dimensions” exists on only one page – page 423. That says just this:

8.1.01 During the Committee’s tenure, immediate law and order problems, and also the long-term internal security implications, including the growth of Maoist/Naxal activities were examined. These apprehensions had been expressed in the memoranda submitted by the Political Parties and various other groups, and also during interactions with different stake holders at the State level meetings as well as when the Committee visited the districts and villages.

Besides, the Member Secretary had one to one discussions on this subject with senior officers of the State Government, Police Department and local administration (in seventeen districts). Inputs were also obtained from various other sources. A note on the above covering all aspects has **been prepared and is being submitted to the Ministry of Home Affairs in a separate cover** along with this Report. The Committee has kept these dimensions in view while discussing various options included in Chapter 9 of the Report, i.e., “The Way Forward”(p.423) (emphasis mine).

Not only does the Member Secretary who was a former Home Secretary of Government of India has confidential conversations outside the purview of the Committee with personnel in 17 districts – leaving out 6 other (for what reasons?), but the Committee admits to this highly irregular and improper conduct of the Member Secretary. And to compound it this, the entire Chapter, obviously drafted by the same Member Secretary, is made secret and given separately to the Ministry of Home Affairs. This also is openly admitted! What kind of behavior is this of a Committee presided over a former Supreme Court Judge. The Report therefore – apart from all the mistakes, omissions, commissions is faulty on this ground alone and should be dismissed as irregular and junked as a waste of public funds and time.

Main Conclusion

Whatever the reasons why SKC has not considered important aspects of the Telangana case, the Report has become controversial as it is deeply flawed and hence treated with suspicion by the Telangana people. SKC has worked on the principle enunciated by the Latin adage *suppressio veri; suggestio falsi* – suppress truth and suggest falsity.

Fundamentally, It would seem that SKC was asked to drag on the whole exercise; hope against hope that like the times past in a year, Telangana would “slowly” subside like a soda water (champagne?) when uncorked would become flat and uninteresting. This time it did not work as all the people were involved and stood firm.

In the Srikrishna *tulabharam*, the weight of Satyabhama’s (Andhra) gold will be countered by Rukmini’s (Telangana) *tulasi* leaf. As long as the villages stay firm, the entire world cannot deny the Statehood they so passionately want regardless of it being second best or no best. For them it is the best. That should do!

Appendix C: 'Intellectual Dishonesty in SKC Report' By Sujai Karampuri

The chronic neglect in imparting scientific temperament into our people is now affecting this country, its social life, and its politics. India is suffering from a massive bout of intellectual deficit. This is coming out in various sections of our life. Either it is 2G Scam or Satyam Scandal, it is clear that numbers are being fudged, scientific and dispassionate scrutiny is missing, manipulation and misinterpretation of data is rampant. Now, it has affected the cause of Telangana as well.

We are now facing a new menace in this country, the intellectual dishonesty, where certain eminent people given paramount responsibility of deciding fate of millions of people are misinterpreting data to promote vested interest groups. Justice SriKrishna, a retired judge of Supreme Court, was given the task of making recommendations on the issue of separate Telangana or united AP. The report is out and it is becoming apparent that Srikrishna is subject to the same malaise that has affected Ramalinga Raju of Satyam scandal or Raja of 2G scam. It is also unfortunate that the media houses, some of them respectable ones, like THE HINDU, have also resorted to the same intellectual dishonesty. Instead of making a scientific scrutiny, they are just playing pawns to the same vested interests that have been dominating Telangana for the last 54 years.

Statistics like per capita have never been used by India to form new States or reorganize States. The basis for forming a State has always been to satisfy aspirations of people of certain region. Uttarakhand had a higher per capita than Uttar Pradesh and yet formed a new State. Andhra State, Gujarat, Karnataka were formed on a regional identity irrespective of any study into per capita comparisons. In fact, no such statistics were used when merging Telangana with Andhra State to form united Andhra Pradesh back in 1956.

In the current context, Srikrishna Committee was not given a mandate to set a new precedent or create a new framework to form new States in India. And yet, the data, its interpretations and conclusions from this report are being used by all, the national media, the newspapers, analysts, observers, and detractors to this movement within the State, to make arguments for or against creation of new State of Telangana.

The report establishes a case for proving that Telangana is not backward, and completely dismisses the arguments for discrimination, marginalization and suppression of Telangana, and callously ignores the aspirations of 35 Million people demanding separate State, through a systematic and deliberate set of specious arguments and devious conclusions. On the case of backwardness, it starts off on a premise of using a flawed statistic of growth rates without giving any reference to how and why such statistic should be used.

A correct picture of the economic performance can be well understood by reviewing the rate of growth by region.

And then it goes only to firmly establish the basis of using 'growth rates' as the most reliable economic indicator to understand if a region is indeed backward, though no such precedent exists. It then concludes the discussion by saying:

It is important to note that the GDP growth in all regions excepting coastal Andhra has experienced accelerated growth especially since 2005 where as the growth of income in coastal Andhra has remained constant

These observations have led to other **intellectually corrupt analysts** and reporters in the national and regional media to make announcements like 'Telangana is more developed than other two regions'. Economic Times writes that 'in fact, Telangana leads the non-Telangana regions with respect to several measures: GDP per capita, infrastructure, health and environment.' Even the most respected newspaper THE HINDU suffered from this intellectual malaise.

THE HINDU uses the above statistic from Srikrishna Committee to write:

What stands out in the Srikrishna Committee's report is its sagacity in debunking, on the basis of facts, certain dubious and time-worn theories that were in circulation.

The growth in per capita Gross District level Domestic Product (GDDP) between 2000-01 and 2007-08 was 58.4 per cent in all of Andhra Pradesh, while it was 63 per cent in Telangana including Hyderabad, 60.3 per cent excluding Hyderabad, 58 per cent in Rayalaseema and 54.1 per cent in Coastal Andhra.

