

Debating Democracy and Democratisation Process: A Study of Telangana Separate State Movement in India

Dr. Jagannatham Begari

Associate Professor, Department of Gandhian Thought and Peace Studies, Social Sciences, Central University of Gujarat, Kundhela, Vadodara, Gujarat, INDIA.

Corresponding Author Email: jaganmss@cug.ac.in

Abstract: *Democracy and democratisation process play a vital role in the development of inclusive society where all individuals are equal and share common democratic values. If there are inequalities based on race, class, region, religion, sex and ethnicity, they could be resolved through constitutional procedures and state mechanisms. The question of rights, justice, equality could be upheld not merely by the state but also non state actors, non-party formations. To understand these critical dimensions, there are theories of democracy in the domain of social sciences and liberal arts such as participatory, deliberative, elite, cosmopolitan. Since the article emphasises on democratisation and democratisation process, it is an attempt to understand the theories of democracy i.e., deliberative, participatory and elitist explicitly. To understand theories and the process of democratisation, article try to evaluate the Telangana separate state movement in India demanded for separate state within Indian federal structure. In fact, it has been successful in achieving separate Telangana state as 29th state of Indian Union. This case, certainly support in understanding the formal and substantial democracy as not only political parties involved in democratic deliberations but other stakeholders like social activists, students, women, employees and cultural groups mostly from subaltern sections. Based on this case and understanding theories of democracy, this article proposes to argue that participatory and deliberative democracy theories deepen democratic culture, uphold inclusive development and educative function. It further tends argue that elite democracy, in fact, does not compete with participatory and deliberative democracy. This proposition is proved in Telangana state movement as it transformed formal democracy into substantial democracy in India*

Democracy and democratisation process play a vital role in the development of inclusive society where all individuals are equal and share common democratic values. If there are inequalities based on race, class, region, religion, sex and ethnicity, they could be resolved through constitutional procedures and state mechanisms. The question of rights, justice, equality could be upheld not merely by the state but also non state actors, non-party formations. To understand these critical dimensions, there are theories of democracy in the domain of social sciences and liberal arts such as participatory, deliberative, elite, cosmopolitan. Since the article emphasises on democratisation and democratisation process, it is an attempt to understand the theories of democracy i.e., deliberative, participatory and elitist explicitly. To understand theories and the process of democratisation, article try to evaluate the Telangana separate state movement in India demanded for separate state within Indian federal structure. In fact, it has been successful in achieving separate Telangana state as 29th state of Indian Union. This case, certainly support in understanding the formal and substantial democracy as not only political parties involved in democratic deliberations but other stakeholders like social activists, students, women, employees and cultural groups mostly from subaltern sections. Based on this case and understanding theories of democracy, this article proposes to argue that participatory and deliberative democracy theories deepen democratic culture, uphold inclusive development and educative function. It further tends argue that elite democracy, in fact, does not compete with participatory and deliberative democracy. This proposition is proved in Telangana state movement as it transformed formal democracy into substantial democracy in India

The participatory and deliberative politics plays a vital role in deepen, widen and substantialise democracy. The people resistance too contributes equally for meeting the aspirations of the people. When the state does not meet the needs and priorities of the people, non-state actors play significant role in articulate the grievances of the people through means of franchise or dissent. This is not possible either in authoritarian or dictatorial regime, nevertheless, it is possible in democratic regimes. The paper proposes to argue that in the epoch of global world, there are diversified challenges and problems that people face like deprivation, poverty, unemployment, gender inequalities and discrimination based on race, class, caste and region. The intra and inter regional conflicts too are also seen in contemporary period. In this context, general masses prefer to articulate their grievances and get solve them through active participatory, democratic and deliberations. In the light of this context, the article is an attempt to deliberate the notion of democracy and theories of democracy such as elitist, deliberative and participatory and try to examine them critically and why are they more significant than other democratic theories?

