

3. Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand Movement, India: Question of 'environmental revivalism' and its consequences

Prasenjit Ghosh

Assistant Professor in History
Mugberia Gangadhar Mahavidyalaya
Bhupatinagar - Purba Medinipur
West Bengal, India

ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6606-5312>

URL: <http://www.mgmahavidyalaya.org>

E-Mail: prasenjitghosh77@gmail.com

Abstract

The fragile political development and the desperation to have a separate state of Jharkhand was a common phenomenon in the last hundred years of struggle for separate Jharkhand state out of the so called tribal districts of Bihar. In the early phases, to facilitate tribal demands, Jharkhand politics depended heavily on their voices, formed organizations to promote socio-economic rights but later we see a different pattern of politics, which affected the original emotional demands, in other words a shift from emotional platform to a more intellectual platform. Such transition did not always have taken right paths, factions come into play in a big way, and therefore it tended to bypass the basic demands like environmental and ecological restoration. Evident suggests that the entire political development underwent severe lacuna in regard to united movement. However in the late 1970s onwards there was a remarkable shift towards the demands of the earlier decade which considerably shortened the period towards a separate state.

Keywords

Jharkhand, Politics, Movement, Environment, Tribes

Supporting Agency

This paper is the excerpt of the UGC Minor Research Project under the financial help of the University Grants Commission carried out in the year 2014.

Vol. 4 No. 2 (2016)

Issue- June

ISSN 2347-6869 (E) & ISSN 2347-2146 (P)

Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand ... by Ghosh, P. Page No. 27-55



Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand Movement, India: Question of 'environmental revivalism' and its consequences

Introduction

Jharkhand Movement in India has been considered as one of the oldest autonomy movements emerged due to "Urbanization-Industrialization pattern of development" (Pathak, 1994:63) in the post colonial 'rectification'¹ regime. However the movement can be located in the early past, around 200 years ago and was launched by the tribal leaders against the colonial hegemony through opportunist traders, money lenders whom the tribes coined as "*Diku*"². It was a tribal dominated movement that had roots of many historical legacies. The Munda rebellion, Santal insurrections and many other tribal movements had tremendous impact on the memory of the tribal leaders to reconstruct the whole event of discomfort and the possible way to free from the disarrays. Since the late 18th century after many ups and downs the movement for autonomy succeeded by achieving new state which was the 28th state of the India that brought into existence by the Bihar Reorganization Act on 15th November 2000, (Singh,2004:139) the birth anniversary of legendary Birsa Munda. Since the formation of the new state within the jurisdiction of Indian Constitution got tremendous academic attention on the question of deterioration of the situation of the state in various aspects. Various reports of central governments as well as NGOs revealed about the worst condition of its inhabitants amidst huge success over the demand of separate state.³ Apparently those reports are prepared from ground level surveys that criticized the necessity of a new state.

However Jharkhand Movement was not among the movements which can be discussed within a single line of argument. It was vast and multifaceted as it was studied in many literatures. Similarly, it was not easy to contextualize all the parameters because of the varied circumstances. It has many issues, such as the political issues, environmental issues, ethnic issues, and tribal issues, economic issues and all of these issues merged with the demand of Jharkhand Movement from time to time and thus it is difficult to move freely with one another. Keeping in mind of the complexities and the vastness of the movement, this paper attempts to interconnect the Jharkhand politics with the

¹ Here the term 'rectification' is used to link up the early attempt to industrialization and post independent industrialization process. Many writers argue that the postcolonial attempt to rectify the early attempt was intensifying more dissatisfaction.

² 'Diku' in most common understanding stands for outside exploiters

³ The present socio-economic situation of Jharkhand has been studied extensively by many organizations. An UNDP programme revealed some unhealthy parameters of Jharkhand State. It was reflected in a article 'Case Studies on Tribal Rights in Jharkhand' by Amit Prakash supported by Asia Pacific Gender Mainstream Programme (AGMP), pls see (asia-pacific.undp.org/practices/governance/azj/docs/casestudy-06-India-Jharkhand.pdf) retrieved on 14.03.2013

environmental revivalism dynamics. At one point it was presumed that the environmental and ecological issues in the long run subsumed in the greater politics, because Jharkhand politics always tended to bifurcate the rural issues such as the geographical uniqueness or the determinants with national interests and at some point it was irretrievable, because of the demand of that time. Thus many issues to a great extent not fully matured because of the political instability in many phases. Indeed it was interesting that at the end; particularly in 1970s such instability reoriented with a high level of maturity towards rural environmental issues and put larger reliance on environmental problems. Issues like environment and ecology began to dominate the last phases of Jharkhand movement which was undoubtedly the major watershed in the history of the Jharkhand movement.

The origin of Jharkhand Movement and the fragmented politics

Jharkhand Movement in colonial and post colonial India had been originated in two distinct phases. It was first organized against the Zamindars, Mahazans and British until the early quarters of 1930s and ended before the independence engrossing land and forest as an integral part of tribal life. It was again got refuelled after Independence against the state hegemony reflected in anti tribal policies by targeting the Congress Ministry. Indeed post colonial movements are more radical because of the realization that the post colonial state expression was nothing but a mere exchanges and shift of the ideas of the past, both is trouble maker⁴. Thus post colonial Jharkhand witnessed many tribal revolts to resolve state atrocities within political understanding, at the same time it allows the tribe to think certain choices of existentialism. The varied experiences show that the escalating discontent in South Bihar (Presently Jharkhand State) was emerged from the alienation and mechanization of traditional tribal culture through long pauperization. It happens due to opening up of resource rich land to the outside exploiter which makes the region a type of enclave surrounded by the unknowns. In these miserable conditions, politics played an important role which exalted an image of tribal solidarity, reckoning a particular point of politics that has a great influence over tribal mobilization through different time and spaces. Furthermore the politics of Jharkhand created the platform where tribal communities can share their demands, equivocally decide the path leading to a separate state. Since the first general election in 1952⁵ when the Jharkhand Party contested and won 32 seats, the electoral politics came as the most decisive factor in the Jharkhand Movement. Following the era of emergence of local politics, a crisis in ideology instigated the leaders to think differently and it was gradually sharpened when there was a fragmented approach in almost all the matters because in

⁴ It has been stated by different Jharkhandi Protagonists in their writings that the problem of Jharkhand remained within the domain of State Govt as well as the central govt and their consecutive policies, they thought that maximum policies implemented so far was not tribal friendly.

⁵ In 1952, in the first General Election Jharkhand party has contested in 53 assembly seats and won 32 seats. See details in Election Commission of India (1952), for further study pls see K.S.Singh op.cit, p-134

most decisions Jharkhand politics never followed a single line of argument. It was critical and confound in each formative period. It was happened because in many occasions particularly in the 20th century the nature of historical events (in political terms) had received dramatic changes due to the cumulative failure in the leadership appraisal⁶. It was true that leaders' participation and strategic articulation sometimes fosters people's zeal of getting into the demand they sought. At the same time, character of any regional movement and its steadiness definitely depends upon its leaders who in the course of the movement became an iconic figure and being remembered for a long time despite of success or failure. However in the case of Jharkhand Movement, the beginning of the first quarter of Independence brought an organized intellectual idea within the periphery of democratic politics. Some of the leaders were also comes up and holds their participation and systematized the course and rationalized the whole movement by political understandings. These discourses produced by intellectuals in tribal and non tribal leaderships of both regional level and in national level.

As early as 1930, the acceleration to consolidate the voices of Jharkhand was distinct and the overall strategy was to give an exclusive platform to the tribal people against state hegemony over different issues. As we discussed earlier that hegemony implies to the economic orientation of the state that steadily alters the primitive economy by propagating hegemonic policies⁷. However the aims of the state was to bring local prosperity, at least on paper, but local experiences suggests that these policies imported alien rule in the region and created steady diasporas of tribal communities from traditional home and hearth. Many writers and protagonists have univocally accepted the views that those policies dispassionately deprived substantial section of forests dependent tribes and their customs. These excluded sections were known as the '*ecological refugees*'⁸ (Mallick, 2007:20-23). They seldom have faced such time when they have to leave their forefathers places and to migrate to other region for alternative subsistence. The state, on the other hand had to table tribal friendly policies to meet the grievances of the tribes of Jharkhand under the constitutional amendments with

⁶ It was assumed that in the course of the movement the participant political groups transformed because of the internal problem particularly in the tribal, non-tribal controversy.