To untrained readers which happen to be 99.9999% of the readers in India, it would appear that Telangana excluding Hyderabad is far more

developed than Rayalaseema or Coastal Andhra. In fact, Telugu news channels and newspapers have been using this data to tell everyone that Telangana is not just backward but in fact it is more developed than other regions. That's how the propaganda machine gets to the conclusion that that Telangana agitation is based in lies. Nobody bothers to question this interpretation. None of them asks why 9 districts of Telangana are considered backward by the Central Government if in fact Telangana is more developed than Coastal Andhra?

The devil is in the details and misinterpretations. The statistics have been misused by these intellectually corrupt people. I will not be surprised if in nearby future CBI finds out that this committee was not just intellectually corrupt but also financially corrupt.

Growth in per capita GDP or GDP to measure backwardness is a flawed statistic. Though almost everyone in India would concede that Orissa and Chhattisgarh are some of the most backward States, using GDP growth one can easily prove that these States are more developed than the prosperous States like Punjab and Maharashtra. In the same way, one can prove that famine ridden and civil-war hit Ethiopia and war-torn and battered Iraq is doing better than United States of America.

One of the contentious issues between Telangana and Andhra region is the misallocation of water resources which has led to dry and barren lands for Telangana whose farmers have started to depend on expensive and unreliable bore wells to water their fields. Telangana continues to be one of the most farmer-suicide prone areas in India. The Srikrishna Committee Report refers to Telangana grievances as 'alleged discrimination' or 'alleged injustice' thereby clearly insinuating that they are unsubstantiated or misplaced. But on the other hand, while referring to the Andhras arguments, the authors describe them as 'evidence' setting the tone that it is going to favour Andhras.

Such bias continues throughout the discussion clearly indicating the purport of the report which is to say that there is no discrimination whatsoever towards Telangana in water allocation. Though the Committee was presented with concrete evidences in the form of numerous records by Telangana engineers that substantiate a clear discrimination, it is brushed off by the callous committee members.

The intellectual deficit appears once again. The report refers to 'higher plateau' of Telangana region for inadequate water projects thereby justifying the present condition where Telangana does not get enough water. This is the exact line Andhras use to tell Telanganas why they cannot get enough water: only because it is high up on the plateau. And it has found its way into the report as 'evidence'.

*On the other hand, the delegations and groups from coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema regions have **put forth enough evidence, both orally and through several presentations and memoranda, to suggest that the support for irrigation systems in Telangana region, keeping in mind that the region is on a higher plateau, has been substantial and that there should be no cause for complaint on this front.***

Lack of scientific temperament amongst Srikrishna committee members has come back to do irreparable damage to people of Telangana. If this report is ever used as a framework for keeping the State together under Option 6, all future endeavors to get water to Telangana region would fail because the excuse of 'higher plateau' of Telangana is cast in stone now.

A scientific report on [Deccan Plateau](#) is worth taking a look at.

In its western regions, the plateau averages about 2,500 feet (762 meters) in elevation; in its eastern parts, it averages 1,000 feet (305 meters). As a result of this difference in elevation from one side to the other, almost all rivers on the plateau flow from west to east and drain into the Bay of Bengal.

It is clear that the plateau is highest in Karnataka and Maharashtra and it slopes downwards towards Telangana. Though Karnataka and Maharashtra are further higher up in the plateau they are given

adequate share of water by various tribunals include the recent Supreme Court decision. Why isn't the same excuse of 'higher up on the plateau' not used by the tribunals to deny water to Karnataka and Maharashtra? It becomes evident that the committee members did not make any efforts to understand basics of geography or how water is allocated to each State. Instead they greedily adopted the intellectually corrupt arguments of Government of AP and Andhra leaders.

The report loses its credibility in facts when they quote that Andhra Pradesh had 6 Chief Ministers from Telangana whereas the reality is that only 4 are from this region. While hundreds of Telangana lawyers took to streets to protest blatant discrimination in the appointments giving concrete evidences to the Committee, the report writes that it “informally discussed the matter with two former Chief Justices of the Hon’ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and it was learnt that there appears to be no basis for bias or prejudice and that all appointments have been made as per rules and procedures and in accordance with law.” Intellectual dishonesty continues to pervade throughout the report where ‘informal discussions’ are used to rubbish all the legitimate claims of Telangana people. It makes a mockery of itself when it says that “Bonalu, Sammakka-Sarakka Jathara are widely popular across AP”.

Summary

This report sets new precedents for Telangana and India, like using per capita growth rates for measuring backwardness, establishing legitimacy to the flawed argument that Telangana does not get water because it is higher up on the plateau, giving credence to unsubstantiated opinion that government employees of Telangana are happy with GO 610, for using informal discussions as evidences, and finally for creating a framework of using economic indicators as basis for creation of new States. There is a grave danger to this region and future of India if they take this committee’s report seriously. Such nonsensical precedents are harmful to Telangana and India in general and it is our duty, as Telanganas and Indians, to fight such intellectual corruption before it becomes endemic.

**From <http://sujaiblog.blogspot.com>*

Appendix D: Part-I
Page 423 of Srikrishna Report:
Doubtful Role of Duggal and 'Secret' Basis of 'Conclusions'
By Prof. Madabhushi Sridhar
NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad

Committee for Consultations on the Situation in Andhra Pradesh (CCSAP) headed by Justice B. N. Srikrishna had a single most achievement of establishing peace during 2010, after the state witnessing turbulent agitations following the fast-unto-death by K Chandrasekhara Rao, President of Telangana Rashtrasamithi leading to 9th December declaration by Union Home Minister that process of forming Telangana state commenced and resignation spree of legislators from Coastal Andhra. Another responsibility fulfilled by CCSAP is wide-ranging consultation process, which should have preceded the December 9 declaration. Being just a home committee of Home department, CCSAP has no legal status of any sort. It is not a 'commission' under Commission of Inquiry Act, thus did not have a status of civil court and adverse commenting on its report cannot become 'contempt of court'. The terms of reference are nothing but examining the demands of separate Telangana and united state, consulting all sections and making any recommendations. It was not meant even to perform a 'fact-finding' mission. Merely because it is headed by a former judge, it is not judicial enquiry. The CCSAP did not follow the mechanism of examining the claims and checking them across unlike in judicial enquiry. It did not even adopt natural principles of justice necessitating avoiding departmental bias and hearing the other view to derive logical conclusions on contentious issues, which attracted criticism that it heavily depended on the reports made by the State Government. The final delivery of the CCSAP is neither a judgment nor a finding. Its report is gradually becoming a catalyst for generating controversies and kicking up agitation once again. Besides several blunders and errors reflecting callous report writing, the CCSAP made serious mistakes of allowing member-secretary to have secret deliberations with state officers and keeping a very substantial part of report 'secret'. The gains of the Committee in achieving the peace and fulfilling obligation of making wide range consultations with all sections of people from three regions of Andhra Pradesh, might get vitiated by closed-door consultations with

