
UNIT 19 POLITICAL DEMOCRATISATION IN THE PRINCELY STATES*

Structure

- 19.1 Introduction
- 19.2 The Evolution of Princely Order
- 19.3 Basic Features of Autocracies in the Princely States
- 19.4 Initiatives for Democratisation from Above
- 19.5 Political Mobilisation in Princely States as a Tool of Democratisation
- 19.6 The Praja Mandals in Orissa Garjat States in 1930s
- 19.7 Democratic Aspirations of the Masses in States on the Eve of Independence
 - 19.7.1 Democratic Struggle in Hyderabad
 - 19.7.2 Democratisation in Jammu and Kashmir
- 19.8 Summary
- 19.9 Exercises

19.1 INTRODUCTION

The patterns of the British conquest and the methods of creating an empire resulted in the emergence of princely order in India. The princes ruled over about 2/5th of the Indian subcontinent which had about 1/3rd the population of the British Empire in India. Some of these states were as big as some European countries while we also had many very small principalities or feudal estates. The one common feature of these states was that they all recognized the paramountcy of the British Crown. They enjoyed little independence in relation to that paramount power and were treated as subordinate or feudatory states. But the rulers of these states enjoyed full autocratic powers over their subjects. The British protected the autocracies of the princes from both internal and external dangers and threats. It was under the umbrella of British protection that these autocratic princes walked with all their grandeur and dignity. The princes were a useful tool in the over-all imperial design and as the natural allies of the British rulers; they willingly supported their patrons in times of crisis either because of war or the intense nationalist mobilisation.

19.2 THE EVOLUTION OF PRINCELY ORDER

The form of government in these states was monarchical and the general perception of the British administrators as well as their nationalist opponents was that they were tradition-bound, unchanging, disinterested in progress where 'oriental despots' stood in the way of modernisation and social change. Prior to the revolt of 1857, many British administrators, under the influence of evangelical and utilitarian ideas, were disdainful of the princes. These 'feudal remnants' were seen as a hindrance in the reform of indigenous society and institutions. They were not more than a cesspool of corruption and socio-economic stagnation and symbols of 'oriental despotism'. However, after the revolt, their timely support

* Resource Person: Prof. Shri Krishan

(especially by the rulers of Mysore, Patiala and Hyderabad strengthened their claims as the trusted and faithful military, administrative and political allies of the British rule. The perception of British administrators underwent a shift, and the princes became the 'natural leaders' of Indian society. They were also rewarded in the form of ceremonial rewards and even material treasure in the form of additional territories in some cases. The British rulers solemnly affirmed their protection and the right to perpetual existence. Assurances were given to the princes that their dynasties would not be allowed to lapse for want of the natural heirs. Queen Victoria proclaimed that 'all Treaties and Engagements made with them by or under the authority of the Honourable East India Company are by us accepted and will be scrupulously observed' and further that 'We desire no extension of our present Territorial Possessions' and 'We shall respect the rights, dignity and honour of the native princes as our own'.

19.3 BASIC FEATURES OF AUTOCRACIES IN THE PRINCELY STATES

The princely states were vast assortment of states differing in size, composition and resources. A popular perception about them, reinforced by the colonial stereotypes, is one of elephant-riding *maharajas* enjoying the company of dancing girls. However, a basic aspect of their autocracy was existence of feudal order within all of them. The colonial ethnographic accounts depicted India as a society that privileged the traditional and rustic over urban and modern. As the East was seen as a storehouse of ancient traditions, colourful rites, majestic spectacles and archaic knowledge, if it had any knowledge at all, so also the princes were seen as representing an old clan-based polity. There were hardly any princes who fit into this kind of stereotype. The sovereignty of the princes was not autonomous as there was constant imperial surveillance, interference and pressures from the paramount power, the British, which determined the form this autocracy was to take and how the old *darbari* system will work in a princely state. The princes no longer enjoyed the old, traditional social protective role without the mediation of the paramount power. The autocracy of the prince was indirectly despotism of the British officials who controlled the state apparatus through many ingenious devices and mechanisms. If at all the prince had power, it was to patrol the hunting range, or the *sikargah*.

