

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN STATES

Mangal Deo,

University of Delhi.

ABSTRACT

India is full of linguistic and cultural diversity as well as economic diversity, that is, where there is inequality of income at the individual level, at the regional level imbalance can be seen regarding the availability of resources and the development process. The people saw the independence of India with the expectation that now they and their areas would develop, but even after 72 years of independence, many areas are still untouched by the benefits of development. After independence, the bigger challenge than maintaining national unity and integrity was the economic inequality and backwardness among the states and regions. One reason for which was colonial exploitation. While some areas like Kolkata, Madras and Mumbai got industrial development, most of the states remained untouched by development. For example, in 1948, West Bengal and Mumbai had 59% of the total industrial capital of the country. It is clear from this that uneven development in India is the result of colonial legacy. Not only the industry but also the agricultural system was ruined under colonial rule. This economic discrimination and inequality established at the regional level was being reflected in the form of per capita income. For example, in 1949, the per capita income of Mumbai was Rs 272, Punjab Rs 331, West Bengal Rs 353, while Rajasthan's per capita income was Rs 172, Orissa Rs 188 and Bihar Rs 200.

MEANING AND DIMENSION

Keeping in mind the uneven development, the government established after independence neither followed a completely socialist system nor a capitalist system, but instead followed a mixed economy. Thus, the government took regional economic disparities very seriously from the very beginning. And realized the need for balanced and equitable development of all regions of the country. Based on this need, it was announced in the Industrial Policy of 1956 that "A high standard of living in the entire country can be achieved only by ensuring a balanced industrial and agricultural economy in every state and region." In this sequence, realizing the need for regional balance of

economic development and to encourage national integration, the National Unity Council of 1961 urged that "all national and state level efforts should be made for the development of economically backward areas in every state." Special attention should be given in planning. So that all the states can achieve the minimum level of development in time.

Considering the seriousness of this problem, the government not only formulated policies affecting the development of poor states and regions, but also made provision of special financial resources. From time to time, the Finance Commission also suggested special allocation of funds for backward areas, that is, there was bias in favour of poor states and resources from rich states were also transferred to poor states. Even in the

five-year plans, special attention was paid to removing regional imbalance and many important schemes were also implemented. Maximum amount of assistance was also allocated. Some states were also given special status. So that they can get maximum grant amount from the central government. After the nationalization of banks done by the government in 1969, special provision was also made for the expansion of their branches in backward areas. From time to time, various schemes were also made by various ministries for the development of backward areas, such as rural development programme, education, health, family planning programme, etc. Poor states benefited more from this. However, the impact of the Green Revolution in the agricultural sector was limited to some specific areas and regional disparities in terms of subsidies were not considered. Even the government could not maintain a balance on the development of infrastructure. Due to which the problem of migration and migration from backward areas arose. The result of which was manifested in movements like Sons of Soil Theory or Drive Out Outsiders in some states and regionalism was promoted. But some backward states gave new impetus to development, while some prosperous states lagged. Some scholars argue that the main reasons for not being able to remove regional disparities at the all-India level can be the low rate of economic development and population growth. Other main reasons for this are as follows –

1. Weakness of economic development strategy in India,
2. Regional imbalance,
3. Slowing down of the development process

As a strategy for economic development, five-year planning was started by following the principle of mixed economy under the strategy of planned development. But all areas did not get the benefits of planned development equally. The reasons for this are increasing population and lack of resources, corruption, and tendency towards centralization. Rudolph and Rudolph called it 'Command Politics'. The development strategy did not prove to be uniformly effective because there is regional

imbalance in terms of resources in India. Some states, despite being rich in natural resources, are untouched by development like Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Odisha etc., for this the central government's role, strategy, and tendency of centralization in policy making can be held responsible.

At the time of independence, there was deep disparity between one state region and other regions in India in per capita income, literacy rate, communication technology, agricultural development etc. Regional imbalance existed in the implementation of various schemes by the government and this situation continued till about 1990, that is, not only the development process was very slow, but the growth rate was also very low. In the context of the changing national and international circumstances in the 1990s, the New Economic Policy was announced by the government in 1991 to accelerate economic development. In which an attempt was made to speed up the process of development by attracting investment by following the policy of Privatization, Liberalization and Globalization (L.P.G).

There were both internal and external factors behind the announcement of the new economic policy announced by the Government of India. Internal factors included reduction in foreign exchange reserves, low growth rate, need for investment, political instability, and coalition politics. External reasons included the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which brought a question mark on the socialist system and the capitalist model of development was considered the best. Following the capitalist model, most of the countries in the world took steps towards globalization through the process of liberalization. The policy of globalization was encouraged and supported by international organizations like International Monetary Fund (I.M.F), World Bank, World Trade Organization (W.T.O). Some rules and standards were set by these global organizations to aid developing countries, which is called 'Structural Adjustment Programme' (S.A.P). India also announced a new economic policy in compliance with this program and took steps

towards globalization through liberalized economic policy.

GLOBALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Globalization is a process of economic integration that supports free markets through free trade of services and goods, immigration, capital flows, and technology flows. The objective of which is to accelerate the pace of development through investment by promoting competition at the global level. Its impact can be seen on all social, economic, political, and cultural fields.⁴ Supporters of globalization argue that it will increase investment, GDP. growth, increase in per capita income, employment, and development of infrastructure. The same critics point out its negative impact and say that this will increase the dominance of multinational companies, marketization, influence of international organizations and policies and the benefit from market-oriented policy will be only to that sector or class which is already developed and is facing global competition.

India too has not remained untouched by the impact of globalization and the regional disparity and uneven development which the government was trying to reduce since independence. It increased further after globalization. For example, within a state, some areas remained backward, and some areas developed rapidly, like in Uttar Pradesh, Western Uttar Pradesh developed but Bundelkhand and Purvanchal are still backward. In Maharashtra, Mumbai is highly developed but in Vidarbha, thousands of farmers are committing suicide. There are many such examples which are proving to be major factors of regional aspiration. Some area level political parties are also encouraging the feeling of regionalism among the public for political interests. The kind of struggle and politics that took place over the formation of Telangana, which came into existence as a new state on June 2, 2014, can be considered an extreme example of regional aspiration. Economic backwardness is also the basis for the formation of Telangana.

Thus, the benefits of globalization went to only those states and regions which were already developed. Those states and regions which were already backward became further backward. As a result of globalization, unequal development within the state became clearly visible. Some areas became very developed, and some areas were left far behind in the race of development. Ultimately, regional aspirations were born due to the desire for development in these areas. Another aspect of this is that the development process has not only been slow but is also contradictory. While the industrial class and service sector continued to receive state support, agriculture, small and cottage industries remained neglected. Even today, 65 percent of the country's population is dependent on agriculture; there is not only a lack of strategy for its development, but this sector has also been neglected. due to which society.

Inequality and division continued to increase. Increasing urbanization is the result of this, and the policy of globalization and liberalization has contributed to further increasing this imbalance.

The outcome of this economic strategy is being seen in the form of economic regional aspirations, although these aspirations are visible in different forms. As:

1. Demand for formation of new states based on backwardness
2. Demand for special status
3. Demand for special package
4. Lack of uniformity in interstate trade and commerce
5. River water sharing dispute.

Regional-economic aspirations which were reflected not only in the demand for formation of a new state but also in the form of demand for special status (like Bihar, Andhra Pradesh) and special package. As from 1947 to 1990, the basis of demand for new states was language, culture, and ethnicity, but after globalization, due to backwardness, development and good governance are proving to be the most important factors. The people of the backward areas feel that the formation of a new state will make

complete development possible, which is being encouraged by the regional political parties for their political aspiration i.e. to attain power. Ashutosh Kumar writes in his book 'Rethinking State Politics in India' that now the demand for new states is being made based on good governance and development instead of the principle of language.

After globalization, development is the most important issue not only in India but in the entire world. But the basic question is what kind of development and what is its standard? Will development be possible merely by the formation of new states, that is, is development guaranteed in new or smaller states? Are small states developing faster than big states? To answer these questions, big states will have to be compared with small states on the standards of development and governance, and mainly a comparative analysis of the development of the states formed after globalization will have to be done. Only then can the question logically be answered whether the new or small states are performing better than the big states or not? Or does the size of the state affect development or not? Or other factors are also important for development.

When the question of development is discussed regarding the formation of small states,

we find that development is a multi-dimensional process and a complex and overloaded word, which is discussed from a limited meaning like economic growth to a broader perspective like social and human development. There is no definite and universally accepted definition of development. Liberalism sees development as linked to the market, whereas Marxism talks about collective control for equitable development. According to Gandhiji, development means prosperity. Renowned Indian economist Amartya Sen gave multidimensional expansion to the dimension of development by interpreting development in the specific sense of increasing or decreasing freedom (political, social, and economic). Criteria and definition of development in the global context UNDP. According to him, development is being able to live a long and healthy life, have access to education and information, the resources necessary for a decent standard of living, and be able to participate in community life. Document issued by the United Nations, which has considered life expectancy, adult literacy, and access to all three levels of education as essential conditions of development and freedom.⁸ Thus, it must be analysed as to which of the big or small states are performing on these parameters of development. is better.