Do they represent distinct theoretical dimension? Do all these theories are important and contribute to the democratic process equally? Can we locate them in the framework of horizontal or vertical contour? Does these theories propose to give equivalent meaning of democracy or does they place one above the other in their theoretical discourse. These theoretical and philosophical enquiries need to be probed deeper. In view of these complex and intricate questions, this proposed article examines Telangana state movement in India to delve democratic theories

Let me conceptualise what is democracy? It means collective decision making and such decisions affects the association and all its members. Every member has an equal right in decision making. The term 'democracy' involves twin principles: popular control of the people over collective decision making and equal rights. These principles are realized in the decision-making of any association (Beetham, D, 2005). David Beetham pointed out that defining democracy makes two things clear. Firstly, democracy does not just belong to the sphere of the state or of government, as normally tend to think of it (Beetham, D, 2005). Democratic principles are relevant to collective decision-making in any association. Indeed, there is an important relationship between state and the other institutions of democratic society. Democracy is not only matter of state affair, but it is a matter of the principles of popular control and political equality (Beetham, D, 2005). For Ambedkar, democracy means not merely form the government but conjoint associating living. The principles like equality, liberty and fraternity are predominant (Ambedkar, B.R.). Democracy means the accountability of the state to the people. It stands for the principles are popular control and political equality. Besides electoral politics, democrats are involved in struggles to consolidate and extend the realization of democratic principles (Beetham, D, 2005). Let me begin with elite model of democracy as it is crucial in this context to evaluate and delve into the notion of democracy.

Elite model of democracy:

The competition is an important aspect in the theory of democratic elitism. Schumpeter argues that liberal democracy is a system in which competing leaders decide political issues. The will of the people is shaped by the competing leaders. Schumpeter argues that elite compete for the office influence over the political agenda. It is evident that the mass electorate simply installs but they do not control, and the electorate have access to the competitive struggle between elites. (Wolfe, J, D.1985: 374). In democracy, leaders bargain for the electoral support but benefits masses. In democracy, there is competition among opposite leaders. Michels argues that the elitists in democracy emphasise on competitive elections and controls the agenda. In electoral politics, elites allow the people to access political power, instead determining elite faction (Wolfe, J.D.: 374).

Theory of Oligarchy and its critique Participatory democracy

Theory of oligarchy challenges traditional democratic theory as it argues that modern organization renders participatory democracy impractical as it invariably results leaders dominate followers (Wolfe, J, D. p. 321). Michels argues that what socialists and democrats have failed to recognize that organisations always destroy democracy as it could not realize participatory democracy in which rich elite committed less to democracy (Wolfe, J, D: 372). Michels

Michels further argues that the participatory democracy is irrelevance and impracticability. He discusses three aspects: organizations discourage members to participate in policy making; denies the educative function. The self-interested rational members discourage masses to participate as it is believed that the masses lack skills and knowledge and therefore rely upon experts and elites (Wolfe, J, D. 1984: 372). Third, the wealthy leaders and members are encouraged to facilitate their participation and develop their material and political interests. Educative function does not operate among worker cooperatives as participation motivated by material or instrumental to reinforce social inequality (Wolfe, J, D. 1984: 373). In view of this, deliberative theory need to be discussed critically.

Deliberative democracy and practical Implications: Dialogue and accountability

Deliberative democracy theory is a normative theory which claims more democratic than realist model of democracy. In contrast to liberal or individualist or economic perspective of democracy, deliberative democracy promotes accountability and discursive. The principle of the consent is legitimate political order which is justified by this theory. The accountability and consent (voting) primarily articulate and explain in public and justify public policy. The deliberative theory is not usually thought of as an alternative to representative democracy, but it is an expansion of representative democracy (Chambers 2003:309). Deliberations take place for truth as to influence decision making. The deliberative democracy is dynamic. Although deliberations aim at a justifiable decision but does not justify the decision and believes that the future deliberations decide. In deliberations, there is a significance of dialogue through which citizens evaluate decisions critically and move ahead. The results are considered provisional in the decision-making process. There are three reasons to see decisions are provisional. First, collective decisions be promoted; second, encourage public spirit; third, deliberation promote respectful processes mutually in decision-making. This theory responds positively to moral disagreement. Deliberations provide the opportunity for the development of individually collectively. The participants in deliberative democracy learn from each other, recognize their drawbacks and formulate policies. In fact, give-and-take assumption is visible in this theory. When citizens bargain and negotiate, in this process citizens learn how to articulate and what better they want. When the citizens deliberate among themselves, they expand their knowledge (self) and gain collective understanding of what best they can contribute and how they serve for the fellow citizens (Chambers 2003: 309).

