

Telangana IS a State And NOT A Definition in a Dictionary

By, Subhash Chandra, Ph.D.
Baton Rouge, LA, USA

October 18, 2011

This whole exercise in vain by professor Prakash Kona reminds me of a proverb in Telugu: “pani lEni mangali pilli tala koriginattu”, translation: Like an unemployed barber shaves a cat’s head.

I am compelled to come to the professor’s aid perhaps because I am one of those passersby who can’t restrain himself from rescuing a person struggling with somersaulting. Yes, I know, the professor has admitted that this is a theoretical issue but, turns it into a cause without a rebel!

The problem with this kind of public somersault is that it attracts passersby, of course that may be the intention of the person doing somersaulting, and makes them while away their time making head and tails of the whole act. The passerby is just as much compelled to indulge in such lazy way of passing time.

Having decided to be that curious and bemused passerby, let me dive in and aid the struggling, somersaulting professor without any delay. And I would like to extend my thanks to Counter Currents for affording me this opportunity.

First things first. Exactly who defined or who decreed that a movement must ONLY be associated with the masses (ok, common people) who demand serious(?) changes in the economy and social order? Maybe, it is professor Kona. I would rather take a more widely accepted definition of the word Movement. Movements are of many kinds – a political movement, a social movement, or a religious movement.

The issue at hand is Telangana State Formation. Well, it IS a Political Movement, primarily. It does have within some social goals. So, what is the definition of a “political movement”?

The Dictionary sources define it as “a group of people working together to achieve a **political** goal” and the first example I found was Palestine

Liberation – “a political movement uniting Palestinian Arabs in an effort to create an independent state of Palestine”.

And that is swell because it directly applied to Telangana State Formation, only difference is it is not yet called “Telangana Liberation”. Will the professor accept this substantiation though?

For some reason, professor Kona decries that a Struggle can happen anywhere but a Movement happens (only) on the streets. Maybe, the reason could be that a struggle could take place in a bedroom and the professor must be considering that possibility. Well, I can go along with it just avoid a lengthy debate.

Has anybody seen the Telangana “struggle” (preferred by Kona) taking place anywhere but on the streets? Since the Telangana “struggle” is taking place ONLY on the streets, then will the professor agree to change his mind and call “Telangana” (Kona’s label) a Movement? I don’t see any reason why not especially that it meets the very narrow definition of a Movement.

I would take the liberty to aver that “struggle” is a component of a “Movement”. The word “Struggle” is defined by the dictionary (various) as “to make a great effort to deal with a challenge, problem, or difficulty”. Well, no Movement can progress without making a great effort to deal with the challenges faced in the Movement.

So, perhaps, professor Kona will now accept that “Telangana” is a Movement and is carrying on many a struggle.

Reading over and over this essay by professor Kona on the theoretical issue of Struggle or a Movement convinced me that the fundamental fallacy in the arguments made by him is making too many imagined assumptions like “a movement has to begin in those spaces on the lower rungs of the ladder.” Holy cow. Then Independence Movement started by Gandhi Ji (he is so fond of quoting) will have to degraded to a “struggle” by that definition.

Kona, though, gets carried away to make some serious errors in defining the Civil Rights Movement in US. It was definitely NOT a “identity-based movement struggling for visibility”. For Pete’s sake, professor Kona, the Blacks had plenty of “visible” identity (their skin color gave plenty of visibility). No sirree, the Blacks in the US were fighting for EQUAL Rights as the Whites had. And they wanted to change the Social Order. Please, read more on the history of United States, and the history of Blacks in US, as well as that of the Native Indians. You might change your perceptions you have now.

So also, Telanganites have plenty of Identity and they are a prideful lot. They are not asking for recognition or visibility. They may have raised a question or two about their depiction in the modern Telugu movies but after having watched the fast deterioration of the quality of Telugu movies in the last two decades they have decided to ignore that whole issue out of pity for the Andhra culture statement made over and over in Telugu movies. How can one bring himself to demand from a beggar no matter how deprived one might be. So, you can take a deep breath and lower your stress level.

Nobody could homogenize people from Seema and Andhra into one composite, no matter how hard one tried. Perhaps, professor Kona is being wishful. They are too far apart to be put into one bottle. And why would we even want to? They are two of a kind and the only common trait they might exhibit is the exploitation of Telangana and Telanganites. Obviously, we are not talking about the vast majority of those populations because only a fraction of them have indulged in such exploitation. Problem is this small fraction has the political, financial, and muscle power and they are hell bent to have their way. And that is not a myth. Please read the SKC report. Even though SKC Report is biased, it at least narrates this same truth.

You are too much taken by your own imagination comparing coastal and seema regions to the western nations in affluence (prosperity). Neither the leaders nor the common people of Telangana are that delusional. If we thought that your regions were that affluent we would have come in droves to your towns and villages. That didn't happen and to the contrary, citizens from coastal Andhra and seema have inundated Hyderabad and Telangana. So what does that prove? That Telangana is more wealthy and rich in resources, right? Our complaint is not that your towns and villages are prosperous but that you have looted our wealth and built infrastructure there and robbed us of our due share of public employment because of your domination in political power. Your businessmen and investors are not that great in their business acumen. If they were they would have "developed" the economies in your towns and villages. Instead, they migrated to Hyderabad and Telangana because it was so easy to exploit here and again because of the concentration of political power in your hands. That political power combined with the executive power enabled you loot the public lands in Hyderabad city, worth thousands of crores, and set up businesses and industries with the money realized from the sale of those illegitimate estates. It only proves, beyond doubt, that you couldn't progress or prosper with the limited legitimate wealth you had and if you could why would you migrate to far off lands? Just remember this historical fact: the Muslim

invaders and the British, French, and Portuguese came to India for the riches they could loot and not the other way.

I am beginning to see you getting a head of your self when you accuse Telangana leaders of being anti-national ("to say the least"). And what is worse than being anti-national, in your opinion? So, the arrogance finally streaks past the façade? Complaining against those Seemandhra carpetbaggers has now become anti-national? Why don't you make it blasphemy? That would give you a little more power.

You are mixing up a salad bowl of "Equality", "Feudalism", "Bathukamma", "Women's liberation", "Tehrir Square", and so on, thinking you can impress us with your "social conscience". We are not impressed. We are just wondering how you can unwind yourself out of that maze.

You must not be watching TV or even read newspapers of late because your imagined concoction of the current Telangana movement reflects it. The whole cross section of Telangana society is participating in the Telangana Movement – men, women, and children, students, public employees, miners, lawyers, doctors, nurses, teachers, professors (your colleagues), auto rickshaw drivers, business owners, cable tv operators, manual labor, farmers, house wives and civil servants and professionals, even the priest class. If you are unable to find newspaper articles narrating these facts, I would be please to provide you links on request.

It is nothing short of Goebbels's propaganda when you to claim: *"This is my point: the working poor whether they are landless laborers, urban slum dwellers or autorickshaw drivers are "untouched" and see no reason to give their loyalty"*. The minimum you could do, especially as a professor, is to not indulge deliberately in false statements.

And another of your statement indicates your penchant to write patently false claims: *"An Indian can live and make a living anywhere from Kashmir to Kanyakumari."* No, you can't do that. Please read India's Constitution to know that. I won't give you the exact Article number; that would be your assignment.

Seriously and Sincerely, we Telanganites do not consider it necessary to have you support for Telangana Movement. Considering your lack of knowledge on the subject, and lack of awareness of facts, and obliviousness to current affairs, it would be a set back to our Movement if educated but uninformed start supporting Telangana Movement.