Comparative study of population of states in India

S.No.	(States)	(Population) (Percentage)	(State Ranking)
1	Uttar Pradesh	199581477 (16.49)	1
2	Maharashtra	112372972 (9.28)	2
3	Bihar	103804637 (8.58)	3
4	West Bengal	91347736 (7.55)	4
5	Andhra Pradesh	84673556 (7.00)	5
6	Madhya Pradesh	72597565 (6.00)	6
7	Tamil Nadu	72138958 (5.96)	7
8	Rajasthan	68621012 (5.67)	8
9	Karnataka	61130704 (5.05)	9

10	Gujrat	60383628 (5.00)	10
11	Odisha	41947358 (3.47)	11
12	Kerala	33387677 (2.76)	12
13	Jharkhand	32966338 (2.72)	13
14	Assam	31169272 (2.58)	14
15	Punjab	27704236 (2.30)	15
16	Chhattisgarh	25540196 (2.11)	16
17	Haryana	25353081 (2.09)	17
18	Jammu & Kashmir	12548926 (1.04)	18
19	Uttarakhand	10116752 (0.84)	19
20	Himachal Pradesh	6856509 (0.57)	20
21	Tripura	3671032 (0.30)	21
22	Meghalaya	2964007 (0.24)	22
23	Manipur	2721756 (0.22)	23
24	Nagaland	1980602 (0.16)	24
25	Goa	1457723 (0.12)	26
26	Arunachal Pradesh	1382611 (0.11)	26
27	Mizoram	1091014 (0.09)	27
28	Sikkim	607688 (0.05)	26

(Source- Census data-2011)

The disparity in the form of union states in India can be clearly seen in the table, like Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Bihar are at the top in population, while Sikkim, Mizoram, Arunachal, Goa are the least populous states respectively. If Aadhaar is created, more than 100 states like Sikkim and Mizoram can be created in Uttar Pradesh alone. In the same area, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, and Maharashtra are the largest states respectively, while Goa, Sikkim, Tripura, and Nagaland are the smallest states respectively. If area is considered as the basis, then the area of Rajasthan alone includes 92 states like Goa and 48 states like Sikkim. Can be made. If compared not only within India but also with other countries of the world, the area of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Uttar Pradesh is more than most of the countries of the world. In terms of population, the population of Uttar Pradesh alone is equal to the population of Brazil, the 5th largest country in the world. is almost equal, that is,

from the point of view of population, only Uttar Pradesh can become the 6th largest country in the world. The population of some other states like Karnataka is almost equal to that of Britain, which is the 22nd largest country in the world.

CONCLUSION

In this way, states have been formed by all the countries of the world based on need and circumstances. But there is a difference in the nature of the federal system. While countries like America give more powers to the states, countries like India give importance to a powerful centre. Its effect can be clearly seen. That is why even in India, from independence till today, no fixed criteria for the formation of states could be determined, sometimes based on language, sometimes on culture, and today after globalization, new states are being demanded based on backwardness.

Backwardness was there earlier also, but after globalization it became clearly visible, the states or regions which were developed became more developed, the states or regions which were backward became even more backward, that is, there was a clear division of states and regions. The middle began to appear between the regions within the state. Therefore, the desire for economic development and good governance, the demand for a new and smaller state, gave rise to a debate in the context of small and big states, whether the size of the state.

Does it affect the process of development or not? But before comparing development, it is necessary to examine which state in India is big and which is small and explain the criteria. If we look at the above table, the biggest question is whether a state should be considered small or big - population or area, because there are some states whose population is less, but area is more, like Rajasthan which is at first place in area, then in population. At 8th place is Chhattisgarh, whose area is more than Tamil Nadu, but it has been formed as a small state. There are some states whose population and area are both very less, these come in the category of small states. Like – Sikkim, Goa, Tripura, and Mizoram etc. From this there is no uniformity regarding the size of the state not only in India but in most of the federal states of the world. States have been formed and reorganized keeping in mind the practical needs of India, which is full of different types of diversities. And that is why some states are very big and some states are also very small, but after globalization, in support of small states. Arguments are being given and on the same basis demands are being made for many states.

REFERENCES

1. Bipin, Chandra. (2002) *India after Independence*, Hindi Medium kiryanvayan Nideshalay University of Delhi, page 168.
2. Ibid.,
3. Suchitra, Bakshi, Arunish Chawla, Mihir Shah, *Regional Disparities in India; A Moving Frontier*, EPW, Volume No. 1, January 3, 2015
4. John, Bellis. & Steve, Smith. *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2007, pages 8-12
5. Ibid.
6. Ashutosh, Kumar. (2011) '*Rethinking State Politics in India: Region within Region*' Routledge Publications, Delhi.
7. Amartya, Sen. (1999) *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, London,
8. Paul, R. Brass. (1974) *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*, Cambridge University Press, London, pages 9-15.
9. Population figures 2011
10. United Nations Population Report.2018
11. Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, 2011
12. Ashutosh Kumar.
13. DIPP Report. (2016) Press Information Bureau Government of India, Ministry of Commerce, and Industry.
14. Raghuram Rajan Committee Report, (1999) Planning Commission, Government of India *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, London.
15. Paul R. Brass.