The theory of deliberative democracy explains that who deliberations shape preferences, think of moderate self-interest of individuals, empower the marginalize groups and mediate among the people. The theory depends on attitudes, behaviours and beliefs which require for deliberations. Deliberative democratic theory upholds rights, popular sovereignty and constitutionalism (Simon, C, 2003) The core element of deliberation was precisely its capacity to change minds and transform opinion. Deliberative theory advocates that decisions can be taken based on debates and informal consultations. The citizens deliberate and express their own opinions. The opinions of others respected while formulation of policies. Habermas (2000) and Rawls (1993) says that deliberations take place in a rational environment. Laia Jorba brings out the three significant aspects: acquire knowledge

by individuals, the changing of opinion and influence the civic attitudes of individuals. Thompson summarises deliberative democracy in three scenarios: distributive deliberation, decentralized and continuous deliberation. (Lincoln, Dahlberg). Deliberative democracy agreed to justify decisions made by citizens and their representatives. In a democracy, leaders have reasons for their decisions and expect suggestions from citizens. The reasoning is important in it and find the aspect of cooperation is vital aspect. The people are not objects but autonomous agents. The characteristic of deliberative democracy is that the reasons are given should be accessible to all the citizens to whom they are addressed (Lincoln, Dahlberg, p.4).

Argumentation enables the reflective continuation, with different means, of action oriented to understanding in postconventional situations, that is, when all ultimate sources of validity can no longer be relied upon (Habermas, 1984:17-18, 25). Argumentation or communicative rationality involves the public use of reason to redeem problematic validity claims within informal interactions that constitutes the social space of democratic reason known as the public sphere (Lincoln Dahlberg, p.4). The public sphere is constituted wherever and whenever any matter of living together with difference is debated. Habermas argues that the public sphere do not talk about a specific restricted public but the whole array of complex networks of multiple and public who engage critical discourse like individuals, community groups, civic associations, social movements and media organizations (Lincoln, Dahlberg). For Habermas, the public sphere refers to the idealized form of public reasoning. He argues that every participant attempts to undertake argument as a part of communicative process. This understanding provides a set of normative conditions or critical standards of the public sphere which evaluate and improve the democratic quality of communicative acts. He advocates the six conditions for public sphere. They are: thematization and reasoned critique of problematic validity claims, reflexivity Ideal role taking, sincerity, formal and discursive equality and autonomy from state and corporate sector (Lincoln, Dahlberg).

Participatory democracy and Democratisation Process:

The liberal thinkers like Rousseau, Mill and G.D.H. Cole argues that the participatory democracy produces popular control in policy making refers to the citizens having a direct or indirect influence on the decision making and implementation stage of public policy. Participation not only control public policy, but also educative function that reinforces and sustains participation. The educative function is crucial (Pateman, C). Carole Pateman critiques the elitist bent in liberal theory and promotes the participatory vision of democracy. She criticized Robert Dahl and Giovanni Sartori for their justification of elite power. She also critical of classical theorists as they promoted a vicious cycle of democratic deficit. Carole has challenged the liberal idea that the power of the state does not contradict the freedom of individuals as it is founded based on their consent (Pateman, C). The social contract theorists rejected the political authority derived by birthright or by violence. Pateman argues that one can derive the legitimate political authority by the consent of free and equal individuals. Pateman argues out that the social contract theories exclude female and therefore it is male centric. There is a systematic subordination of women to men in classical liberalism as it excluded women from the social contract and sexual hierarchy is reinforced by the natural order. Therefore, she argues that women are not merely

absent from the social contact but also politics (Pateman, C).

Participation upholds popular control. Each member share burdens and benefits equally by their participation. The interest of every person is reflected in the wider interest of public. Justice is possible as free men oblige themselves to be obedient to self-prescribed laws effect everybody equal in participatory democracy. Public and private interests could be articulated. Hence, citizens are motivated by participating in deliberations. J. S. Mill argues that participation promote the protective and educative function. Rousseau and Mill contends that behaviour of other is shaped by their participation, in turn, sustains participatory politics. He further emphasizes that the participation is visible at the local level and not fully at the national level. Functional representation that stems from membership though diverse and complex in industrial society (Pateman, C.). The Participatory democracy results in the form development of small communities who are committed to nonexploitative social relations.