Most of the princely states had autocratic rule where powers was concentrated in the hands of rulers or their favourites appointed in the patrimonial administration. The burden of land revenue was generally much higher in the princely states compared to British administration and this was linked to their administrative machinery. The rulers generally enjoyed supreme control over the state revenues for their own personal use, often leading to ostentatious living. In some states, the rulers shared powers with the *jagirdars* or feudal aristocrats, who controlled the landed resources because they were relatives and supporters of the rulers or both. These feudal elements enjoyed varying degree of authority and power and the ordinary peasants and cultivators had no voice in the administration. The feudal lords not only collected and retained the land revenues from their respective estates but also had limited police and magisterial powers within their estates. In Alwar state, for instance, the *jagirdars*, who had kinship relations with the ruler, controlled about 1/3rd fertile lands in the Southern parts of the state. The *jagirdars* also held administrative positions. The ruler and these feudal chiefs reinforced

each other's position. During Raja Banni Singh's rule (1815-57) in Alwar, outside Muslim officials trained in British method of administration were appointed, leading to a conflict between the *jagirdars* and this new class of administrators. In Hyderabad, the Nizam's own estate or *sarf khas* comprised of about 10% of the total area of the state and income from this was used to meet the expenses of the royal house. Another major chunk of land-resources (about 30%) was under the control of *jagirdars* of various categories. Oppressive practices like *vethi* (a kind of *begar* or unpaid labour service) and illegal *abwabs* or illegal taxes of many kinds were quite common in many of the princely states.

The feudal chiefs and the landed magnates were the main supporters of the princely autocracies who shored up the authority and powers of the princes, although some 'enlightened' rulers and their ministers did try to introduce reform in the administration and system of taxation. Such reforms too were basically more concerned about efficient handling of governmental functioning like collection of taxes, the maintenance of law and order and the provision of some limited public services like transportation, communication and education. There was hardly any attempt to introduce democratic accountability in the functioning of the government.

The princely states were generally run on laws that were a combination of enactment based on the British Indian legal codes and personal decrees and orders of the rulers. The element of arbitrariness was so significant that such decrees could be withdrawn or modified at the discretion of the prince any time. There was no institutional check on the arbitrary powers enjoyed by the princes within their own territories. They could freely use whatever force the British allowed them to keep against their subjects. The coercive apparatus of the state was generally small but quite effective in the circumstances where people were disarmed. To give you an idea of the strength of a ruler's police and military apparatus, we can see the figures for the Patiala state. It had a territory of about 5,412 square miles and its armed police, trained by a British police officer, had 1,600 men. Its small army consisted of about 1,200 infantry soldiers, 450 cavalymen and another 210 men in command of artillery.

19.4 INITIATIVES FOR DEMOCRATISATION FROM ABOVE

Some princes introduced representative assemblies in their states, although these were not truly speaking modern democratic institutions with accountability. Mysore was the first princely state to inaugurate a representative assembly in 1881. Subsequently a legislative council or upper house was added in 1907. Similarly Travancore launched a similar nominated legislative council in 1888 and created an elective consultative assembly (although with a majority of appointed official members) in 1904. Baroda also had a representative assembly from 1907. Most of these bodies, however, lacked a real popular representative character and even did not had a modicum of accountability as the majority of members of these bodies were the trusted officials appointed by the rulers. The other states with such bodies were Bhopal, Gwalior, Hyderabad, Cochin, Datia and Pudukkottai. Such assemblies were basically advisory in functions. In states with a reputation of being modern, the *diwan* or the chief minister of the state chaired their sessions. In others, the ruler moderated, as occurred in Datia in

1929 or Gwalior where, the *maharani*, a regent for the minor heir, assumed control. Where the ruler presided over the assembly, it resembled a medieval *darbar* in which the elites presented their grievances but had no legal authority to influence the outcome of the policy. Some states introduced a limited franchise. During 1930s, for example, in Travancore and Cochin, about 5% of the population could vote for the assemblies. Most of these assemblies, however, did not control the budgets or have the right to initiate legislation. In exceptional cases when an assembly acquired such restricted powers to influence budget and legislation, as was the case in Mysore in later years, the ruler could still authorize expenditures or legislation in ‘emergencies’. As the resources they managed were so restricted, these assemblies never became the focus for popular political activity.