bureaucrats of state as evidenced by truncated Chapter 8 on law and order, of the Report itself. Cumulative understanding of the entire narration leads to inference that the Union Home Ministry desired denial of Telangana state and suppression of any agitation as a consequence of breaching the commitment made on December 9.

It is very disturbing to know that the basis of 'The Way Forward' – the conclusion and solutions chapter of Srikrishna Committee (Committee for Consultations on the Situation in Andhra Pradesh), is maintained as top secret and the Ministry of Home Affairs made only incomplete report available to the people. The deliberations by senior bureaucrats of 17 districts in Andhra Pradesh, were not open to the full Committee but made only to Mr. V.K. Duggal, member secretary of the Committee. It creates an impression that the Government influenced the Committee through Ministry of Home Affairs using its former officer as the Member-Secretary. If true, it undermines the significance and respect of Mr. Justice Srikrishna Committee. The page 423 (chapter eight) of Report is not in tune with the reputation of the head of the Committee, Mr. Justice Srikrishna as credible and independent judge and its members. Without Chapter 8 on Law and Order (which was given to Ministry of Home Affairs in sealed cover) the Report is incomplete and the people in general are denied access to substantial part which made the Committee to decide the way it has decided.

Neither this Committee nor the Government of India explained why and what is the secret about the deliberations of the police and other senior officers of state on a public issue like separate Telangana or united Andhra Pradesh? Why should they have one-to-one meeting with only Duggal when the Committee with five members headed by a former judge of Supreme Court is making a very serious and deep study of the political problem of separation of Andhra Pradesh? Is it not disrespect to the Committee in general and to Justice Srikrishna in particular?

The Union Home Minister Chidambaram invited on 6th January 2011, all AP political parties to national capital to deliver the copies of report without Chapter 8. Even the Home Minister did not choose to share that chapter 8 with the leaders of the political parties from Andhra Pradesh, who are expected to formulate their views on the recommendations of the Committee. Though it may be reasonable for the Committee to report to MHA for keeping an important chapter secret

from public, it is unreasonable for the MHA to retain it as secret. What remained in the report was just a paragraph that is given in the box below.

Most Problematic and controversial page 423 of Srikrishna Report**8.1.01** During the Committee's tenure, immediate law and order problems, and also the long-term internal security implications, including the growth of Maoist/Naxal activities were examined. These apprehensions had been expressed in the memoranda submitted by the Political Parties and various other groups, and also during interactions with different stake holders at the State level meetings as well as when the Committee visited the districts and villages. Besides, the Member Secretary had one to one discussions on this subject with senior officers of the State Government, Police Department and local administration (in seventeen districts). Inputs were also obtained from various other sources. A note on the above covering all aspects has been prepared and is being submitted to the Ministry of Home Affairs in a separate cover along with this Report. **The Committee has kept these dimensions in view while discussing various options included in Chapter 9 of the Report, i.e., "The Way Forward".**

This statement, which is the single page Chapter 8 of the Report, makes it obvious that the discussions with senior officers were not made in presence of full committee, and also that six districts are omitted, totally. As per the Report, the deliberations between Mr V. K. Duggal, member secretary of the Committee and former senior bureaucrat of Home Ministry, and bureaucrats of 17 districts, formed the 'basis' or considered by the Committee while offering six options in Chapter 9. It is also not known which of those six districts are and why they are omitted. Political parties and people in general are asked to decide the future course of action in dark as they do not have access to complete report.

This paragraph in page 423 is also very significant because entire conclusions were drawn based on deliberations of officers of seventeen districts to one individual officer, and that is expected to guide the Union Government in deciding the future of Telangana or Andhra Pradesh.

When the full committee is not taken into confidence and situation is not totally explained, how can it formulate final views (as told to

Member Secretary and then by him to the Committee) as the basis for Chapter 9, which is final word of the entire report. The members of the committee were denied chance to cross check the points and figures mentioned in that confidential deliberation. It is neither proper nor in public interest to rely on such views, which are not openly discussed or verified. Not only that it excluded totally the other point of view, but also smacks of contempt for CCSAP, its head, Justice Srikrishna and respected members, the elected representatives, political parties, academicians, associations, and people in general who with great respect and expectations presented their points of view. (Since this CCSAP was not constituted under Commissions of Inquiry Act as a commission with a civil court status, the provisions of Contempt of Court Act, cannot be invoked to prosecute the persons attributing motives for the judgment) Though some groups including Telangana Rashtra Samithi were initially reluctant to present their arguments before the Committee, almost every political party, society and association have respected the Committee by presenting before it.

Keeping this part of the report of the Committee as secret is highly objectionable and against the principles of transparency in administration. The very purpose of the constitution of this committee is to make wide and open consultation with all sections and stake holders. That purpose is defeated when administration did not discuss with Committee in an open platform, but preferred secret deliberations with Duggal only. This secretive

deliberations leads to a question that whether the committee was allowed to work with an open democratic frame at all?

It sends signals across the country that the substantial part of report is either penned or totally suggested by member secretary and wetted by Home Ministry. 'Thus essentially it will lead to a conclusion that 'the way forward' (Chapter 9, the optimal solutions and options) must have been made out as desired by the Government of India. It will be difficult for the political parties and the people to consider these conclusions of the committee as they are substantially based on unrevealed reasons. Such clandestine transfer of information does not facilitate the Committee to be independent on this highly contentious issue and might also provoke all sorts of rumors. The rumors will flourish as long as secrecy in public affairs continues.