Participatory democracy considers as just society. It consistent with traditional theorists who believes that power relations are based on the consciousness of members and use their autonomous moral wisdom towards the equitable and mutual social relations. This revised democracy model contributes to a greater ideal of participation and human development (Pateman, C). The participatory democracy upholds collective decision making. the citizens have the power to decide policy proposals and the electorate monitor the performance of politicians by comparing proposals of citizens with the policy implementation (Aragones, E & Pages, S, Sanchez, 2009). The proponents of democratic theory advocated for equal society. This should be reached through equalisation of participation in politics in which citizens are free to discuss and decide upon their matters (Henrike Knappe (Held, D. 2006:13). Participatory sphere institutions potentially contribute along all three of these dimensions and multiplying spaces in which increased number of people come together to take part in political life, give rise to new political subjectivities and open up ever more areas of decision-making to public engagement (Aragones, E & Pages, S, Sanchez, 2009).

The expansion of participation facilitates in the creation of new political actors and political subjectivities. Yet in recent years, this is the institutional gap between the legal and technical apparatus. Hence, it is seen that there is exclusion of poorer and more marginalized citizens. Thus, it is found that there are challenges of inclusion and provide representation and bridge the gap (Aragones, E & Pages, S, Sanchez, 2009). The participatory democracy opens effective channels of communication and negotiation between the state and citizens that creates new forms of citizenship and improve effectiveness and public policy. The citizens engage directly in resolving local problems and to make their demands heard by state and improve the public programmes and implementation of policies. In other words, expansion of participation guarantees the poor to access social services and enhance prospects for economic and political inclusion and development (Aragones, E & Pages, S, Sanchez, 2009).

In view of theoretical conceptualisation of democracy theories i.e., elite, deliberative and participatory and relate these theoretical discourses, it is found that elitist democracy does not recognise the participatory nature and educative function and advocate for political competition among rich elites as they become leaders and formulate

mobilising masses and take with them by using welfare policies. The participatory democracy not only relevant in the era of pre globalisation era but also post globalisation era and plays significant role in the process of democratisation and development and achieve inclusive society. It is to note further that deliberative democracy as like participatory democracy encourages informal deliberative process and discursive process. The people are free to discuss critically and carry dialogue on the issues pertaining to people. It is found that people participate in discussions not merely from the class and group but from all classes and sections to take part in decision making or influence policy making. Non-party formations and people's movement vital role in both these theories. In fact, both the theories competent enough to challenge elite politics and push the agenda of democratic and inclusive politics and development. Bring all sections together irrespective of class, caste, sex, ethnicity, region and religion. Telangana state movement is a case which provides this analysis true. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate democracy theories critically, it proposes to dwell into Telangana separate state movement critically and analytically.

Telangana separate state movement in India: Debating democratic process

Indian state is an example of witnessing numerous movements since its independence such as farmers, dalits, tribals, women. There are other movements like grassroot micro movements and movements against globalisation. Notwithstanding these, there are movements by backward regions within India's provinces/states for the formation of new states. As a result, regional movements for the formation of states, government of India has formed new states i.e. Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand in the decade of 1990s. Since 1990s, the second phase of Telangana movement has been started. Unlike the first phase of the movement in the decade 1960, it is more mass based, non-political groups and activists mostly from the subaltern sections. This phase of the movement could be in both participatory and deliberative democracy, in contrast to elitist democracy.

Telangana movement one of the democratic movements in India which has demanded for the new state by bifurcating from the state of Andhra Pradesh in India. In fact, this movement has the history of six decades and it is successful in achieving the statehood in 2014. It has all the qualities and components that social and political movements as enumerated by advocates of theory of social movements (Rao, MSA). Notwithstanding these, to evaluate and examine the democracy theories, this movement could be seen and use as field site or empirical base. The movement includes several dimensions i.e., political, social cultural and economic. It is not merely demands merely separate statehood but resisted the domination of social and political dominant elites (Forrester, D, 1970). Hence it is worthwhile to take as a case to evaluate democracy theories.