⁷ Commercialization of forests by the forest departments and ecological change in the forests belt was one of the principle factors behind Jharkhand movement

⁸ The term 'ecological refugees' has been used by S.Bosu.Mallick in his article 'State Forest Policy and Adivasi Self-rule in Jharkhand' 2007, pp-20-23 in C.K.Paty (ed) 'Forest, Government and Tribe, Concept Publishing, New Delhi, Here in this paper it has been cited deliberately to show the displacement occurred due to large scale industrial development and different policies that encroaches tribal lands and curtailed tribal rights from their *Khuntkatti* lands. Various development projects undertaken since 1950 revealed such numerous land alienation figures. In his article ' Fate of Commons, Commoners and Displaced : Why do people resist displacements' in 'Governance of Commons, and Livelihood Security' (ed) Himadri Sinha and Anant Kumar, Xaviar Institute of Social Science,2013, Stan Swamy recorded that in between 1951-95 govt. has acquired 32,91,000 hectares of lands. Lands acquired for development projects were 6,256,109sq.km. Forest area declared 23,417,082 sq.km and illegally acquired near about 3,238,000 sq.km area and subsequently land only available in entire Jharkhand area is 46,802 sq.km.

expediency. However the rapidity of the growing discontent over issues directly related with '*Jal Jungle and Zamin*' (Jewit,2008:68-82)⁹ flooded through different phases of armed struggle in the Jharkhand Movement against the common enemy the '*Diku*' and in turn the state reaction to the problem was manipulated by trying to please with insincere praise or servile attentions that fleer the tribal mind into dejected state of affairs.

This could be elaborated with some critical analysis of the politics of Jharkhand. It was well known that the pressure on tribal egalitarian system (communitarian) was started with the expansion policies adopted during the colonial state formation and soon the penetration of the non-tribal into the region added more dissatisfaction to the process.¹⁰ The emergence of new class and land tenures brings catastrophic changes into the regional economy by altering traditional systems based on customary practices. The changes in socio-economic structure added new dimensions through ethnic conflicts and many others which demoralized the tribes. Scholars have argued that from its origin the movement lies on some basic issues like land alienation, forests rights, protection of language and culture. But the paradigm has shifted from emotion to intellectuality gradually and prominently since the merger of the Jharkhand Party with the then Congress in 1963, that was ended in diversion of party line. Some believes that it was not merely a major setback for the Jharkhand Movement but also defamed the authenticity and reliability of the leaders.(Sharma 1998 : 699-704)¹¹ However, according to many Jharkhandi protagonists it was a frenzied step but interestingly since then the gradual political development through factions and the conscious effort was carried out to oust the penury from the society, Jharkhandi politics to a great extent able to nationalize this issues with strong political appeal. However since 1920 the promises made by the leaders often ended in failure or have never fulfilled in the course of the movement due to factions. We are aware of the fact that at the early stage, the projection of separate state on the ground of socio-economic freedom was overwhelmingly accepted by the tribes¹². But later the incorporation of the non-tribals for the Jharkhand cry was substantially became boomerang because it ostensibly diluted the questions of

⁹ P.Paurji, 1996, 'No nature apart: Adivasi Cosmvision and ecological discourses in Jharkhand India', Paper presented during the 'second conference on the reconstruction of Jharkhand' Cambridge, UK, quoted in S.Jewitt, 'Political ecology of Jharkhand conflict' Asia Pacific Viewpoint, vol-49,no,1 April 2008, pp-68-82, the term has been used to relate Jharkhand Politics as synonym with Jal, Jangle and Jamin. (Water, Forests & lands)

¹⁰ It was documented that along with the British many non-tribals penetrated in the Jharkhand region as Mahajan, Money lenders etc.

¹¹ Many Jharkhandi protagonists believed that the Congress ministry never wanted separate Jharkhand State because of the geographical position of the south Bihar, it was enriched and capable of producing revenues, which they don't want to lose. Here north Bihar-South Bihar dichotomy plays a vital role.

¹² K.S.Singh in his article 'Agrarian Issues in Chotanagpur' in 'Tribal Situation in India' (ed) K.S.Singh 1972, has argued that since the early 20th century from the Munda uprising, later Tana Bhagat Movement, and Unnati Samaj Movement, all of these movement tended to obscure from agrarian distress. p-375

'Diku' within itself, hitherto growing discontent prevailed over the participation of the non-tribals. It was not a hidden fact that participant leaders mainly those who are Christian and educated were seen as a multiplex omnivorous character who was enough to make a mal off of the whole situation and it was evident in their choices. (Bihar State Archive, (hereafter BSA) 1947, F/N-270) Besides, somewhat inconsistently Jharkhand Movement was successful through the politics, they played as well as keep coming across the ground level choices but cracks and disarrays among the leaders virtually lead the movement into a complex one. It worsens further since the emergence of radical politics in the 1950s with the rise of Jharkhand Party. The party got immense local support for its tribal friendly attitude however their interests in electoral politics and parliamentary affairs for succeeding the demand of Jharkhand claim obfuscated the actual demands of the tribes i.e. social and cultural upliftment, the land and forest rights etc. Furthermore the leaders have not been able to discover the actual position they should take into consideration for tribal solidarity. However apart from this phenomenon the movement has succeeded in achieving the goal but unfortunately the promise (socio-economic freedom) could not be fulfilled. This was a peculiar situation that Jharkhandi politics have faced in the last 50 years or so and can be embodied as movement of memorandums¹³.

Many Scholars have argued that the initial attempt of solidarity among the tribes have come from Chotanagpur Improvement Society (Chotanagpur Unnati Samaj) in 1915. It was largely associated with Christian educated persons. Some of the key figures were Joel Lakra, Theble Oraon, Bandiram Oraon who submitted a proposal to the Simon Commission in 1928 seeking special administrative unit as well as some special privileges for the adivasi of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana. It has helped the tribals to consolidate their demand. In this period some attempts have been taken to revive some old movement and that certainly rejuvenated the entire tribal communities to reconnect with earlier uprisings. (Ekka & Sinha, 2004:1-40) It was said that the entire period from 1915 to 1940, many adivasi movements have been carried out with the immense sympathy of the missionaries who were active in this region to promote education among the tribals. During this period large scale conversions were also done¹⁴. By the end of the 1940, there were many regional organizations that fought for the sake of separation of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana from Bihar. That era also witnessed the rise of 'Adivasi Mahasabha' under the leadership of Jaipal Singh Munda¹⁵.

¹³ Hundreds of memorandums have been submitted by various political parties in various offices both in the state as well as in centre regarding their demands.

¹⁴ Pls see details in the political special files on Foreign Missionary Activities, file number 1815, 1947, BSA

¹⁵ Pls see details in the political special section on the subject ' attributes of Jaipal Singh & others' file no -270,1947, BSA

Later he was criticized for authoritarianism¹⁶. During this period of political development many Christian and non-Christian political organizations have separately submitted various memorandums to various offices both in the state level and in the center for separate province on the ground of traditional culture, language and geographical uniqueness. Such evolution leading to the development of political consciousness among its residence, however the major setback for the movement comes from within because of the rise of factions which virtually weakens the movement. The reasons for factions can be listed in the following manners, first, the Christian and non-Christian controversy, second, hidden alliance between Mahasabha and Congress and third, the involvement of *Sadans* or non-tribal. All these problems simultaneously weaken the movement in the formative period. From the mid fifties the involvement from both left and right parties enabled the movement to get transformed into democratic politics and bring ideological splits. The Diku-Non-Diku controversy itself got transformed with the involvement of the *Sadans* and the nature of the demand has changed in a big way, such as the setting up of universities, SC, ST reservation, Jharkhand Planning Commission, Primary schools for different linguistic groups etc.(Basu,1994:43) The land and forest rights and the ecological questions remained less important. It was true that the rise of Jharkhand Party in the 1950s brings some radical process in the movement, helps to develop a pro-Jharkhandi mentality with a broad based separation movement and later the process of radicalization reinforced within the rise of Sibusorens' Jharkhand Mukti Morch (JMM) Jharkhand Coordination Committee (JCC) and All Jharkhand Students Union (AJSU) in the 1980s. (Ekka & Sinh, 2000:1-40) These political parties also after having some success fragmented over different issues and becoming split-prone and opportunistic while most of this fraction tried to deal with the centre for separate states neglecting the emotional pursuits of the tribes.