Srikrishna's tilt in favour of United State

There are two important sentences in the report, which strengthen doubts of efforts to suppress agitation for Telangana, if looked in the context of secret role played by Duggal. First statement is at page (iii) of prologue in paragraph 4, stating the final conclusion as:

".....the Committee found the balance tilting in favour of keeping the state united....."

Thus, in prologue, Committee made it very clear, which again reflected in option 6, described by committee as the best, continuing united state with constitutional safeguards for Telangana. This suggestion has to be seen in comparison with paragraph (e) of Option 5, at page number 453 in Chapter 9, which states:

"...The Committee is of the view that given the long history of the demand for a separate Telangana, the highly charged emotions at present and the likelihood of the agitation continuing in case the demand is not met (unless handled deftly, tactfully and firmly as discussed under option six), consideration has to be given to this option."

From this paragraph it appears that the Committee fully supported the Home department's view of treating the agitation for Telangana as 'law and order' problem and recommended to handle it 'deftly, tactfully and firmly'. Only when the state fails in doing so, option 5- carving out Telangana has to be considered. Here the Committee states that it is discussed in option 6. When reader goes to option 6 of the Report, reads as follows:

"It is possible that the MLAs/MLCs and MPs belonging to different parties in Telangana may be pressurized to resign in order to create a political crisis. It would indeed pose a serious challenge to the leadership to deal with this immediate backlash and the agitations which are likely to continue for a period of time. This aspect has been covered at some length in the chapter on law and order and internal security implications."

As the report stated that 'this aspect was covered at some length in the chapter on law and order and internal security implications', the reader is again directed to Chapter 8 only to reach a dead-end. That Chapter 8 (page 423), as explained above is just one paragraph and whole of it is secret, which was only for Ministry of Home Affairs to

read and act. Thus the Committee and its Report became conduit for the transmission of substantial information from administrators of 17 districts of Andhra Pradesh directly to the Home Ministry. It is very unfortunate.

While starting option 1 (maintaining status quo) at page 441, the Committee said:

“This (status quo) implies treating the issue as basically a law and order/public order challenge to be handled by the state government, not requiring any major intervention by the Union Government.”

Though it comes first in the list of options it is last and least in terms of preference as explained in the Report. Its negative aspect is – implication that agitation for Telangana is a ‘law and order’ problem, positive is – an advise not envisaging any role for paramilitary forces from the Union Government, which of course, the union defied.

The Report in option 6 suggested:

It is, however, also our anticipation that once the empowerment model as also the advantages of the state staying united have been understood by the people it would be possible for the Government to contain and control the agitational activities and take the state towards economic growth and progress.

Use of Force

It was in fact, very responsible way of suggesting that only when people are made to understand the benefits of staying united, it is possible to contain and control the agitation. But the apprehensions of suppression rise high with deployment of paramilitary forces and retaining the chapter 8 as secret till today. These deeds confirm apprehensions that the Congress governments both at center and state are considering this as law and order problem and using paramilitary forces to force a ‘solution’ instead of offering a Parliamentary resolution of the crisis, which was rightly suggested by Srikrishna Committee.

If the developing political situation in AP is any indication, the state might plunge into political turmoil and the power to rule might pass over into the hands of Governor, who is a former police officer. Coupled

with confused conclusions, and contradictory options, the page 423 secret suggesting suppression of agitation as a law and order problem is undemocratic. This is totally favouring anti-Telangana lobby headed by coastal Andhra business-parliamentarians.

As the people have right to know the deliberations between Duggal and senior bureaucrats of the Andhra Pradesh, it is the foremost duty of the Government of India and Andhra Pradesh to immediately lift the veil of secrecy around chapter 8 on Law and Order in Srikrishna Report. Such a method of secrecy and indications of suppression are totally against the spirit of peaceful consultation process established by the Srikrishna Committee. It is the time for taking a decision as soon as possible to put an end to the turmoil and ensure the peace achieved by Srikrishna Committee when political governance failed. It is unreasonable to undermine that hard-earned result and provoking the people into turmoil again. They should assure the people that a) there will be no more secrets in giving people the report, b) the paramilitary forces will be withdrawn, c) a Parliamentary solution will be preferred, and d) their agitation, which is agreed by Committee as legitimate and justified, will not be suppressed by using armed forces.

Part - II Srikrishna's Principles of Injustice

Consciously avoiding bias and meticulously hearing the other point of view are principles of natural justice, which are sine qua none for every administrative, quasi judicial and judicial conclusion, but unfortunately ignored by Justice Srikrishna Committee (on Telangana issue).

For the first time a report of a Union Government Committee is under attack. Even as the experts in different fields challenged the truth of the chapters of Srikrishna Report, its secrecy and constitutionality was questioned in High Court. Mr. Raghu, convener, Telangana Electricity Employees Joint Action Committee (TEEJAC) threw an open challenge to any power sector expert to prove any single conclusion of Srikrishna on Electricity, and win Rs. 10 lakh. He also offered to resign job if defeated. The TEEJAC presented to Srikrishna a well researched document 'Exploitation, discrimination and neglect of power sector in Telangana Region in Andhra Pradesh' with solid proofs, which was not considered by committee. Mr. R. Vidyasagar Rao, former Irrigation Engineer thoroughly exposed blindness of committee as to visible diversion and

exploitation of Telangana Rivers. Similarly almost all of chapters came under severe attack which could not be answered so far.

Attack on its eighth chapter is quite focused in a writ petition by Narayan Reddy (79), senior advocate, former MP. More than the secrecy, Justice Srikrishna's silent approval to reckless package of outsourced chapters is causing serious dent to its credibility. Besides blocking the crucial 'law and order' chapter, the report is vitiated by pro-Home Ministry bias. The consultants engaged by committee were irresponsible in not checking the 'lies', mistakes, blunders and historical untruths. The committee totally depended on Mr. VK Duggal, former official of Home Ministry whose secretive deliberations with selected senior officers of 17 districts formed basis of report. The fuel to attack the report is available in page 423. This half page chapter (8) proved fatal to the veracity, reliability and intellectual honesty of the Committee.