The established facts proved by the recommendations made by several Committees and Commissions set by the governments time to time and the scholar repeatedly argued in their writings that injustice being done to the Telangana region in the erstwhile Andhra Pradesh state (Ram, Kodanda M, 2007) and (GoI, Justice Srikrishnan Committee) argued Telangana movement is one of the democratic movements in India witnessed both the deliberative and participatory democratic politics. The movement could be seen in two facets. One, electoral-deliberative process and two, people's centric non-party

resistance. In the first facet political parties articulated the demand by considering their interest and electoral prosperities. The political parties prepare the election manifestos in which they clearly supported the demand and requested the voters to support and vote for their party. If they get the majority and form the government, they declare/ support the demand in the Parliament/Assembly. However, their motto behind their support was to win the majority seats. Majority of parties have supported the demand and gave their consent to the government in favour of the formation of separate state. The leadership had deliberated within their parties democratically and submitted their viewpoints or standpoints to the Committee which constituted by the government of India.

It was observed that leaders and cadre in political parties are divided into two groups either in support of or opposing or taking neutral position. During the election campaign they used the demand of Telangana to get the support of the people for the election of their party candidates. On other side, non-party organisations consist of individuals, communities, employees and all stakeholders from Telangana region irrespective of the ideology caste, class, gender and religion have adopted participatory activism and formed organisations and organised people's agitations in across the Telangana such as such as Telangana Million March (Sagaraharam), Samara Deeksha, PrajaPoru Yatra and many democratic movements. These groups are independent and are not affiliated with any political party. It is also found that many student activists, leaders and cultural activists and many others have belonged to the subaltern castes and classes. Their demand was not merely territorial statehood for Telangana region but the demand for the democratic statehood in which minorities, weaker sections, deprived sections, women and tribals get equal rights and equal participation in the policy making and policy implementation as Ambedkar envisaged in his paper on states and minorities (Haragopal, G, 2009). However, it needs to be understood that there is continuous dialogue and deliberations among the political parties, leaders and activists and all stakeholders. Deliberations are held substantially not merely within a region but also all the regions in the state and the nation. In other words, the movement is witnessed both the participatory and deliberative theoretical discourses and therefore argue that that democratic process can be seen.

It is to note that within Telangana movement, there is a powerful cultural movement advocated and resist for protection and promotion of civil and democratic rights. It upheld the rights of subalterns particularly dalits, tribals, women and other weaker sections in the region. It demanded democratic statehood not merely territorial statehood. In democratic state there can be equal distribution of power sharing among all the stakeholders. Redistribution of land and land to the landless, there should be no discrimination based on the caste, class and gender. There must be continuous democratic deliberations and equal participation in the new state after the formation of the state (Hausing, K. K. S. (2018). In this context it is to argue that there is spirit and objectives of participatory and deliberative democracy embedded in the movement. Justice Srikrishna Committee which constituted by the government of India too had recommended democratic Telangana state. Majority of the leaders and social activists, singers, writers and other opinion makers belongs mostly to the deprived and subaltern sections. (GoI, 2010). In other words, the cultural movement within

Telangana movement is more deliberative and participatory substantially and it is not motivated politically though it collaborated with political movement. Every stage in its resistance, it organised on their own, developed their own leadership and resisted not merely for the separate state but demanded democratic rights i.e. social, cultural, economic and political rights. Hence it is rationale to argue that Telangana movement includes both the participatory and deliberative spirit. Even after the formation of the state, the relevance and essence of the cultural and democratic movement is significantly essential.

Nevertheless, Telangana movement is considered as powerful, creative and vibrant cultural movement consists of singers, writers and other opinion makers. Their participation in the movement not merely demonstrated for separate statehood but also democratised the movement and leadership and acted as an internal critique of the movement and pressurised the political leadership to stand by the people and movement (Haragopal, G, 2009). The cultural movement has created enormous literature and new leadership. Most of the activists emerged in this movement are from subaltern groups and marginalised sections. Their participation strengthened the spirit of participatory democracy and witnessed the functions like participation, popular control and educative. There are other forms of agitations (Chalo Assembly, Millian March, Vanta Vapu, railoko, pattalapaiki Palleloo, Telangana bandh and other mass protests led by Political Telangana Joint Action Committee led by apolitical person (Prof. M. Kodandaram) and academician to build the pressure on both the state and political parties. The non-political resistance tends to indicate that the people lost faith and trust in political parties, process and leaders. Hence, the protest as led by the TJAC which is apolitical in nature headed by an academician got tremendous attention among the people in the country. All political parties and their leaders worked under TPJAC and Kodandaram. The students from several Universities participated in these protests. These instances, in fact, indicates that the power, strength of the movement and dedication of the activists.