The situation continues to threaten the hope of the separate state and further disadvantageous under many reasons in the course of the movement. There had been a remarkable growth of scholars' attention on the issue that during the movement probably after the independence, ethnicity got transformed into regionalism. One can locate a clear shift from 'community' to the 'region'¹⁷ and nationalization of an ethnic regional movement ignoring the basic needs of the ethnic demands. Inevitably local issues subsumed within a greater understanding of parties seeking national attention. The fact can't be overruled that the demand of Jharkhand separate state was undergone different changes within the democratic politics, particularly after the rejection of the demand of separate state by State Reorganisation Commission (SRC) in 1956 on the issue that the proposed area

¹⁶ He was criticized for being friendly with the Congress Party and being supreme in the selection of Mahasabha Party candidates, for reference pls see Ignes Kujur, 'Jharkhand Betrayed' in S.Basu Mallick and R.D.Munda Edited The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for the Autonomy in India, IWGIA, 2003, pp-16-30

¹⁷ The shift from a community based demand to regional demand not only created complexities within political ideologies of different parties, but also to a great extent subsumed many old demands into larger political understanding.

comprising the districts of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana does not have a tribal majority, no common language etc¹⁸. However the rejection was implemented very cleverly. The members of the SRC considered only Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana which was a part of erstwhile Bihar to show the minority logic, and categorically put aside the entire Jharkhand area which inevitably infested with huge tribal population¹⁹. The rejection by the SRC was criticized by most the parties and in order to capitalize the situation, the major and minor political leaders took it as a way to make suitable entry in electoral politics. Indeed, the rejection of the demand turned out badly for the political parties in terms of credibility of the movements. First, the movement has lost its indigenous character due to inclusion of non tribals and second the demand of separate state was fall in crisis because of the lack of proper decisions including the decisions to fight to restore and capitalize the region's economy and its popular base. Furthermore, the reason for weakening the bases was interesting; scholars have argued that none of the existing parties ever claimed the entire geographical area because only Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana have future in industrial development²⁰. In 1977 Janata Dal demanded a statehood as it believed in smaller states. From 1980s the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) which is considered by political critiques as the party of Hindu chauvinists and presently the ruling party in the centre has taken its agenda on Vananchal (Woodland) for two reasons. One, it clearly opposed to Jharkhand and adivasi and the other was to promote the non-tribals for greater interests in the region.(Munda & Mallick, 2003:unpaged) The new state was emerged in 2000 on 15th of November on the day of the birth anniversary of Birsa Munda but unfortunately the present area did not meet the actual demand and it finally succeeded with only 27% tribal's out of the total population. Recently there is slow but steady development of another movement targeting the reallocation of the forested area that has not been added with the main Jharkhand which lies most of the forested belt of West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh that were left out. (Munda & Mallick, 2003: unpaged)

The Political dilemma in Jharkhand Movement: the emergence of Adivasi Mahasabha and the Congress-Mahasabha Dichotomy:

Now it would be pertinent to look into some broader aspects of the Jharkhand politics. Given the political condition prevailing in the Jharkhand, the debate that recurred periodically needs to be brushing up more to get a clear idea. Following the years in the 1930s the Chotanagpur Unnati Samaj as a whole taken the main responsibility towards the tribal question. Its objectives were propagated

¹⁸ SRC while visiting the area has rejected the demand because of the less ST population in the proposed Jharkhand, accordingly a major shift towards greater Jharkhand has been taken into consideration to overcome the problem

¹⁹ See detail analysis on the subject in the introductory portion of "The Jharkhand Movement: Indigenous Peoples Struggle for the Autonomy in India (ed) R.D.Munda & S.Bosu Mallick, IWGIA, 2003

²⁰ Such negotiation was one of the important context in the whole Jharkhand demand

through a magazine 'Adivasi' which were published in English, Hindi and Mundari dialect. As we discussed in our earlier sections that when the Samaj placed a demand for separate state to the Simon Commission under the leadership of Bishop Van Hoeck and Joel Larka, the immediate response they got from the non-converts is a clear division. The non-converts formed a separate association called Chotanagpur Kishan sabha in 1931 under the leadership of Theble Oraon. Their manifesto was to deliberately address the problems of the peasantry. On the other hand in the wake of the political scenario the Catholics also decided to open their own organization for political activities. In 1928-29 under the leadership of Bonafice Larka and Ignes Beck Chotanagpur Catholic Sabha was established, in almost same year the Munda Sabha also formed. Later in 1938 all the three adivasi organization merged with Adivasi Mahasabha headed by a western educated man called Jaipal Singh²¹. (Rana, 1996:467-481)

In all probability, the emergence of Adivasi Mahasabha was the legal outcome of the fraction in different organizations of the Christian and non Christians. It was settled with its objectives of joint hands and evoked for separate state for the adivasi. It has to be keeping in mind that the objective of the Adivasi Mahasabha as they pursued was a Pro-British and anti-Congress until India became independent.(Sharma,1998:699-703) However the anti-Congress approach was not free from criticisms which broadly determined the political progress. During the rise of Mahasabha, the activities of the Muslims League were interesting. In the course of the movement the participations of the Muslims in the Jharkhand separation movement was relying on the principle that the tribes should separate themselves from the movement of Adivasi Mahasabha and find the way on its own. Though it was evident from the weekly confidential reports of the police administration that many Muslim League workers belongs to Singbhum district were friendly with Jaipal Singh. Amin Ahmed, the then president of Muslim League and Md. Hanif who was an owner of a petrol pump helped him with money and petrol. (BSA,1947:F/N-270) In this controversial situation the paradigm has shifted quickly when Jharkhand Momin Union was established in Ranchi in 1946-47 under the vision to join adivasi in the Jharkhand Demand.(BSA,1947:F/N-270[3]) But their activity was confined within Ranchi only. They were unable to find any hope in Chaibasa and Singbhum district. The leaders of the Momin Union are Abbas and Rahim Bux, both of them are office bearers of the union. Both of them delivered many speeches openly asking the adivasis to give up and disassociate from Jaipal Singh's movement for separation of Jharkhand. Both of them actually asked the adivasis to join congress party. (BSA,1947:F/N-1815)

²¹ In my field visit to Ranchi, I have asked one rickshaw puller to take me to the Jaipal Singh Stadium, but most of them refused to me on the ground that they don't know the actual location, in the meanwhile an young boy came to me and told me that I should mention the name Jaipal Singh Munda, interestingly one Rikshaw wala came forward and took me to the famous ground.

Indeed it cannot be denied that the formation of the Adivasi Mahasabha in the year 1938 actually strengthen fight for separation of Jharkhand. However, though the leaders were optimistic but failed to address social injustice properly. It became harsher when they avoided the question of degraded forests and uncontrolled urbanization. It looks more urban centered and instead of counter of those genuine malaise, Mahasabha had taken some intellectual resolutions like the appointment of the lawyers as govt lawyers, employment of the tribals in government municipalities, boards, establishment of the degree colleges for tribal education, and social and economic upliftment of the adivasis etc. Interestingly the demand or self rule was became a political aspirations followed by the changing nature of the demands itself. (Report of the Committee on Jharkhand Matters (hereafter RCJM),1990) After elected as a President of the Adivasi Mahasabha, Jaipal Singh submitted a memorandum to the then Prime Minister of Bihar describing that the goal of Mahasabha depends on the economic and political freedom of the aboriginal tract of India. He also endorsed and extends his full support in the movement led by Indian National Congress for the Independence.(BSA,1947:F/N-270) He considered through this memorandum of the necessity of participation of the adivasis into the legislative assembly. Jaipal Singh's understanding of affiliation with the congress may be developed from certain ground reality. Theoretically it might come from certain assumptions that the demand for separation can only be achieved with the congress because they were in power during that time. Though he profoundly objects the views of the Biharee Ministry because he thought that they had no experiences or had no connections with the adivasis and perhaps unaware of the fact of 'tribal situation' in South Bihar.(BSA,1947:F/N-270)

The movement for the separate Jharkhand was really strengthened because of some leaders of the Adivasi Mahasabha. In this phase of relentless struggle, many Jharkhandi leaders have raised their voices for Jharkhand in several public meetings and few radical commitments were also publicly announced. Yunis Surin, a leader of Adivasi Mahasabha asked the adivasi to shed blood for separate state of Jharkhand.(BSA,1947:F/N-270) In 1947 a large meeting of the adivasi was held at Khunti Village, where Jaipal Singh demanded a separate state on the ground of "the protection from the detrimental consequences of the amendment in the Chotanagpur Tenancy Act in respect of their korkar land, waste lands reclamation act, paddy levy order and reservation of forests in Chotanagpur which would deprived the tenants from the privileged of jungle products for their domestic purposes". (BSA,1947:F/N-270)Indeed Jaipal Singh's addresses on the agrarian and environmental issues suddenly added dimension to the movement and accordingly the movement for jungle rights were re-fuelled and radicalized. Jaipal Singh advocated that the Jungle rights should remain in the hands of village Panchayat and taking adibasis side he proposed that the govt. should prohibited liquor in all Bihar but adivasi must have their traditional right of preparing Rice Beer (*Handia*) during religious and social performance. He strongly believed that the protection of '*Jahirasthan*' (Religious place) was necessary in Chotanagpur because it was important in tribal culture. Indeed it

was sharpened tribal minds regarding their environmental rights. Thus the environmental and ecological restoration of the whole Chotanagpur plateau gradually became a primary objective of the movement. In addition to the speech given by the veteran leader Jaipal Singh many other prominent leaders like Lucas Kongri also endorse the legitimate demand of jungle rights and seek redressal of all the social and economic distress. On the other hand Herman larka in a separate gathering focused on the concept of original homeland and created an imaginary of how the tribes through the historical process took shelter in the vast tract of jungle land. In this process the Adivasi Mahasabha anticipated some cultural-environmental practices also. During the movement it was reported that collection of 'Sup Dhan' (Paddy) for funds was carried out in many places in Jharkhand which was a classic example of the tradition of the forest tribes. (BSA,1947:F/N-270) During the same time there were another two organizations developed and involved with the cry of separate Jharkhand province ideologically step forwarded with the Adivasi Mahasabha. One was Chotanagpur Separation League and the other one was Chotanagpur Mine Owners Associations. But they did not succeed enough and both of the organization disappeared due to pressure of the government. However it was only Adivasi Mahasabha who continued to remain active in its goal. It was in the year of General Elections in 1945 the Adivasi Mahasabha contested its first electoral poll and could win only 4 seats whereas congress completely routed the Adivasi Mahasabha.(Ekka & Sinha, 2004:27) The result of this huge defeat was due to the emergence of Adim Jati Seva Mandal under the leadership of Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Sanatan Adivasi Mahasabha under the leadership of Theble Oraon.(Ghosh,1998:40)