19.5 POLITICAL MOBILISATION IN PRINCELY STATES AS A TOOL OF DEMOCRATISATION

The political mobilisation in the princely states passed through three distinct phases. In the first stage, the mobilisation was centred on some specific local grievances such as employment of too many ‘foreigners’ or outsiders in the administrative services of the state and a lack of freedom of press and assembly. The newly emergent urban literate groups were behind this kind of demands and petitioning was the principal mode of the articulation of the demands at this stage. This phase is discernible in Travancore in late nineteenth century although in other states its visibility is seen in 1910s and 1920s. During the 1910s the urban educated subjects of the princely states formed the *praja mandal* or *lok parishads* in some states. Generally the persons educated in British India were behind such moves. The princely states generally lagged behind the British territories in post-secondary education and sometimes these political agitators were based in British territories if the repression of the prince on the political activities was severe. The main demands of these early agitators were greater recruitment of the state’s subject in government employment, the guarantee of civil liberties especially the freedom of press, assembly, an association, and in a few instances even the establishment of representative assembly in the state. Seldom did they question the legitimacy of the princely order or demand its outright abolition. *Praja mandal* leaders usually attributed political oppression in the states not to the princes but to the authoritarian or corrupt officials, frequently outsiders or sometimes the scheming *zenana* women or their advisors. Praja Mithra Mandali (1917) of Mysore was perhaps the first such early organisation. Others of similar kind soon emerged in other states such as Baroda, Bhor, and Indore. The Kathiawad Rajkiya Parishad (1921) and the Deccan State Subject’s Conference were also similar organisations.

The second stage emerged in the late 1920s and first half of the 1930s. Now the petitioning leads to direct confrontation and public protests in the form of street demonstrations by the literate urban class of people. The main demand now is greater popular representation and the legal right to form political associations. Such organisations emerged in Bhavanagar, Gondal, Junagarh and most Rajputana states in 1920s and 1930s. In Punjab, The Punjab Riyasati Praja Mandal was formed. By the second half of the 1920s, a more active phase of agitation begun in many states. There were demonstrations and public protests in the form of marches. The educated groups demanded now representative and increasingly responsible government that would diminish princely autocracy but not deny

princely authority. They also asked for widening of franchises for the representative assemblies; and selection of elected members of the legislative councils as ministers. This clearly was an indication of rising democratic aspiration of people in the states after the experiment of Popular Congress Rule in nine British provinces (1937-39). Another major demand was privy purses to check arbitrary expenditure of the rulers and increased funding of social infrastructure especially in the field of education and health. Such organisations further demanded recognition of *praja mandals* as legitimate organisations and release of political prisoners arrested during public protests in the states.

In the third phase, peasant mobilisation emerged and became the prominent feature of second half of 1930s and 1940s on the whole. In fact peasant based movements developed simultaneously. They went side by side with the urban educated middle class mobilisation but there were not much direct organisational linkages of the peasant protests with the urban politics. In the rural areas, middle caste peasants generated the most vocal supporters of the protest movement. There were peasant and tribal movements against the *jagirdars* of Bijolia in 1920s in Udaipur. The main issues were the arbitrary taxes, feudal cesses and *begar* or unpaid labour service. The Jat Kisan sabhas of 1930s in Rajputana states, however, also focussed their attention apart from economic grievances, on the questions of ritual status and challenged the Rajput's prerogatives of riding on elephants, horse and camels. The major challenge for the political leadership in the princely states was to broaden its popular base, coordinate their efforts with the political associations in British India and to achieve some leverage with the rulers. It was also a major challenge for them to bridge the gap between the urban and rural movements and to overcome the narrow exclusive boundaries of caste and religious communities in their mobilisation so as to forge the people as citizens.

One thing has to be made clear here. The Indian National Congress, representing the broad democratic spectrum of opinion in the country, after a brief flirtation with the princes as their financial benefactors during the 1880s, had consciously distanced itself from the princes as well as from the political mobilisation in the princely states. This strategy of non-interference continued even with the coming of spectacular mass mobilisation in the early Gandhian phase. There were perhaps some weighty issues that were responsible for such an approach of non-interference in the politics of princely states. First were the constraints of resources at the disposal of Congress. Secondly, the nationalist leadership did not want to fight simultaneously at two fronts because it was aware that princes existed only due to protection of the paramount power of the British. Thirdly, Congress leadership was aware that the movements in princely states were linked to the appeals based on class, religious and linguistic identities and could result in more regional and religious fragmentation. However, while generally not allowing strife around class issues, Gandhian leadership permitted 'constructive work' such as anti-untouchability in the states. Gandhi actively supported the Vaikom Satyagarha in Travancore in 1925, where the demand for the opening of the road around Vaikom temple for the use of 'untouchables' was raised.