Other illustration of the movement witnesses that the members of the Parliament from the Telangana Congress launched hunger strike outside the Parliament in Delhi against non-fulfilment of the promise by the UPA government to create a separate state and gave the slogans like "Give Telangana and Save Democracy". **Telangana Joint Action Committee leaders have staged a similar protest at Jantar Mantar, New Delhi** (Vaddiraju, A. K. (2017). TJAC has launched several agitations, at the state level to pressurize the state and Union government as it has launched programme i.e., the Sansad Yatra at New Delhi, nation capital which pressurized the government at the national level to take the decision early and this peaceful resistance further pushed the political parties and the government to declare Telangana state. The other protest movement i.e., The Sansad Yatra made both social activists, political leaders brought together in fighting for the state formation. These not merely mobilised the political parties at the national level in their favour but also made the regional political parties to abide by the aspirations of the people. (Begari, J, 2014).

It is significantly visible that all the protests/ resistance forms are Gandhian forms of protests. The movement has adopted the means of democratic resistance to attain their long pending demand. As a part of the movement, the people from different walks of life in the

region have been organised on their own, formed their own JACs, youth emerged as leaders, the people slightly literate started writing songs, poems and pamphlets, organising meetings on their own. Drawing from the emerging literature, it is to note that the unfolded democratic culture was forced political leadership in the region to respect the people's aspirations and demands and support the demand. This trend tends to argue that the people centric movement or organisations or participation can play significant role not only get solve their demands but also substantialise, deepen and realise democratic demands and promote deliberations among all the stakeholders.

It is to note that if one fine the election manifestos of the political parties and their political strategies and tactics, it is found that though the political parties and political elite leadership deliberately used the movement in the favour of their political needs, electoral gains and prospers and get the political mileage and form the government. It is because all political parties in the state and region are dominated by dominant socially privileged and economically rich political elite and their interest is not the formation of the state but make use of the movement to fulfil their political interests. This conspiracy of the political elites understood by the masses, social groups, students, educationalists and intellectuals and opposed, criticised and resisted against the manipulative narratives and the opportunism of political elite and developed the powerful independent grassroots micro movement. Notwithstanding, this movement forced the political parties stand by the people and change their political stand in favour the demand for statehood. (Begari, J, 2014). In view of this, I argue that participatory and deliberative democracies are better, inclusive and deepen democratic spirit and do educative function and political control. In other words, it plays torch bearer role in the process of democratisation. This understanding of theoretical framework is seen in Telangana movement.

There are substantial deliberations which shaped the movement, preferences and suggested alternative forms of resistance. Deliberations empowered the marginalised sections, mediated differences and drawn the meaningful democratic discussions in the movement. Different organisations, individuals, other apolitical civil society groups had integrated into joint action groups and worked together to fight for the separate statehood including democratic rights. It can be argued that socio-economic and political conditions necessary for healthy deliberations which was seen substantially in it (Srinivasulu, K & Satyanarayana, D, 2010). The deliberations not merely within the movement but also deliberations can also be seen with other groups, parties and communities which are either against their demand or not in favour to their demand. Deep reading of social, cultural and political foundations could also be seen in the movement. In other there was continuous dialogue among all stakeholders within and outside the movement and also deliberations with the State. These foundations, in fact, participatory and deliberative in nature and contributed in educating leaders, masses, activists and guided the state in fulfilling the aspirations, democratisation and substantialisation process. It is pertinent that talking, listening one's own opinion and respecting the views of others is very much seen in the movement. In other words, learn, critical, self-critical, change of their opinions and other as well was witnessed in the movement (Srinivasulu, K & Satyanarayana, D, 2010). Thus, it is rationale to argue that the theory and characteristics of

deliberative democracy very much embedded in the Telangana state movement.

In summary, the article argues that the elitist, deliberative and participatory democracy theories significantly witnessed in Telangana state movement. Social and political elites failed in misusing, politicising and misrepresenting Telangana movement for their political gains. Partly, they are successful in the initial phase of the movement in the decades of 60s and 70s. The elites relatively successful in the initial years of second phase of the movement i.e. 90s. Based on these analysing above theories critically, the paper argues that as a part of the Telangana movement, participatory and deliberative theories are very much reflective and more significant in every stage of the movement (electoral and people centric resistance). It is found that though these theories are interrelated, interdependent and mutual, however, they are distinct. In the process of formation of Telangana state, participatory and deliberative not merely theoretically relevant but also empirically present. Both participatory and deliberative process by the social activists in the movement rigorously opposed the elitist and dominant politics who opposed the demand and taken the side of the state and dominant narrative. Hence, elitist democracy has been rejected by the masses. In fact, these theories are considered as important and contributed equally the democratic process. These theories are considered as horizontal, not vertical in the process of democratisation and they cannot be seen one above the other and all theories are considered equally significant in understanding democracy and democratisation.