Apart from the indistinct political development in the entire Jharkhand, the controversy over relationship with the congress was the crucial one. Adivasi Mahasabha, in this situation completely rejects its collaboration with the congress ministry and openly criticized Bihar Congress for their incapability of addressing the demand of separate state. They believed that the congress ministry in order to keep their benefit out of the nationalist politics betrayed adivasis and promulgated anti separation mentality among the adivasis. Indeed during this crucial phase of the Jharkhand Movement ideological conflicts and interpretation to some extent become fortunate because it helps in bringing inclusive identities for the tribes. However due to these controversies, pivotal issues related to Jal, Jungle and Jamin were slipped aside and less important and later were subsumed in the garb of larger politics. It would be interesting to note that the conflicts between Congress and the Adivasi Mahasabha were an old one. In 1939 two articles were published in 'Adivasi' fortnightly news paper from Beni Madhab Press, Ranchi titled '*Bihari Bandar Nacho*' (Dance Bihari Monkey) and '*Nili Rang Bumi Se*' (From the Blue Coloured land). (BSA, 1939: F/N-429) These two articles showed the extreme hatred possessed by the adivasi to the Biharis as well as the ministers. The paper 'Adivasi' was jointly edited and published by Julius Tigga, and Rai Saheb Bandi Ram. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429) Julius Tigga was an indisputable leader of the adivasi movement. Immediately after publication it was criticized as 'objectionable articles' by the govt. Some security measures were also taken by the

government under existing Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act – Act XXIII of 1931. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429) The article has been treated as prosecutable because it shows scurrilous abuse of Bihar Ministers, and Parliamentary Secretaries and others. It was evident that the purpose of the articles was to show the hatred between the Biharis and the Adivasis and strengthen the movement for separation. It was believed that previously an article was published in ‘*Sentinel*’ criticizing the leadership of Jaipal Singh; undoubtedly it was the reply to that article. Here are some of the lines of the English version which are also circulated along with Hindi. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429)

“O girl: the leaves of gram do not fill the stomach,
 The Beharees have eaten them with their mothers-in-law and daughter-in-law.
 Dance O idiot, dance: dance thathak thaiya
 Flood comes in Bihar, people do not sleep.
 Let us go to Nagpur where there is a bed of flowers,
 Dance O idiot, dance: dance thathak thaiya
 Let us carry to Bihar wealth and treasure
 And give to Nagpur clouds of earth and stone
 Dance O idiot, dance: dance thathak thaiya
 Make chundi your left hand and the Christian your right,
 Speaks ill of Jaipal by circulating false tales
 Dance O idiot, dance: dance thathak thaiya
 Dance O monkey: your simple mother is coming,
 She will give rice in a plate and you will eat to your fill,
 Dance O idiot, dance: dance thathak thaiya”

Source: *Govt of Bihar, Political Special Section, Subject: Articles under the Heading ‘Bihari Bandar Nacho and ‘Nili Rang Bhumi Se’ in the ‘Adivasi’, File No-429, 1939. This phrases was taken partially and it was published on 1st July 1939*

This matter had been sent to court for judicial enquiry under the Press Act. Later both the editors were found guilty and thereby prosecuted and convicted and were sentenced rigorous imprisonment for one year. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429) There were also some growing discontents about the separation of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana from Bihar. Opposing the demand for separate statehood, S.K Sahay, whose identity was not clear, he might be belonging to Hindu Society created a new platform called ‘Chotanagpur Progressive League’. It was aimed to bring peace and improve situation of all the residents of Chotanagpur. During this case some grievances has been come out from the adivasi leaders that the Biharis used to call them ‘Kol’, which means pig, that in turn aroused bitterness and hatred against the Biharis. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429)

The faction in the interior politics of Jharkhand is no doubt weakens the solidarity among its people. Neither has it created any positive will to fight for Jharkhand nor it has shown any right path for taking their demand towards success. Considering the weakness started since the activism of the missionaries²² and the emergence of Jharkhand Party it was only a mere struggle between the North Bihar and the South Bihar. Political instability and groupism steadily diluted the indigenous people's voice over different ground level issues. The hatred towards Bihar ministry continuously expanded and it was reflected in the various meetings held in the Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana that almost all the leaders criticized the Congress led government for doing nothing. (BSA,1947:F/N-270) Along with these some other issues came in front. Adivasi Students' of Jharkhand in continuation have addressed a letter to the Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Vice-President of the interim Government about the negligence in the academic matter made by the leaders of Bihar proper. In other occasion Harman Larka, Agnes Kujur, Junas Surin, Hanna Bodra, Simon Tirkey, Samuel Bage and many others leaders openly criticizing Bihar Congress as outsiders and blamed them for doing injustice to the tribes of Jharkhand. Taking Congress stand in a big way, Harman Larka in a public meeting addressed that the Congress Govt and its minister did not even know how the agriculture was carried out in Jharkhand.(BSA,1947:F/N-270)

Nonetheless in the movement of Jaipal Singh, what was broadly accepted that it tended to confine towards generalization with a common ideological platform. This is to say a common virtue in a mixed society irrespective of caste, ethnicity, religion, rather for Chotanagpurians. In the same manner there were factions and questions emerged slowly against the veteran leader Jaipal Singh. In the debate of publishing article with Rai Saheb Bandiram Uraon in the '*Adivasi*' news paper some section of the fellow supporters particularly the Lutherans criticizing Jaipal Singh on account of relationship with a non Christian.(BSA,1939:F/N-429) Even when Jaipal Singh went to Delhi to attend the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, the Lutherans also suspects him for having a touch with Dr. Rajendra Prasad whom he congratulated for being the permanent chairman. (BSA, 1939: F/N-429) On the other hand, Heyward, a reputed leader and the Political Secretary for Adivasi Mahasabha also keeping in touch with the Muslim League because of the untruthful attitude of the Jaipal Singh. Even later he had refused to work anymore with Jaipal Singh, on the other hand Jaipal Singh also step up against the attitude of Heyward; therefore there were some division within the Mahasabha and finally splits into two groups. Mrs. Hanna Bothra, Ignes Kujur was taking side of Jaipal Singh and the majority of the leaders and supporters were getting closure to Heyward. A CID group officer from Ranchi reported that in a meeting of Jharkhand Separation League which was held on 25th May, 1947 where Jaipal Singh asked to Heyward and Julius Tigga to resign from the Adivasi Mahasabha on account of favoring the Muslim League. Considering the situation rose in the meeting,

²² It was believed by the Jharkhand Protagonists, that as long as the foreign missionary active with the tribes for separation movement, it was not able to render its political will because of the religious shadow.

Julius Tigga resigns from his post though Heyward did not but continuously make challenges against Marang Gomke Jaipal Singh. The whole incidents was published in *Sentinel* in its Sunday issue under the heading “Mr. Jaipal Singh on his new politics” with some spice. (BSA, 1947:F/N-270) after some vigorous attempt to re-establish the unity and reinforce Jharkhand Movement within the political domain it has merged with a new regional party, The Jharkhand Party under the leadership of Jaipal Singh and the preliminary objectives of the party was to collect support from all Chotanagpurias.(Narayan,1988:50-51)

The emergence of Jharkhand Party and the modern phases of Jharkhand Movement: An electoral game?