The most controversial part in page 423 is:

"Besides, the Member Secretary had one to one discussions on this subject with senior officers of the State Government, Police Department and local administration (in seventeen districts). Inputs were also obtained from various other sources. A note on the above covering all aspects has been prepared and is being submitted to the Ministry of Home Affairs in a separate cover along with this Report. The Committee has kept these dimensions in view while discussing various options included in Chapter 9 of the Report, i.e., "The Way Forward".

Perpetuation of secrecy

This discloses affairs behind curtains of its 'open' functioning. The committee is formed for Consultations on the Situation in Andhra Pradesh (CCSAP)' to study demand of Telangana or United State. It is not constituted under the Commission of Inquiry Act. Supreme Court former judge as the chairman does not make it a judicial commission. It is supposed to make open consultations; instead, it allowed its secretary to have one to one deliberations with senior officers of selected districts of Andhra Pradesh. These officers made oral representations to Duggal who later interpreted it to the Committee. The information which was not openly presented to the Committee should not have been accepted or admitted. But it was considered and given undue importance without verifying the views or contents. Some one who drafted the final

chapter (9) of 6 options used Duggal's personal deliberations as basis and that chapter was straight away transferred to Home Ministry in sealed cover. This means, its origin when officers spoke to Duggal, latter's interpretation to Justice Srikrishna, and its transmission to Home Ministry,...every thing at every stage was secrecy. The Home Minister did not prefer to share the sealed cover with political parties. Most surprisingly the opportunist and discredited political parties did not even demand the disclosure of the secret report.

No legal status

To a RTI query the Home Ministry rightly stated that it had no legal status. It was reiterated officially before the AP High Court, by none other than Attorney General of India Mr. Vahanvati. The Additional Solicitor General M Ravindran stated that this report (of Srikrishna) would not have any impact on the final political decision. Justice L Narasimha Reddy believed it would definitely have its impact on decision making and thus the public were entitled to know its contents. (Times of India, dated Feb 18, 2011)

On 17th February, 2011, Mr. Ravindran gave eighth chapter to judge to read it. Quoting instruction from Government, he said that this was based upon sensitive intelligence reports, security concerns, in the event of final decision on the Telangana issue. After reading it in his chambers, judge was controlling himself and said that the contents made disturbing reading. (The Hindu dated Feb 18, 2011) His further reaction in the form of observations during conversation with Additional Solicitor General was:

“...the report is full of lies and a mind-boggling description of non-existent things....It is unfortunate that this report and its related exercise was presided over by a former judge of the Supreme Court. Any person with a semblance of faith in the system of democracy would lose faith in it. The report prepared by the front office of an MP would have been more sensible than this report. Even the high command of a political party would have hesitated to prepare such a report...It is disgraceful for any person. Was it for this that the government spent `40 crore on the committee?... such reports would decrease the public confidence in judiciary....If the judiciary fails in protecting democracy then who will?” (Deccan Chronicle, dated Feb 18, 2011).

The sitting judge's comment on the former judge of Supreme Court caused a flutter in the legal circles. One advocate who was present in the court told this author the three formulations of the judge as follows:

1. It is a text book case to demonstrate as to what a sitting or retired judge should not do when heading a committee.
2. A person with clear political leanings would have chosen to be respectful to the other point of view than the committee has chosen to be;
3. Task assigned to committee is purely administrative in nature, however the high command of a political party would have hesitated to do what the committee did.

As suggested by the Judge, Mr. Ravindran read the last four paragraphs and commented that they need not have gone into all this. (The Hindu, 18th Feb, 2011). Being administrative in character, Srikrishna Committee has an onerous responsibility to be truthful, transparent and unbiased.

Departmental bias

Generally the retired judges of higher judiciary are appointed to lead such committees and commissions because they know how to verify conflicting claims to arrive at truth. One of the major follies of the committee is that it allowed Duggal to hear the police officers to decide such an important social issue of people's demand for Telangana. It is just 'his master's voice'. Its suggestion to give Telangana state only when agitation is not handled deftly is facing severe criticism as anti-democratic and provocative.

The Home Department tried to use independent stature of Justice B N Srikrishna and his reputation in giving an objective report on Mumbai blasts in time. But his report on Telangana proved otherwise. The over-reliance on consultants and secretary caused irreparable loss to him personally and to UPA Government politically. Ruling party MP Mr Madhu Yashki leveled serious charges of corruption against the Committee, to which Duggal reacted severely warning legal action. But no action was so far initiated. Will the government reveal the secret report to save the face or wait for the directions of the AP High Court?

Appendix E: 'On Water Resources and Irrigation'

By R.Vidyasagar Rao

Retired Commissioner, Ministry of Water Resources, GOI

In response to the notification of the Srikrishna Committee soliciting the views and suggestions from various political parties and other stake holders, the Telangana Rashtra Samithi (TRS) submitted its detailed report Vol-II (Irrigation) to the Committee. The Committee in turn appointed a technical expert to examine the issues contained in the Report and to enquire whether there has been any neglect or dis-crimination, as well as to suggest remedial measures for improving the situation related to water / irrigation in the State, as stated in the para 4.3.01 of the committees to report. Unfortunately, the Expert has not pointed out the neglect or discrimination directly and rather chose to remain silent, perhaps with an intention not to embarrass the Govt. of A.P. though sufficiently, at many places appeared to have agreed with the grievances high lighted in the report of the TRS. The grievances brought out before the committee and have been dealt in the following paras:

1. Howlers : Some of the howlers that had appeared in the report are:
 - i) The increase in the irrigation potential through major and medium projects after the formation of the State is reported as 713 % in Telangana which is just absurd (4.4.08). It has increased from 7 Lacs ha to 18 Lacs ha (Para 4.4.08 itself)
 - ii) 7 river lifts “planned” (should have been “being executed”) on river Krishna have been shown as on river Godavari (Para 4.4.04).
 - iii) Through RDS on Tungabadhra, Telangana receives much less water. This has perhaps not been taken up effectively by the Tungabadhra Board. Tungabadhra Board has nothing to do with the RDS as it has no jurisdiction over the RDS (Para 4.5.02 (II)).