The advance of national movement in British India and resultant increase in the political consciousness of the people also had its share of impact on the princely states. From the very beginning, national movement became synonymous with the march of democracy and demand for a responsible government. The impact of Non-Cooperation movement in the beginning of 1920s was felt in the states

when *praja mandals* (states' people's conferences) appeared in some of them. The democratic aspirations of people in princely states assumed a concrete organisational form in December, 1927, when at the initiative of leaders from states like Balwantrao Mehta, Maniklal Kothari and G. R. Abhyankar, the All-India States' People's Conference was convened. It was attended by 700 activists from the various states. The Congress had passed a resolution at Nagpur Congress Session (1920) asking the princes to grant democratic government to their subjects. The Congress also allowed persons from states to join the Congress organisation as its primary members. But Congress also made it conditional with rider that Congress members in the states could not take part in any political activity in the states as Congressmen or in the name of Congress but only in either in their private capacity, as individuals, or as members of the local political associations. The stress was that the state subjects should develop their own organisations and should not look to outside support. However, the informal relation between nationalist organisation and local *praja mandals* existed and paved the way for more intense mobilisation patterns in the states in subsequent phases. Nehru, representing a leftward shift in the priorities of Congress declared in Lahore Session of the Congress (1929) that the fate of states was linked with the rest of India and that only the people of states would have right to determine the political future of the states.

The situation in the princely states was changing dramatically in the 1930s. Firstly, the Government of India Act (1935) conceived of a plan of federation in which the Indian states were to be brought into a direct constitutional relationship with the British India and the states were to send representatives to the Federal Legislature. The Scheme was undemocratic as it had provision that states' representatives would be nominated by their rulers, not democratically elected. This was to ensure that nationalist representatives would be always in minority. Although this part of the Act was never implemented, both Congress and the All-India States' People's Conference opposed the move and demanded that all representatives for the Federal Legislature should be on the basis of a popular elective principle. Secondly, the assumption of offices by the Congress in the majority of provinces of British India in 1937 had an electrifying impact on the popular participation in the political processes, both in British Indian territories and the states. Thirdly, the left-oriented Congress was under the spell of radical leaders such as Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose in the 1930s and the Congress Socialist Party was demanding a more radical policy in the princely states. The *praja mandal* movements mushroomed in most states as we illustrate with example of Orissa *garjat* states below.

19.6 THE PRAJA MANDALS IN ORISSA GARJAT STATES IN 1930s

The *praja mandal* movement in the *garjat* states was basically a peasant movement which was an epoch-making struggle that considerably influenced the politics of the province as well as the nation. There were 26 *garjats* or, feudatory states of Orissa and it took twelve years after the formation of the province to merge those states with Orissa. The movement, which initially was directed against the misrule and autocracy of the rulers, subsequently demanded responsible government and the merger of the states with Orissa. The attempt to organize the people of the feudatory states took real shape during the Civil

Disobedience Movement, when the First All Orissa States People Conference was organised at Cuttack in 1931. The organisation that went into hibernation soon after its formation was revived again in 1937, with the efforts of Sarangadhar Das, known as 'Garjat Gandhi' in the *garjats*. The second session of the All Orissa States People's Conference was held at Cuttack on 23rd June 1937. The conference declared its objective as the attainment of responsible government. It also exposed the exploitative character of the *garjat* administration and urged upon the rulers to remove the grievances of the people. The conference provided the impetus to the people of the *garjats* and thus in almost all the states the people formed *praja mandals*. Through this organisation, they put up before the rulers their demand lists, which included the abolition of numerous feudal exactions and restoration of civil liberties. The feudatory rulers saw the *praja mandals* as real danger to their authority. They not only refused recognition to this organisation but adopted several repressive measures to restrict their activities. The first popular agitation against the *garjat* administration was witnessed in the state of Nilgiri, a small state in the border of Balasore. The punitive action of the ruler of Nilgiri on the people of the villages incited the people and on 2nd May 1938, disturbances started in Nilgiri. The people under the leadership of Kailash Chandra Mohanty and Banamali Das pressed the ruler to yield to their demands, which included the recognition of their civil liberties and removal of unjust laws. Brutal and repressive measures adopted by the ruler to calm down the agitation failed to dislodge the people. Ultimately a compromise was made through the mediation of H.K. Mahtab.