After some years of continuous debate and dispute, the emergence of Jharkhand Party in 1949 was an example of moving from factionalism to a comparatively stable common ideological platform. As because of the huge allegations for communal image²³ by the leaders of the Mahasabha it was the crucial juncture where utmost emphasis had been put on envisioning past movements and accordingly steps were taken to get rid of the situation. There were two objectives of the Jharkhand Party, (1) To promote social economic and political advancement for the tribes of Chotanagpur and (2) To reconsolidate fragmented areas of Jharkhand, and incorporating all the areas into one Jharkhand State under the constitutional framework.(Ekka&Sinha, 2000:27) However the party has not been able to impress all the tribals in the Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana and lost its ethnic character and took regionalism as the focal point of its existence. (Ghosh,1998:41) The Congress workers who were stamped as *diku* have been predominantly hold their position within the party and convinced that language should be the basis of the Jharkhand Demand not ethnicity. After some assurance of the special status under the fifth and sixth schedule of the Indian Constitution of free India the leaders of the party have agreed to fight upcoming election and thus open another phase of electoral politics.(Ghosh,1998:41) This was an era of concrete political foundations towards national political development, and by and large it was accepted by all the Jharkhandi Protagonists that from 1950s the Jharkhand Movement was in its peak because of the reconstructions of the traditional movements. Satisfactory steps were taken everywhere to consolidate the demand of the separate State. When Thakur Sub Committee visited Ranchi to look into the matter, thousand of tribals have placed their memorandum demanding separate state on the basis of unique geography, culture, language, society, administration, civilization and economy. But not much success has come out from the visit. Scholars like Stuart Corbridge has argued that the root of ‘*ethnoregionalism*’ in the historical

²³ Some of the followers of Jaipal Singh criticized him because of the intimacy of Muslim League supporters. See details in file, 270, GOB, BSA

process in the fifties were developed clearly when the Jharkhand Party contested in the 1952 General Elections and bagged 32 assembly seats in Bihar and became the chief opposition to the congress.(Corbridge,2005:17-55) He argued that the ideology behind such '*ethnoregionalism*' can be studied by three models, one is the 'sons of the soil' model²⁴ which seeks to dominate the region with hegemony to secure regional culture and rights, and the other model was 'perverse model'. In this model the success of Jharkhand Party and the rise of '*ethnoregionalism*' were as he noted "an appropriate response to the isolationist tribal policies of colonial power". In the third account he noted that the rise of '*ethnoregionalism*' were the response against the 'internal colonialism' prevailed in Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana.(Corbridge,2005:18)

The result in the election to the assembly was stunning under the leadership of Jaipal Singh and the victory was not only received respect from other parties however this victory also brought certain changes in the ideology. After this huge victory, in the same year Jaipal Singh nominated the name of Darbhanga Maharaj Kamaleswar Singh for the upcoming biennial election to the Rajya Sabha which again demoralized the tribes because, after election Maharaja forgets all his promise and did nothing. It was the beginning as stated by Iignes Kujur that after Maharajas election many other men were also got tickets and completely betrayed Jharkhand. They imposed their decisions and emerged as dictators. That was harmful to the movement for separate state. The trajectories often been criticized by saying that the seats were sold to those person under the sole direction of Jaipal Singh for his own personal benefit. Jaipal Singh was accused for selfish attitude towards his fellow friends²⁵. It was further aggravated during the 1957 elections because Jaipal Singh nominated another non party candidate Mrs. Jahanara Singh (Probably she was Jaipal Singh's second wife),(Sharma,1998:701) for the election. Harman Larka and the Maharaja also filed their respective names for election though they both were defeated. Harman Larka was expelled from party. The expulsion was condemn by Harman larka and criticized Jaipal Singh for being selfish and high-handedness. Harman Larka opposed the leadership of Jaipal Singh on the ground that he betrayed tribals of Chotanagpur when State Recognition Committee (SRC) visited Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana in 1954 by not signing the memorandum prepared by the MLA's. Later SRC rejected the demand of Jharkhand on the ground that Jharkhand Party did not win over majority seats in the 1952 election. Since then there were clear slackness found that steadily grasp the movement. Corruption crept into Jharkhand Party. In the 1962 election Jaipal Singh again put his signature on the name of a businessman A. Agarwal but this time tribal people refused to accept any alien name. Later Jharkhand party win only 20 seats and that

²⁴ 'sons of the soil' model has been used by M.Weiner in 1978 in his book of the same name published from Princeton University, he actually address the very concept of the tribal uprisings occurred against the hated Dikus with this concept, the attachment of land and its periphery has been important for these movements.

²⁵ See details in Ekka & Sinha 2004, op.cit, and also see Iignes Kujur 2003,op.cit, pp-16-30

to some extent created the way to extinction. (Kujur,2003:16-30) The allegation over authoritarianism on Jaipal Singh has come up and complete erosion was taking place with the landlord dominated Janata Party led by Raja of Ramgarh which was later renamed as Swatantra Party. (Sharma, 1998:700-703) One of the Jharkhand slogan for the election to the various offices of Panchayat Raj were '*Abua Daku Diku Senoa*' means Jharkhand is ours, the decoit will go.(Narayan,1998:43) Similarly another slogan '*Hindu Muslim Sikhi Esahi, Sab Jharkhandi Bhai Bhai*' (Basu,1994:43) completely counter the former. Scholars have argued that the antipathy of the Jharkhand movement lie strongly with the coming of the *Diku*. They were blamed for snatching away tribal belongings and put them in serious condition. But as we discussed earlier that, from the early 1950s the participation of the non-tribals brought ethnic, linguistic and political differences, that had a decisive role in the movement. Particularly in 1963 when the Jharkhand party was merged with the then Congress party the faction began to dominate all the way to the end, though the movement went straightway to more radical platform after the merger. Before the merger there were some positive fundamental changes took in the Bihar cabinet. Sri Krishna Singha, the former Chief Minister of Bihar who was re-elected in 1962 election has appointed a tribal man S.C.Tubid as deputy minister. It was nevertheless a cherished dream for all tribal to have a tribal origin man as a deputy minister for the first time in the history of Bihar. (Kujur,2003:22) This would lead a further closeness among the leaders of both Congress and the Jharkhand party and later after the Indo-China war in 1962 when Jawaharlal Nehru visited Ranchi Jaipal Singh in writing agreed to merge Jharkhand party with the Indian National Congress on the ground to save the nation 'from the peril of China' 'unconditionally and unreservedly'. (Kujur, 2003:22) This merger was to a large extent "a natural corollary of many processes' and an understanding of shift from isolationist attitude (either ethnic or regional) to a more radical broad based politics under the banner of Indian National Congress. (RCJM, 1990:15)

The rise of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha and the formation of the Jharkhand State:

Since 1963 to 1968 there are many organizational factions came up from the old Jharkhand Party. Some setback also came from the Santals as they were separated from the mainstream party and formed their own party named after Santal insurrection (Locally called Bul). (RCJM, 1990:16) Some urban educated tribals also formed Birsa Seva Dal as pressure groups on the demand of Job in Industries. (RCJM, 1990:16) Within few years after the merger, the Jharkhand Party collapsed and set forever after the death of Jaipal Singh in 1970s. (Sharma, 1998:700-703) It was assumed that the emergence of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (hereafter JMM) was formed in the wake of agrarian unrests and the factions of all Jharkhand parties.(RCJM,1990:16) The conscious efforts in the industrial belt as well as in the agrarian sectors popularize the party and accordingly it has succeeded in the following years. On the other hand Jharkhand Party did not contest in the 1977 Lok Sabha poll and

bagged only one seat in the general election in 1980, while JMM bagged 13 seats and secured 3.88 lakhs of votes. Out of the 28 seats reserved for the ST, JMM has captured seven seats. Congress has got 14 seats, CPI and Dalit Mazdoor Kissan Party got nothing out the same. Out of the total number of 82 seats, both JMM and Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) got 11 seats each and congress got 41 under its banner and became the major political party in Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana.(RCJM,1990:16) During the movement of Janata party in Bihar in 1974 under the influence of Jayprakash Narayan, the separate movement became kept in low, in spite of Jayaprakash Narayan's own preference of creating smaller states. However due to reluctance, Jan Sangh, Vishva Hindu Parishad, and Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh freely penetrated into the region.(Ghosh,1998:54)

Table-1 Election Performance of major and minor political parties in Bihar Assembly: 1952-2000 (Party wise)

Year	Name of Political Party	Contested	Won	Votes Polled	Percentage	Vote % in seats Contested
1952	Jharkhand Party (JHP)	53	32	765272	8.01	38.75
	Chotanagpur & Santhal Pargana Janta party (CNSPJP)	38	11	301691	3.16	26.38
1957	JHP	70	31	749021	7.08	29.84
	CNSPJP	119	23	829195	7.83	18.55
1962	JHP	75	20	432643	4.39	21.98
1967	Jan Kranti Dal (JKD)	60	13	451412	3.33	18.46
1969	Bihar Prant Hul Jharkhand (PHJ)	14	05	56506	0.38	12.63
1972	Progressive Hul Jharkhand Party (Shibu) (HJS)	6	01	32631	0.19	17.16
	Jharkhand (JKD)	42	01	90717	0.53	6.36
	All India Jharkhand Party (JKP)	45	03	149754	0.87	9.45
	Bihar Prant Hul Jharkhand (PHJ)	15	02	90234	0.53	17.86