The above shows that much carelessly and in a most casual way such an important report has been drafted.

2. **Statistics:-** The report has produced the official statistics without bothering to verify the same and further did not carry out any

analysis. To cite an example, in Telangana, it is reported that the net irrigation has increased by 11 Lac hectare whereas there has been a marked increase of 12 Lac hectare under the well irrigation itself. This is in contrast with the coastal irrigation where it is mostly through the canal irrigation. Entire expenditure for increase in the well irrigation is borne by the farmers whereas the coastal farmers are getting virtually free irrigation, thanks to the Govt. The committee did not bother to mention this vital point. Similarly, the Committee does not analyze as to why there is a sharp decline in tank irrigation in Telangana as compared to other regions.

3. **Jalayagnam:-** It was brought to the notice of the Committee that the Govt. is claiming that lot of new ayacut has been provided with irrigation facilities through new projects and thus it is making a false propaganda. The expert himself during his visit to the SRSP project has enquired the farmers of SRSP-II and found that the claim of Govt. was utterly false. Unfortunately, the report does not contain his observations and on the other hand produced the statistics by the Govt. without any cross verification (Para 4.4.05 (II)).

4. Grievances :

- A) Though the Committee has agreed to a few of the grievances pointed out by the Report of TRS, Engineers during his site visit, he failed to pin point the reasons for such grievances and did not fix any responsibilities on the authorities leading to such grievances. In fact as per the terms of the appointment of the expert, he was required to point out the neglect / discrimination, but unfortunately the expert has failed to fulfill his obligation in the matter. The issues which the expert /committee agreed to are as under :
- i) Illegal construction of Potireddipadu head regulator and raising of MDDL of Srisailem Reservoir without proper sanctions and any supporting technical data.
 - ii) Delays in execution of Jurala and Lendi.
 - ii) Less flow through RDS (However, did not mention about deliberate and illegal diversions by the K.C. canal farmers).

- iv) Poor State of planning and execution of SRSP.
 - v) The hapless condition of farmers of Ghanpur and Nizamsagar projects.
 - vi) Need for undertaking transfer of Krishna water to Hyderabad in order to release Singur to its farmers.
 - vii) Dropping of Nagarjuna Sagar left bank canal into Palair reservoir.
 - viii) Need to provide piped domestic water to the areas affected by flourosis in Nalgonda Dist.
- B) The Committee did not agree to a few of the genuine grievances brought out before the Experts by brushing aside the same on the basis of strange and typical arguments, which have no scientific basis. These grievance are as under :
- i) The deliberate neglect of tanks in Telangana by the Govt.
 - ii) The grievances in respect of Polavaram Project.
 - iii) The grievances in respect of Inchampally Project.
 - iv) The slow progress of SLBC.
 - v) Utilisation in Krishna and Godavari.
- C) The Committee has ignored many grievances which have been brought out to the notice of the Expert for the reasons best known to him. They are :
- i) The projects that have been abandoned, truncated / mutilated and neglected, a list of which was already furnished in the report Vol-II (irrigation) submitted to the Committee.
 - ii) Taking up of Dummugudem – N.S. Tail Pond project.
 - iii) Awarding Pranahita Chevella works even without preparation of DPR.
 - iv) Comparison of release of funds of SLBC vis-à-vis - Telugu Ganga.
 - v) Release of Kinnerasani Waters to Dhawalesvaram barrage.
 - vi) Disparities of areas irrigated in Telangana vis-à-vis other parts of Andhra Pradesh.
 - vii) Introduction of micro irrigation in Telangana.

viii) Modernisation of schemes in Andhra .

ix) Issues of G.O.s with jet speed in respect of Andhra Projects.

5) Lift Schemes :- The expert has his own bias towards the lift schemes, though Govt. after considering various aspects thoroughly have cleared may lift schemes, which are already under execution. The Expert chose to point out that these schemes involve huge costs. In support of his argument he has considered an economic power cost of Rs.6/- per KWH whereas it is somewhere between Rs.2.50 per KWH.

In nut shell, the report appears to have been prepared with a malafide intention and under influence of vested interests. It has deliberately chosen to avoid pointing out the real culprits and ill intentions of the Govt. in cheating the Telangana region by stealing their legitimate share of water and causing innumerable hurdles in implementation of the projects.

Appendix F: News Articles on Srikrishna Report What the Srikrishna report missed on Telangana

From Tehelka Magazine, Vol 8, Issue 3, Dated January 22, 2011

IN LATE 2009, a question was asked, with fire and blood, across Andhra Pradesh's northwestern Telangana region. One year later, it seems a whole other question has been answered. When the Srikrishna Commission (SKC) was set up last February, its mandate was to identify the root causes that fuelled the 60-year-old movement for a separate State of Telangana, and recommend ways to address these issues. While the report, submitted on the last day of 2010, makes six recommendations, it has only scratched the surface of why 10 districts in the fourth largest State in the country have been screaming to break away.

In Telangana's Adilabad district, 350 km from Hyderabad, residents of Anandpur village gather under a banyan tree. In the keen silence that descends, cotton farmer Raja Reddy, 52, speaks, "Imagine you have three sons who fight each other all day, every day. As a father, your first response is to pacify and make them understand. But after the fifth, when the fighting doesn't stop, the sensible choice left is to divide your eState into three and let them go their separate ways."

However, Raja has never felt like he was part of the AP family. The conversation under the banyan tree keeps returning to how the people of Telangana have nothing in common with coastal Andhra and Rayalseema, the other two regions of the State. When the Telangana movement was reignited through student agitations in December 2009, it defined itself as an identity movement, a call for "self-respect". The movement has waxed and waned since before the 1956 merger of Telangana with AP, but never died down. Alongside it, influenced by it, evolved a political culture in Telangana. So much so that today, to sever the three elements of the movement — identity, economy and politics — is to glean a half-truth. But this is exactly what the report has done.