Talcher and Dhenkanal were the two other *garjat* states, where the activities of the *praja mandal* created troubles for the ruling chiefs. The Talcher *praja mandal* movement attracted the attention of national leaders, for it adopted a novel measure to fight against the ruler. The repressive measures of the ruler compelled the people of Talcher to adopt a new form of passive resistance and they left their homes and moved to the neighbouring areas of Angul, in British Orissa. It was estimated by the *praja mandal* leaders that about 60 thousand people out of the total population of 86 thousand had left their homes and taken shelter in the temporary camps. The mass migration of the people, their plight in the camps, who stayed there for long 8 months, was an innovative way of getting into the political arena. In the state of Dhenkanal, a reign of terror was instituted by the ruling chief to suppress the *praja mandal*, which had started its agitation against the reign of tyranny in Dhenkanal. However, the most tragic incident that shocked the people and represented the police repression in severe form was committed in the villages of Bhuban and Nilakanthapur at the night of 10-11 October 1938. There, the police party attacked the innocent villagers and killed six persons. This sort of wanton repression not only invited condemnation but it also strengthened the determination of the people to fight for the fulfilment of their just demands. In the *garjat* states of Athagarh, Baramba, Narsinghpur, Nayagarh and Tigiria the people raised their voice under the aegis of their *praja mandal* units. The popular agitation in Ranpur assumed a violent character. On 5th June 1939, the people gheraoed the royal palace and pressed for the release of their arrested leaders. Major R.L. Bazelgette, the political agent, who was present on the spot, without heeding to the people's demands, ordered the crowd to disperse. To frighten the crowd he fired a few shots. This infuriated the crowd and in their retaliatory attack Major Bazelgette was killed. In the wake of this, police repression started in Ranpur. Many people were arrested, some fled to the

neighbouring areas. Finally two persons Raghunath Mohanty and Dibakar Parida were hanged and others suffered exile and life imprisonment.

Such development brought about a sea-change in Congress policy towards these movements. The Congress at its Tripuri Session (1939) passed a resolution enunciating new tactics. It removed the earlier restraint on the Congress activities in the states. Now there was greater identification between the Congress and the *praja mandals*. In 1939, Jawaharlal Nehru was elected as the president of the All-India States' People's Conference, a step that marked the merger of the two streams of democratic movement in princely states and British India. As a result of this, unlike previous movements, the impact of Quit India movement was felt more uniformly in the princely states and the British Indian territories.

19.7 DEMOCRATIC ASPIRATIONS OF THE MASSES ON THE EVE OF INDEPENDENCE

It appears on surface that Indian states were merged in the Indian Union after 1947 using coercive means by Sardar Patel. But the coercion was often backed by popular democratic aspirations of the masses as we will see in the case of Hyderabad and Kashmir, the states where force was used.

19.7.1 Democratic Struggle in Hyderabad

Congress had launched a Satyagraha in Hyderabad in 1938 under the leadership of Swami Ramtirth. It was not much successful. Around the same time, The Communists entered the Andhra Maha Sabha and using the linguistic identity demand and agrarian anti-feudal reforms, gained some influence. The Communal organisations, Itihad-ul-Muslimin and the Hindu Maha Sabha, both tried to polarize people along religious lines around the same period. Gandhi had asked Swami Ramtirth in 1942 to begin a Satyagraha as soon as a similar struggle was launched in British Indian territories by the Congress. While Congress tried to widen the social base of its movement in Hyderabad through State Peoples' Conference, the Communist used the Andhra Maha Sabha as their front organisation and made use of Telugu language question and land-reform, simultaneously demanding end of Nizam's autocratic rule. Nizam tried to curtail any kind of democratic and civil rights in their state in 1940s. The State also tried to portray the genuine democratic demands of State Congress as those of 'Hindus' in order to get the sympathy of Muslim masses and there were communal conflict on some occasions. Realising that it was not possible to merge with Pakistan, due to geographical reasons as well as political disliking of Nizam for Jinnah, the state's ruler was dreaming of keeping Hyderabad a separate sovereign state.

Swami Ramtirth and other Congress leaders began a Satyagraha in August 1947 for the merger of Hyderabad in India. The Communists had organised an anti-landlord and anti-Nizam campaign in Telangana region since 1944. Ravi Narayan Reddy played a crucial role in this popular struggle as the leader of Andhra Maha Sabha. Nizam tried to suppress it but it assumed mass dimension by 1946 and despite a ban on the Communist organisation by the Nizam's Government in December 1946, there was an informal and temporary alliance between State Congress and Communists, although it contained seeds of an ideological conflict as well. The armed takeover of Hyderabad through 'Operation Polo' by the Indian

troops in September 1948 was celebrated as a democratic step by the people of Hyderabad state.