	Chotanagpur Bhumi Raksha Party (BRP)	02	00	1274	0.01	1.88
1977	BRP	01	00	902	0.01	2.71
	Jharkhand Party (JKD)	31	02	72303	0.42	6.92
	JKP	21	1	78406	0.45	12.05
	PHJ	05	0	14806	0.09	8.01
1980	Jharkhand Party (JKD)	26	0	31952	0.14	2.94
	Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (JMM)	31	11	380891	1.69	25.11
1985	JMM	57	09	443821	1.82	13.75
1990	JMM	82	19	1008174	3.14	15.20
	Hul Jharkhand (HJD)	09	0	13904	0.04	2.13
	Jharkhand Dal (JKD)	28	01	134827	0.42	6.83
	Jharkhand Party (JKP)	12	0	7481	0.02	0.72
	Marxist Coordination (MCOR)	11	02	70365	0.22	6.33
1995	JMM	63	10	803132	2.32	12.31
	Jharkhand Peoples Party (JPP)	33	02	116939	0.34	3.53
	Chotanagpur Santal Pargana Jan Seva Dal (CSP-JSD)	41	0	101050	0.29	2.38
2000	JMM	85	12	1306152	3.53	14.92
	Hul Jharkhand Party (HJKP)	01	0	621	0.00	0.79
	Jharkhand Party (JKP)	16	0	44187	0.12	3.36
	Jharkhand Peoples					

	Party (JKPP)	12	0	10082	0.03	0.87
	Marxist Coordination					
	(MCO)	09	01	104450	0.28	9.59
2005	JMM	18	0	76671	0.31	4.00

Source : Census of India, Statistical Report on General Elections, Bihar Legislative Assembly (1952, 1957,1962,1967,1969,1972,1977,1980,1985,1990,1995,2000,2005) see also 'Report of the First General Elections under the Constitution of India in Bihar, 1951-52', by Nandalal Sinha, Chief Electoral Officer, Bihar, 1953, RAR

Notes: JMM has considerably losing its credentials from 2000, on the other hand if we look at the Lok Sabha poll since 1952-2000 we can see that JMM actually emerged as a strong political contender since 1989. In 1984 Jharkhand Dal and JMM got nothing from the poll while in 1989 JMM has got three seats from Rajmahal, Dumka and Jamshedpur constituency. Again in 1991 JMM got 6 seats by contesting 14 seats. But from 1996 a clear downfall can be located because in 1996 JMM got only 1 parliament seat and from 1998 to 1999 it was all about BJP. In 1998 BJP got 13 seats and in 1999 BJP has got 23 seats. (Source Election Commission of India)

The nature of JMM was categorically defined as the most extreme leftist force and was popularize on the ground of militancy and violence. (Narayan, 1998:50) At the beginning, JMM strongly applied the necessity of addressing the major problem of the adivasi interconnected with land and forests. Report of Committee on Jharkhand Matters, May 1990 (hereafter RCJM) admits that this phase turn around against agrarian distress and articulation of more radical thinking accompanied with the earlier uprisings.(RCJM,1990:16) Thus it started its campaign with agrarian radicalism and cultural revivalism. Initially JMM took steps to recovered alienated land by force harvesting into those lands (*Dhan kati andolon*), it was spread like a fire in and around Tundi village of Dhanbad district. In order to give minimum education to the tribes and agricultural knowledge, JMM took initiative for cooperative farming and literacy programme.(Mishra,2010:176) Sibn Soren who is the veteran leader and founder of JMM started literacy campaign in the village akhra, he also started campaigning *Kalali Toro, Jharkhand Choro* (Smash the liquor shops, quit Jharkhand) which was indeed very significant because the adivasis were highly indebted and their earning wages usually went to liquor shops.(Ekka & Sinha,2004:43)

JMM took some other agenda directly related with tribal problem. Some of leaders wanted reallocation and proper compensation for the tribes who will be under threat of Koel-Karo River Valley projects, showing protest in the form of Jungle Katai Andolon against the illegal felling of trees valuable to tribal economy, etc. (Ekka & Sinha, 2004: 43) This was also the era of rise of left and naxalite movements in the entire Jharkhand. (Ekka & Sinha, 2004: 43) Since its beginning as a major flag holder for Jharkhand cry it was associated with the Marxist Co ordination Committee led by A.K.Roy. A. K. Roy was an eminent person and the founder of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (BCKU) therefore JMM also gets solidarity from the industrial workers also. (Ekka & Sinha, 2004: 41) This all round performance created a lot of hope for the separation of Jharkhand. In this period of rise of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha, many social organizations were also revived. Such as *Kulhidrup*, the village council was renamed as *Atu Baisi*, Pargana the inter village council was also renamed as *Vichar Baisi* etc.(Ghosh,1998:52) Tribal self government was partially revived. These initiatives were taken in order to restore traditional cultural of the tribes. However within few years or so factions also grasp the motive of the JMM. Many non-tribals belonging to Mandals, Kurmis were included within the party flag who suspiciously making trouble in the performance of the JMM. In the wake of the parliamentary election in 1980 one of the founder members Behari Mahato left JMM and found his own party JMM (B). He was taken this decision against the decision of fighting the upcoming election with the Congress by Sibusoren, though he again rejoins his party after the killing of JMM president Nirmal Mahato by a Congress activist.(Ghosh,1998:54)

Since the election of 1977 following the emergency Janata Govt came to power in both Center and State of Bihar. Within a very short period many other organizations were also emerged including Janata Dal and formed an All Party Chotanagpur Santal Pargana Alag Prant Sangharsh Samiti with an appeal for separation of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana Division.(Ghosh,1998:54) On the other hand to get them closure to the demand of separate state JMM successfully organized a party consortium under the banner of six parties namely Jharkhand Party, JMM, Hul Jharkhand, Birsa Seva Dal, Akhil Bharatiya Congress, and RSP. All the parties jointly submitted a memorandum to the central govt demanding 1. Local dialect should be incorporate as the medium of education. 2. Sal trees should not be replaced by Segun tree and 3. Appropriate wages, bonus etc should be rendered for those who are working under forest departments.(Ghosh,1998:54) However the struggle for Jharkhand by the JMM was not succeeded enough and the return of congress in the power in 1980s again diluted the manifesto of the JMM. Sibusoren maintained his proximity with the govt and gets himself out of the contact with his fellow mates. But Congress had maintained a good relationship with the JMM and it reflected in the 1985 election when JMM has bagged 14 seats in Bihar assembly. Congress in this period again got enough support from many angels. But nothing positive was happened for the Jharkhand State, the movement in this period was clearly contained within

memorandums, seminars. The leaders were becoming “voiceless or plain ‘yeas man’ once they elected”.(Munda & Keshari,2003:220)

Post 1986 period of the Jharkhand movement was considered as the period of reborn of the movement. However the split within the parties were traceable in this period also. In this era the students’ of Jharkhand become consciously participated in the movement and formed All India Jharkhand Students’ Union (AJSU) under the demand for separate state of Jharkhand. Many other parties such as Jharkhand Co-ordination Committee (JCC) and Jharkhand Peoples Party were also emerged as the major ally of AJSU in 1991. (Singh, 2004:135) The formation of the AJSU was directly opened up the platform for students’ unity. It was radical in nature and opted for militant struggle to achieve the age old demand of separate state. The occasional upsurges, agitation, Bandha, Gherao were taken into account to achieve free Jharkhand within the jurisdiction of Indian Constitution. (Ghosh,1998:59) In the course of the movement the demand of ‘No Jharkhand, No election’ was taken as an agenda in its conference in 1986 at Jamshedpur. (Ekka & Sinha, 2004:55) AJSU collectively appreciated the demand with all the Chotanagpurians including non-tribals and submitted a memorandum to the then Prime Minister Rajib Gandhi focusing on linguistic, socio-cultural homogeneity of all the forests belt comprising the area of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana regions of Bihar, jungle mahal part of West Bengal, some forested belt of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.(Ekka & Sinha,2004:55) The emergence of Jharkhand Coordination Committee also got refueled with the demand of separate state. Participants got themselves accustomed with view of other political parties emerged in the 1990s. Hundreds of other political parties, organizations were also emerged for Jharkhand cry. It was seen that different parties and their demands actually radicalized the process. Similarly the relative success in the Lok sabha and in the assemblies helped them to think for Jungle mahal area of West Bengal because this could be the opportunity for widening the issue of greater Jharkhand. The issues of greater Jharkhand in accumulating large number of tribes and non-tribes reside upon a large geographical area were taken surprisingly. In 1987 it was decided to extend the demand for separate state comprising 21 districts of West Bengal and Madhya Pradesh.(Ghosh,1998:61) But in the 1990s the JMM has decided to join hands with the BJP and confined them with the demand for separate state within the geographical area of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana for maximum support of the non-tribals and accordingly a Jharkhand Bananchal Area has been set up. (Ghosh,1998:61) Earlier, in the course of the movement, demand of Jharkhand state was suffered itself with the conflicting demand of geographical boundaries²⁶. Apart from the