REFERENCES

1. Ambedkar, B.R. (1936). *Annihilation of caste. An undelivered speech*. New Delhi: Arnold Publications.
2. Aragone, E., Sanchez, S. P. (2009). A theory of participatory democracy based on the real case of Porto Alegre, *European Economic Review*, Extracted: <https://aragones.iae-csic.org/PD-EER09.pdf>
3. Cornwall, A., and Schattan, V. P. C. (2007). *Space for change? politics of participation in new democratic arena*. Source extracted: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08c03ed915d622c00107d/Cornwall-intro.pdf>
4. Begari, J. (2014). *Interrogating democracy and human rights: telangana people's movement*, Rawat Publications, Jaipur.
5. Begari, J. (2023). *New telangana state: trends, possibilities and challenges*, *Explorations. E-journal of the Indian Sociological Society*, Vol.7 (2). pp. 52-74. Extracted: <https://insoso.org/sites/default/files/2023-10/August%202023%20Articles.pdf>
6. Beetham, D. (2005). *What is democracy? A beginner's guide to democracy*. Oxford: One World Publication.
7. Chamber, Simons. (2003). *Deliberative democracy*. pp.307-325. Extracted: <https://cmapspublic2.ihmc.us/rid=1NBX330Z2-28GR7MP-25X9/Simone%20on%20%20deliberative%20democracy.pdf>
8. Cornwall, A. and Schattan, V. P. C. (2006). *Space for Change? Politics of participation in new democratic arena*. pp.2-27. extracted: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08c03ed915d622c00107d/Cornwall-intro.pdf>
9. Dahlberg, L. (2005). *The Habermasian Public Sphere: A Specification of the Idealized Conditions of Democratic Communication*. *Studies in Social and Political Thought, Theory and Society*, 34 (2):111-136
10. Forrester, D. 1970. "Subregionalism in India: the case of telangana." *Pacific Affairs*. pp.5-21. Extracted: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2753831>.
11. GoI. (2010). *Justice shrikrishna committee. committee for consultations on the situation in andhra Pradesh*. New Delhi. Government of India.
12. Gudavathy, A. (2013). *Telangana: nation, state and the city*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 48 (5).
13. Haragopal, G. (2009). *Telangana people's movement: unfolding political culture*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45 (44), 51-60
14. Hausing, K. K. S. (2018). *Telangana and the politics of State formation in India: Recognition and accommodation in a multinational federation*. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 28(4), 447-468.
15. Wolfe JD. *A Defense of Participatory Democracy. The Review of Politics*. 1985;47(3):370-389. doi:10.1017/S0034670500036925
16. Knappe, H. (2017). *Participatory and deliberative democracy: from equality norms to argumentative rationalities. doing democracy differently: political practices and transnational civil society*. pp. 45-76. Extracted: doi.org/10.3224/86388720.
17. Kalpana Kannabiran, Sagari R Ramdas, N Madhusudhan, S Ashalatha, M Pavan Kumar. (2010). *On the Telangana Trail*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45 (13), 69-82.
18. Macpherson, C.B. (1973). *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*. New York: Oxford University Press
19. M. Kodanda Ram. (2007). *Movement for telangana State: a struggle for autonomy*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(2), 90-94
20. Munro, A. (2024, May 6). *Carole Pateman*. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.
21. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Carole-Pateman>
22. *of Democratic Communication, Studies in Social and Political Thought*, 2005, pp.1-18.
23. Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge University Press.
24. Rao, Ch. (2011). *Srikrishna Committee on Telangana: Recommendations at Variance with the Analysis*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 29, 2011 Vol. XLVI, No. 5, pp. 33-36.
25. Rao, C. H. (2014). *The new Telangana state: A perspective for inclusive and sustainable development*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 10-13.
26. Sarah, J. (2002). *Society vs state? civil society, political society*