The report presents 461 pages of largely economic arguments disproving Telangana's claim of backwardness. Often, it says, "There are a few crucial indicators on which Telangana is lagging behind." But the Statehood demand is deeply political, wound in narratives of

“perceived injustice”, as the SKC itself calls it, and an unshakeable anger against discrimination from other regions. By stating Telangana has been the fastest growing region and Rayalseema is worse off than Telangana, the report painstakingly debunks the claim of poverty in Telangana, but it doesn’t devote the same thoroughness to the identity question. In doing so, the report presents an economic solution to a political problem.

In Dipaiguda, Bheema Reddy, 49, a cotton farmer and mandal Congress president, offers an instance of the politicisation. “Since all the power is with the Andhra lobby, nothing gets done here. Take the Penganga inter-State irrigation project, which could have changed our lives. MLAs, including the present one, have been trying for the past 20 years to get it going, but nothing has moved because he doesn’t have enough clout.”

It’s not just the lack of projects but also the differential response to needs that irks them. “In Andhra, if a coconut tree falls, they get Rs. 4,000 as crop insurance. Here, we get Rs. 300,” says Perkgugudda resident M Linganna. When the State lost last year’s harvest to floods, the government reacted swiftly in Andhra. “The interest on their loans was waived and they got reasonable crop loss coverage. Here, we are yet to see a paisa,” he says.

The crowds that gather to discuss Telangana respond to an often repeated Statement in the SKC report: the movement is primarily the doing of frustrated youth and poor Dalits whose disaffection at unemployment and backwardness respectively has been cynically exploited by an opportunistic political class to fuel a divide between Telangana and the rest of AP. “But the discrimination is real for us!” says Ravinder Reddy, 40. “Name one hero from Telangana in Telugu movies. It’s always the buffoons and villains who are from Telangana.” Raja adds, “Inter-marriages are very rare. Andhraites settled here prefer going 1,500 km back to Nellore to find a match. We only make good neighbours it seems, not good in-laws.”

DID THE SKC ask these questions when they visited Adilabad? “They were here for an hour. They conducted meetings at the Collector’s office and went to a single village 3 km away,” says Ravinder. The mobilisation, albeit political, has reached wide and deep, and its

arguments of injustice are today part of the Telangana people's idea of who they are. This unquantifiable but crucial element of the movement finds no place in the report.

But their economics might not be fully sound either. The SKC report doesn't include any data from a 163-page report on the power sector in Telangana. K Raghu, executive engineer at AP Transmission Corporation, says that apart from factual errors about the location and establishment dates of hydel and thermal plants, the SKC report has "conveniently left out facts and documents we submitted to their technical expert VB Gupta".

The electricity report shows that the State government incurs an annual loss of Rs. 1,100 crore in transporting coal from Telangana to power stations in other regions, when economic logic points at building projects close to the fuel source. Out of 19 power projects coming up in the State, only three are in Telangana.

Villagers describe a process of migration that finds no mention in the report. "Over the past 20 years, Andhraites have been migrating to Telangana, leasing and buying land," says Ravinder. "Because of irrigation costs, agricultural land in Andhra is expensive. One acre would cost upwards of Rs. 1 crore. The best land in Adilabad costs Rs. 5 lakh. With more wealth and political connections, they are starting petrol pumps, real estate firms and cornering all infrastructure contracts."

If the report had focussed as much on the social mechanisms and politics underpinning the fight for resources as it did on the resources itself, it might have asked pertinent questions that would have gone a long way in understanding the aspirations of people on both sides of the divide. Instead, it remains a document about a region, not its people.

Srikrishna committee report just reiterates old arguments

Mohan Guruswamy | DNA India | Tuesday, January 11, 2011

The long-awaited Srikrishna committee report is out. It makes no specific recommendations and has thrown the ball back to the politicians. Thus, even though it was completed in time, it has been a waste of time. All it did was to keep Telangana tempers bottled up for some months. Now be prepared for the explosion.

The report tends towards retaining the status quo with some palliatives to assuage the widespread sentiment in the Telangana area.

To serve this end it has sought to disprove the claim of most Telangana protagonists that the Telangana region has remained a backward and under-developed part of Andhra Pradesh even after more than half a century. It has marshalled numbers and used data to support its case.

As a professionally qualified economist and policy analyst, I know very well that facts can be used to prove or disprove pretty much any proposition. The Srikrishna committee has used the economist on board to good effect and he has done a good job of what he was tasked with. But what Dr Abusaleh Shariff misses is that the issue is not one of regions as much as it is about people.

The essential grouse of the Telangana protagonists is that the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1956 was not adhered to, and the people of Telangana were excluded from the development process and given a short shrift in the political process.

Two examples are all it takes to establish this. At the time of integration, it was promised that Telangana would have a regional council that would oversee the development works and, most importantly, all the land transfers. This was to ensure that wealthier migrants from the coastal Andhra region did not buy out the poorer people of Telangana.

But this has happened in every Telangana district where large migrant populations from coastal Andhra have bought up vast tracts of the best canal and tank-irrigated lands. The migrants will argue that land was bought legally. That is exactly what the Jewish settlers in occupied Palestine say.

If the Srikrishna committee had spent some of its time studying who owned how much, it would have got a pretty good understanding of what the Telangana protagonists were talking about. Instead it went out of its way to make a case that all was well in Telangana.

It was this fear of being swamped, widespread among Telangana people, which was very apparent to the States Reorganisation

Commission(SRC) (1953-55) headed by Justice S Fazal Ali. The SRC recommended that “the residuary State of Hyderabad might unite with Andhra after the general elections to be held in about 1961, if by a two-thirds majority the Legislature of Hyderabad State expresses itself in favour of such a unification”.

The SRC also recommended that the residuary State should continue to be known as Hyderabad State and should consist of Telugu-speaking districts of the then-princely State of Hyderabad, namely, Mahabubnagar, Nalgonda, Warangal (including Khammam), Karimnagar, Adilabad, Nizamabad, Hyderabad and Medak, along with Bidar district, and the Munagala enclave in the Nalgonda district belonging to the Krishna district of Andhra. This recommendation of the SRC was not heeded and it is the root of today’s demand.