²⁶ Here conflicts in demand refers to the actual area of Jharkhand, which was sometime created problems within some of the flag holders of different parties, Mr. N.E.Horo president of a truncated Jharkhand Party placed a memorandum to Smt. Indira Gandhi in 1973 with a bigger domicile area consisting of West Bengal, Orissa, and Madhya Pradesh, but Jaipal Singh has left some parts which Mr. Horo demanded but included some more Jungly part of lower UP, Bihar and MP, for details pls see

perception that the area comprising Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana were the main centre of industrial capital, it shows a continuous reference of revival of past claims taken into consideration by the adivasi leaders. In order to legitimize the demand for so-called free Jharkhand including the area of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana and later the outward claim on the basis of inclusion of larger forested areas were taken empirically. The shift probably has come out from a notion of environment or ecological consideration. It would be pertinent to consider that Jharkhand Movement started more on the basis of ecological notion with economic and political consideration subsumed in it. In the case of Jharkhand Movement the ecological basis of the movement can be found in the traditional resource management inscribed in agricultural practices. It was indeed much debated that during the movement, the JMM considered that the revival of the old system to a great extent realistic towards fulfilling the objective of the so-called homeland. Because for many consecutive years the original question of land and forest rights remained unresolved which caused massive repression for the tribals. It was why the JMM relied mainly on the agrarian or forestry issues that can help the tribe to find their own solidarity. This is how the movement remained intact for another couple of years; it may lose its significance, if JMM would have considered only political or ethnic issues. If it was happened then the movement would have stopped after the first General Election of India held in the year 1952 when JMM got majority or after the making of Jharkhand State carved out from Bihar. Economic and political contents of tribal movement were many a times appropriated by the non-tribals or the tribal aristocracy, leading the movement to a dead end. But as the ecological essence remained intact the tribal movements got refueled and rejuvenated. The main argument on this would be that the demand of larger state, a 'greater Jharkhand' (including forest belt of West Bengal) patronage the existing state of nature. On the other hand deterioration of the tribal number and the infiltration of the non-tribals in a large number into the region may be acted functionally behind such decision. In the meanwhile after some vigorous discussions and demands the emergence of Jharkhand Area Development Council bill in 1991 had been favorable to some extent because it added Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana division into a single unit, (Ghosh, 1998:68) which certainly opened up the hope for greater Jharkhand. But again faction came into play as AJSU decided to support only sixteen districts from Bihar, not twenty five districts from four states.

In the last few years before the emergence of Jharkhand State the participants' political parties acted radically through meetings, rallies, dharnas, bandhs etc. In this provocative situation a Committee on Jharkhand Matter was set up, peopled with different representative groups to look after the whole demand. In 1990, the committee in its report recommended the formation of Autonomous General

A.K.Roy, pp-79-80 who is the trade union leader and founder of Marxist Co-ordination Committee and a former member of Parliament 'Jharkhand: Internal Colonialism' in S.Bosu Mallick edited "Indigenous Struggle Movement for Autonomy in Jharkhand, op.cit.

Vol. 4 No. 2 (2016)

Issue- June

ISSN 2347-6869 (E) & ISSN 2347-2146 (P)

Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand ... by Ghosh, P. Page No. 27-55



Council (JGC) like Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council in West Bengal and formation of a “over all cultural development authority for the development of Jharkhand as cultural region”. It also claimed in its supplementary note that without a single political administrative unit in the form of Jharkhand State with the areas of Chotanagpur and Santal Pargana in Bihar, and bordering areas of West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh ‘will not adequate to fulfill the aspirations of the people’. (RCJM,1990:50) According to the demand of RCJM the Bihar Govt formed Jharkhand Area Autonomous Council (JAAC) in 1995 under the Chairmanship of Sibu Soren, however most of the political parties stood against such decision because they wanted the status of a State. But later within few year it expires because of the reluctant attitude of the then CM Laloo Prasad Yadav’s govt.(Ghosh,1998:68) After few dramatic ups and downs when BJP in the 1998 formed its allied govt (NDA) decided to curve out a Vananchal State. And accordingly on 15th November 2000, the 28th State of Indian Constitution emerged. It was curved out from Bihar with an area of 79,714 sq km with a considerably less tribal percentage. It constitutes only 27% and most of the area in West Bengal and Orissa were left out.(Mallick,2003:unpaged)

Before the formation of the Jharkhand state the area which was proposed by the functionaries of the movement was 1, 87,646 Sq Km with a population of 40 million.(Basu,1994:2-3)

Table-2 Proposed Jharkhand Areas

Bihar		79,638 Sq.Km.
District :	Singbhum	13,447 Sq.Km
	Ranchi, Gumla	
	Lohardanga	18,331 Sq.Km
	Hazaribagh, Giridih	18,060 Sq.Km
	Palamou	12,667 Sq.Km
	Dhanbad	2,994 Sq.Km
	Santal Pargana	14,129 Sq.Km
	(Dumka, Godda,Deoghar,Sahebganj)	
West Bengal		26,864 Sq.Km
District		
	Midnapur	13,724 Sq.Km
	Purulia	6,259 Sq.Km
	Bankura	6,881 Sq.Km
Orissa		45,897 Sq.Km
District		
	Keonjhar	3,240 Sq.Km
	Sundargarh	9,675 Sq.Km

Mayurbhanj	10,412 Sq.Km
Sambalpur	17,570 Sq.Km
Madhya Pradesh	35,247 Sq.Km
District	
Raigarh	12,910 Sq.Km
Surguja	22,337 Sq.Km

Source: Jharkhand Mukti Morcha Memorandum to the Hon'ble President of India on 11th Aug, 1989, see also Jharkhand Movement, Ethnicity and Culture of Silence, Sajal Basu, 1994, P-2-3

There was a difference between the proposed and present area, the Jharkhandi leaders were not been able to get all the proposed area they demanded while they have only achieved 79,261 Sq.km. successfully, the reason was partly because of the lack of coordination with other areas specially in West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh and partly because of the political stands took by the selected states, that is why the state had less district of what the proposed is numbered.

Table-3 Present Jharkhand Areas

Present Area:	79,714 sq.km
Population:	26,945,829

	Districts	2001 Census	2011 Census
1	Bokaro (183sq.km)	1,777,662	
2	Dumka (3714sq.km)	1,759,602	
3	Giridih (4854 sq.km)	1,904,430	
4	Deogarh (2478.61sq.km)	1,165,390	
5	Jamatra (1802sq.km)	Not available	790,207
6	Gumla (5327sq.km)	1,346,767	
7	Koderma (1500sq.km)	499,403	
8	Lohardanga (1490.80sq.km)	364,521	
9	Palamou (5044sq.km)	2,098,359	
10	West Singbhum (5351sq.km)	2,082,795	

11	Ranchi (7574sq.km)	2,785,064	
12	Saraikele-Kharsawan (2727sq.km)	Not available	1,063,458
13	Chhatra (3706sq.km)	791,434	
14	Dhanban (2074.78sq.km)	2,397,702	
15	Garhwah (4044sq.km)	1,035,464	
16	Godda (2110sq.km)	1,047,939	
17	Hazaribagh (4313sq.km)	2,277,475	
18	Khunti (2367sq.km)	Not available	530,299
19	Latehar (3630sq.km)	Not available	725,673
20	Pakur (1806sq.km)	701,664	
21	East Singbhum (3533sq.km)	1,982,988	
22	Ramgarh (1389sq.km)	Not available	949,159
23	Sahibganj (1599sq.km)	927,770	
24	Simdega (3750sq.km)	Not available	599,813

Some of the districts were carved out after 2001. Therefore population data are only available in the 2011 census reports.

Source: census of India 2001& Map of India, See also Jharkhand govt website

Conclusion:

The political condition of Jharkhand did have success of attaining separate Jharkhand State (Though it was not the actual area) that was appeared significant but there were some intrusive authoritarianism that have slowly emerged. The success involved in strategic emancipation evolved through long period of political ups and down and finally succeeded with lot of criticism and significance. Probably the first question which came up with huge debate that why National Parties like Congress (I), CPI (M), BJP, CPI not supported the demand for separate state, it was argued that the CPI(M) actually not supported the movement because it shows a secessionist approach as well as gone through a communal approach.(Rana,2003:117) In fact at the time of JMM and its extension programmes at Purulia and Jhargram it consistently criticized the then West Bengal CM late Communist leader Jyoti Basu for his narrow Bengali chauvinism. (Roy,2003:73-77) However it cannot be denied that the movement was lie within factionalism because it does not able to address the problem within the periphery of class struggle which could be developed under the participation of left ideologies.