19.7.2 Democratisation in Jammu and Kashmir

In October, 1932, a Muslim Conference was established in Srinagar under the leadership of Sheikh Abdullah. Its aim was to fight for the democratic rights of Muslims, their socio-economic and cultural progress, lowering of land revenue demand, and adequate representation to Muslims in state services etc. Maharaja Hari Singh had established a legislative assembly known as the '*Praja Sabha*' in the state in 1934. It was not a truly representative assembly and in no way created a democratic and accountable system of government in Jammu and Kashmir. There was provision of separate Communal electorate in the elections to the assembly and elected members were always in a minority. Only about 3% people got franchise under this constitution. The assembly could legislate only on subjects allowed by the autocratic Maharaja and although it could discuss and put resolution on budget, it had no power to alter budget proposals. Sheikh Abdullah renamed his organisation as National Conference. It was more than a symbolic gesture as he was moving towards secular democratic ideology. He was close to local Congress leader Premnath Bajaj. He also came in contact with Jawaharlal Nehru and started stressing social and economic issues like agrarian reforms more than religious issues.

Under the pressure of democratic demands of National Conference, Maharaja Hari Singh amended the constitution of legislative assembly in 1939. Now the elected members could be in majority in the assembly, although the separate communal electorates and system of nominated membership in assembly were retained. Meanwhile the communal polarisation became sharper in the state with revival of conservative, and communal based Muslim Conference. In 1944, Maharaja included two members of the assembly in his ministry, one Hindu and One Muslim. Mirza Afjal Beg, the deputy leader of National Conference in assembly became the minister of Public Works department but it was a short lived arrangement. Mirza Beg resigned from his post in March, 1946. National Conference launched a 'Quit Kashmir' Movement in 1946 with a demand to end the autocratic rule of Maharaja in Kashmir and to include peoples' representatives in the constitution-making process. For this National Conference gave a petition to the Cabinet Mission to give right to the people of Kashmir to send delegates to Constituent Assembly. Many leaders of the National Conference including Sheikh Abdullah were arrested and sent to jails. The main demands of National Conference at this juncture were:

- 1) Right to frame Constitution for the autonomous socio-political units of federal Indian Union.
- 2) Right of the people of the states to self-determination on the basis of nationality.
- 3) Recognition of the right of people of a state to cultural identity.
- 4) Right of people of a state to merge or stay away from Indian Union in future.
- 5) Right to a state to leave the Federation even after merging with it.

However, main contention of Sheikh Abdullah at this point of time was that it should struggle against the proposal of Cabinet Mission to leave right to send representatives in the Constituent Assembly to the rulers. He argued that

democratic struggle of people against state's autocracy was part of anti-imperialist struggle because the princely order was a creation of British rule and it must end with the coming of Independence. There were protests in many parts of Jammu and Kashmir against the arrest of leaders of National Conference. Nehru and All-India States' peoples' Conference supported the movement in Kashmir. Contrary to this the Muslim Conference had started supporting the creation of Pakistan and weaning away Muslim people for a communal agenda. The influence of Muslim Conference grew in the absence of National Conference leaders and when they were finally released, armed intrusion of Pakistan had already begun. It was under these circumstances that Maharaja Hari Singh asked for Indian help and decided merger with India. The merger paved the way for establishment of a democratic government for which Congress and National Conference has been struggling for long.

19.8 SUMMARY

We have seen how the princely states came into being as feudal appendage of an Imperial design. Initially Congress did not intervene in the political processes within the states. However, mass democratic associations of people developed in the states in the form of *paraja mandals* and they expanded their influence by advocating democratic reforms and civil liberties in the states that were governed by autocratic rulers. By late 1930s Congress supported the democratic aspirations of the people in princely state and *praja mnadals* organised a number of anti-feudal agitations in many of the states and simultaneously demanded creation of representative assemblies and a responsible government. The process of democratisation gained momentum in 1940s when it became clear that country was moving towards Independence. The ease of integration and merger of the states into Indian Union, with minimal use of coercion in the process, was due to fact that political mobilisation had already been under way in most of the states.

19.9 EXERCISES

- 1) Describe the nature of the princely states in British India.
- 2) Discuss the various forms of democratisation movement undertaken by people in the princely states.