Water for agriculture has been a big issue for the people of Telangana. The region is home to two of India’s greatest rivers, the Godavari and Krishna, yet canal irrigation accounts for little more than 10% of the irrigated acreage. The area irrigated by private sources, such as wells and tube wells account for about 65%. Tanks, which used to account over 60% of the irrigated acreage in 1956, now account for less than 5%.

By contrast, over 50% of the irrigated acreage in Coastal Andhra is by canals and another 15% or so from tanks. Mind you, water from canals and tanks comes free, whereas well irrigation entails huge capital costs and recurring expenses. To rub salt into Telangana’s wounds, a good part of the water from the essentially Telangana projects like the Nagarjunasagar project is drawn away into Coastal Andhra.

The Srikrishna committee was constituted to examine issues that have led to widespread alienation in Telangana. Instead of doing that in a dispassionate manner, it seeks to establish that the claim for a separate Telangana is without any economic or social basis. Its main recommendation is that a single State with some Constitutional provision to assuage Telangana sentiments will suffice. The least the learned judge should have known is that such Constitutional arrangements will be unconstitutional, if they are only applicable to one region.

The sorry State of our democratic process is illustrated by the fact that despite the demand for the Telangana State being supported by all the elected representatives of the region and by every political party except the CPI(M), it is sought to be fobbed off taking recourse to the specious and nonsensical logic that the Naxalites will somehow take over Telangana in the end. If malgovernance becomes the only reason for the takeover by Naxalites, then it would seem the whole country is ripe for it?

Appendix G: News Reports on Srikrishna Committee Members Duggal's presence at TSR's dinner party kicks up row

(The Hindu 11/11/2010)

HYDERABAD: Congress leaders from Telangana and Seemandhra were locked in another round of verbal duel following Justice B.N. Srikrishna Committee member-secretary V. K. Duggal attending a dinner party hosted by MP T. Subbarami Reddy this week.

Telangana Congress MPs took objection to it claiming that it had sent wrong signals to the people of Telangana. Mr. Duggal, however, did not attach much importance to the meeting claiming that the MP held an official position "Visit to Mr. Subbarami Reddy's house is a personal affair and I had gone to houses of Telangana leaders earlier," he said.

Congress MP from Karimnagar Ponnampallabharathi Prabhakar launched a scathing attack on Mr. Duggal while Congress Action Committee for Telangana demanded his resignation. "Justice Srikrishna should sack Mr. Duggal if he refuses to resign," former Minister R. Damodar Reddy said.

Andhra MPs hit back at the critics of Mr. Duggal. Guntur MP Rayapati Sambasiva Rao said, "This is ridiculous. What is wrong if the member secretary attends a party hosted by Congress MP?" Mr. Duggal told The Hindu that the committee would visit the State in mid-December after the conclusion of the Parliament winter session. Meanwhile, the TRS took strong objection to Mr. Duggal's participation in the dinner hosted by Congress MP T. Subbarami Reddy.

TRS MLA K. Tarakarama Rao and others said at a separate press conference that the member-secretary's participation in the dinner was akin to a judge visiting the house of an accused.

Telangana group flays Srikrishna panel Member-Secretary

(Expressbuz 11/11/10)

NEW DELHI: Member-secretary of Justice BN Srikrishna Committee, VK Duggal, on Wednesday clarified that his presence at a dinner hosted by senior Congress leaders in New Delhi would have no bearing whatsoever on the report the panel would be submitting to the Centre on the contentious issue of Telangana.

Former MP T Subbarami Reddy, MPs Rayapati Sambasiva Rao, Mekapati Rajamohan and Lagadapati Rajagopal had hosted the dinner in honour of this year's Dadasabheb Phalke award winner and film producer D Ramanaidu on October 23.

Duggal was among the VIPs who had attended the high-profile dinner party but ever since he had been targeted by the Telangana leaders, even those from the Congress, who saw a conspiracy by their coastal counterparts to influence the committee.

"Nobody should read too much into my dinner participation," Duggal said and pointed out that he had had high tea with Telangana leaders and also mixed with leaders from the other regions in the State on different occasions.

Addressing a press conference here, Duggal further said he had also watched the Commonwealth Games with a group of politicians. "This is just a courtesy. These visits will have no impact on the committee or its report," he asserted.

A few leaders from the Telangana Rashtra Samithi (TRS) expressed the apprehension that Duggal's action would cast a shadow over the committee's report, slated to be submitted to the Centre by December-31.

Telangana group flays Srikrishna panel Member-Secretary

(Hindustan Times 11/11/10)

The Telangana Joint Action Committee (JAC) of TRS and various people's organisations today criticised VK Duggal, Member-Secretary of the Centre-appointed Srikrishna Committee, for attending functions hosted by Congress MPs from non-Telangana regions. "Duggal's meeting with the non-Telangana MPs is creating doubts in our minds. Justice Srikrishna (who heads the panel) should clarify on this matter," JAC Convener M Kodandaram told reporters.

Talking to reporters in Delhi a few days ago, several Congress MPs from Telangana also took exception to Duggal reportedly visiting the residence of Congress Rajya Sabha member and former union minister T Subbarami Reddy in the national capital.

The Telangana MPs reportedly asked how can Duggal visit the residence of a non-Telangana MP when he is supposed to give a fair and impartial report on the Statehood issue.

TRS has also taken exception to Duggal, a former Union Home Secretary, visiting the residence of Reddy.

Duggal, however, asserted that he is an Indian first and treated all regions of the country alike. He has known Reddy for about 15 years now, Duggal said.

The Member-Secretary reminded he had attended an art exhibition on Telangana earlier and that he had tea with MPs from the region on a different occasion.

Talking to reporters in Delhi a few days ago, several Congress MPs from Telangana also took exception to Duggal reportedly visiting the residence of Congress Rajya Sabha member and former union minister T Subbarami Reddy in the national capital.