Apart from the political aspirations there were other important issues which were dovetailed with the success of Jharkhand Movement. In a larger context, particularly in the context of environment and ecology it signifies that the emergence of new state has established the 'ecological prudence'²⁷ of the Jharkhandis as representative and authority. However in the entire movement ecological and environmental factors were subsumed in the electoral politics and even after the creation of separate state no such policies were rendered to meet the ecological questions raised by the movement. The question of forest rights, the agriculture and its associated culture were taken up as an issue in late 1970s particularly by the JMM. And was reflected in Singbhum in 1978 when tribal people, particularly the Hos reacted against the illegal destruction of forests by agencies of modernity. The movement was taken place against the implantation of teak (which is commercially valuable) instead of Sal tree. It was organized through clear felling of trees though it was symbolic. It was carried out with a view of ecological knowledge that nothing grew under teak, specially the bushes, grasses which was used to take as necessary food by the elephants. Therefore it curtailed the subsistence practice of the local wildlife.(Damodaran, 1997:273-298) In this movement JMM has succeed to develop and maintained a reciprocal loyalty to the demand of the aboriginals. It was substantiate through the notion of common treasure. Even though most of the activists allegedly defended the work of implanting teak and raised slogan 'Sal is Jharkhand, Teak is Bihar'.(Gadgill,1989:765) As we pointed out earlier, that in the early 1940s there was no clear cut environmental agenda in the movement, not even reflected anywhere in the memorandums, ethnic issues were the main concern which probably undermine the popular voices. But the environmental issues were largely incorporated in the seventies, and that probably found its original base. The assertion of tradition of collective farming, preservation of jungle land and the egalitarian concept of land use became prominent and asserted forcefully. (Damodaran,1997:273-298) However one may argue that, revisiting the past was taken as agenda to define a ritualistic approach towards the sympathy of the tribes and according to this notion many alternative action was taken place to render ecological revivalism.

It cannot be denied that Jharkhand Movement had a very strong territorial association which could be traced back to 18th century when the adivasi rose revolt against the alien intruders for the sake of homeland. Though after a series of debate on the issue of '*Diku* or '*Dikuization*' of the whole movement, the accent on the demand for statehood actually mixed up and converted to a larger hybrid platform and came out from the orthodoxy. JMM uses 'green colour flag' to show the ecological plurality of all the Jharkhandi adivasi and also chose its election symbol as *sismandi*, (A particular kind of fowl sacrificed to bonga). (Damodaran,1997:291) Not only JMM, other organizations like Jharkhand Buddhijibi Manch (Jharkhand Intellectual Forum) which was active

²⁷ Madhav Gadgill , a known ecologists and academician often used the term 'Ecological prudence' in his many articles.

from 1986 has also taken some environmental friendly agenda. The forum has decided to bring back the Sahrul, and Karam festival and accordingly it was celebrated in 1990 at Hazaribagh. About 5000 tribals have participated in the festival.(Ekka & sinha,2004: 116) These activities were also accompanied with several seminars that univocally criticized govt industrial policies and launched campaign for ecological sustainability through an environmental brigade.(Ghosh,1998;65) It was more prominent, that even of as regards to the voting percentage in some area in general, depended upon the choices it shows that Jharkhand Party is leading with 42.5% from the congress and Jan Sangh whose voting percentage stood 32.5% & 25.86 consecutively. The majority of the tribals voted for Jharkhand Party because of their sacred Cock symbol (Domestic fowl). They refused to vote for other symbol. (Vidyarthi,1972:449) Thus the use of symbol of sacred things became a monopoly during Jharkhand movement in order to popularize tribal culture. The assertion of symbols of traditional things and colours signifies the fights for virtue and against the evil. This is how the movement popularizes the environmental perception. One of the main reasons for the survival of environmental components despite of the electoral power structure was the memory, which played a vital role in constructing motivation for separate statehood. Thus the politics of Jharkhand did something which in contrary has been able to unite the factions long after the emergence of political consciousness.

References

1. File No- 429/1939, Sub: Article under the heading 'Bihar Bandar Nacho' and 'Nili Rang Bhumi se' in the Adivasi. Bihar State Archive (hereafter BSA)
2. File No- 270/1947, Sub: Adivasi Movement: Activities of Jaipal Singh and Others. BSA
3. File No- 270 (3)/1947, Sub: Formation of Jharkhand Momin Union to work for the separation of Jharkhand. BSA
4. File No- 1815/1947, Sub: Activities of the Christian Missionary society in Chotnagpur and the Santal Parganas in connection with the adivasi agitator, policy to be adopted towards them. BSA
5. Basu, Sajal.(1994) Jharkhand Movement, Ethnicity and Culture of Silence.Simla, IIAS. Quoted from *Jharkhand Bidroho o Jiban*, by P.P.Mahato. Calcutta, 1982.
6. Corbridge, Stuart. (2005).The Ideology of Tribal Economy and Society, Politics in Jharkhand, C1950-1980. In Sarah Jewitt, Sanjay Kumar, Stuart Corbridge (Eds.) *Jharkhand: environment, Development, Ethnicity*. New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
7. Damodaran, Vinita. (October 1997). Environment, Ethnicity and History in Chotanagpur, India,1850-1970. *Environment and History*, JSTOR 3(3). URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20723049> accessed on 02.09.2013
8. Ghosh, Arunabha. (1998). *Jharkhand Movement, A Study in the Politics of Regionalism*. Calcutta. Minerva Associates (publications) Pvt. Ltd.
9. Jewitt, Sarah. (2008). Political Ecology of Jharkhand Conflicts. *Asia Pacific View Point*, 49(1), 68-72.

10. Singh.K.S. (2004) Ecology, Ethnicity. Regionalism and State Formation: An Exploration of the Jharkhand Movement. In Rajib Balakrishnan (Eds.) *Jharkhand Matters : Essays on Ethnicity, Regionalism and Development in India*, New Delhi, Konark.
11. Kujur, Igenes.(2003) Jharkhand Betrayed. In Ram Dayal Munda & S.Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, Copenhagen, IWGIA.
12. Mishra, Asha. (2010). Indigenous Movement for a Seperate State-Jharkhand During The Twentieth Century. In Asha Mishra & Chittaranjan Kumar Paty (Eds.) *Tribal Movements in Jharkhand, 1857-2007*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
13. Mullick, S.Bosu. (2007). State Forest policy and Adivasi Selfrule in Jharkhand. In Chittaranjan Kumar Paty (Eds.) *Forest, Government and Tribe*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
14. Pathak, Akhileshwar. (1994). *Contested Domains, The State, Peasants and Forests in Contemporary India*. New Delhi, Sage.
15. Munda, R.D, Mullick, S.Bosu (2003). *The Jharkhand Movement, Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*. IWGIA.
16. Narayan, S. (1988). *Movement, Development, Police and Judiciary in Tribal World*. New Delhi, Inter India.
17. Report of Committee on Jharkhand Matters. May,1990.
18. Ekka,William, & Sinha, R.K. (2004). *Documentation of Jharkhand Movement*. Kolkata, Anthropological Survey of India.
19. Gadgill, Madhav. (1989). Deforestation, Problems and Prospects. Society for Promotion of Waste land Development. URL www.ces.ennet.in/biodiversity/sdev/mg/pdfs/mg087.doc.
20. Keshari B.P, Munda, R.D. (2003). Recent Development in Jharkhand Movement. In R.D.Munda & S.Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous People Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
21. Rana, L.N. (1996). Political Consciousness in Jharkhand, 1900-1947. *Indian History Congress Proceedings, 57th Session*.
22. Rana, Santosh. (2003). The Jharkhand Movement. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
23. Roy, Amit. (2003). Second phase of Jharkhand Movement. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
24. Sharma, Usha. (1998). The Background and Nature of the Congress-Jharkhand Merger(20th June 1963). *Indian History Congress proceedings, 59th Session*.
25. Vidyarthi, L.P. (1972). An appraisal of the leadership pattern among the tribes of Bihar." In K.S Singh (Eds.) *Tribal Situation in India*, Shimla, IIAS
26. Sharma, A.P (1988). The Jharkhand Movement, A Critique, *Social Change*, 18(2),60
27. Singh, K.S. (1972). Agrarian Issues in Chotanagpur." In K.S.Singh (Eds.) *Tribal Situation in India*, Shimla, IIAS.
28. Swamy, Stan. (2013). Fate of Commons, Commoners and Displaced : Why do People Resist Displacement ?. In Anant Kumar & Himadri Sinha (Eds.) *Governance of Commons and Livelihood Security*, Ranchi, Xavier Institute of Social Service.

Cite this article:

Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand Movement, India: question of 'environmental revivalism' and its consequences

Citation Format: APA

Ghosh, P. (2016). Political identities and dilemma in Jharkhand Movement, India: question of 'environmental revivalism' and its consequences. *S O C R A T E S*, 4(2), 27-55. Retrieved from <http://socratesjournal.com/index.php/socrates/article/view/206>

For more citation formats, visit:

<http://socratesjournal.com/index.php/socrates/rt/captureCite/206/0>

Indexing metadata is available online on:

<http://socratesjournal.com/index.php/socrates/rt/metadata/206/0>