

Colonialism, Princely Rule, and Beyond: Reconstructing Modern Telangana's Past

Dr. Mudavath Saida

Freelance Faculty
Department of History
Osmania University, Hyderabad-500007, Telangana, India

Abstract:

This paper reconstructs the modern history of Telangana by tracing its passage through three overlapping political formations: indirect colonial subordination under the Asaf Jahi (Nizam) dynasty, forcible integration into the Indian Union following the 1948 Police Action, and the subsequent decades of linguistic-state reorganization culminating in separate statehood in 2014. Rather than treating Telangana's past as a footnote to either Mughal-Deccan or Andhra regional historiography, the paper argues that Telangana constitutes a distinct historical trajectory shaped by the specific character of "indirect rule," an armed peasant insurgency (1946–1951), and enduring regional grievances over water, employment, and cultural recognition within the composite Andhra Pradesh (1956–2014). Drawing on peer-reviewed historiography, colonial administrative records, Census of India data, and post-bifurcation economic statistics, the paper synthesizes political, agrarian, and socio-economic dimensions of change. Data tables comparing literacy, income, and fiscal indicators before and after 2014 illustrate the material stakes of the statehood movement. The paper concludes that Telangana's modern history cannot be adequately understood through a simple colonial/postcolonial binary; rather, it must be read as a layered process of subordination, rebellion, absorption, and renewed self-assertion. This reframing has implications for how regional histories within federal India are historicized and taught.

Keywords: Telangana, Hyderabad State, Nizam rule, princely states, colonialism, Telangana Rebellion, linguistic reorganization, statehood movement, regional historiography.

1. Introduction

Modern Telangana's history sits awkwardly across three historiographical traditions that rarely speak to one another: the history of British paramountcy over princely India, the agrarian and communist movement historiography of the Deccan, and the political-science literature on India's linguistic-state reorganizations. Because Hyderabad State was never under direct British administration, Telangana is frequently marginalized in colonial histories that privilege the Presidencies; because it became the Telangana region of a composite Andhra Pradesh in 1956, its distinct historical experience was for decades subsumed within a broader "Andhra" narrative; and because its 2014 statehood is often treated as a contemporary political event rather than the culmination of a long historical process, its deeper continuities are underexamined (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013; Bhukya, 2020).

This paper argues that Telangana's modern history is best understood not as a single transition from "colonial" to "postcolonial" status, but as a sequence of at least four overlapping regimes of rule and resistance: (1) indirect colonial subordination through the Nizam's court, in which the East India Company and later the British Crown exercised paramountcy while leaving a nominally autonomous Muslim ruling dynasty in place over a Telugu-, Marathi-, and Kannada-speaking populace; (2) the agrarian crisis and communist-led

Telangana Peasant Armed Struggle of 1946–1951, which challenged both feudal landlordism (the *jagirdari* and *deshmukhi* systems) and princely sovereignty simultaneously; (3) forcible integration into the Indian Union through Operation Polo (the "Police Action") of September 1948, followed by military administration and eventual incorporation into linguistic-state reorganization in 1956; and (4) five decades of political subordination within a composite Andhra Pradesh, culminating in a mass statehood movement and the creation of India's twenty-ninth state in June 2014 (Sherman, 2007; Pavier, 1974).

The historiographical stakes of this reconstruction are significant. Standard narratives of Indian decolonization treat 1947 as the decisive rupture, yet for Hyderabad State's roughly 16 million subjects, the more consequential rupture was the 1948 Police Action and its aftermath—a full year after Indian independence (Sherman, 2007). Similarly, standard narratives of Indian federal formation treat the 1956 States Reorganisation as a tidy exercise in linguistic rationalization, yet for Telangana, this reorganization inaugurated a fifty-eight-year grievance regarding the distribution of water, irrigation investment, government employment, and educational opportunity relative to the coastal Andhra region (Suri, 2014; Kumar, 2018). This paper therefore treats "colonialism," "princely rule," and "postcolonial federalism" not as sequential closed chapters but as layered structures whose residues shaped the eventual 2014 settlement.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology and sources. Section 3 examines Hyderabad State under indirect colonial rule. Section 4 analyzes the Telangana Peasant Armed Struggle. Section 5 discusses the Police Action and integration. Section 6 traces the linguistic reorganization and the buildup of regional grievance from 1956 to 2001. Section 7 examines the statehood movement and its 2014 culmination. Section 8 presents comparative socio-economic data. Section 9 discusses historiographical debates and offers a synthesis. Section 10 concludes.

2. Methodology and Sources

This paper adopts a historical-analytical method combining secondary historiographical synthesis with quantitative socio-economic data drawn from verifiable public sources. Historiographical material is drawn from peer-reviewed journal articles indexed in Scopus- and JSTOR-listed outlets, including *Social Change* (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013), *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* (Sherman, 2007), and *Economic and Political Weekly* (Pavier, 1974; various contributors on the 1946–1951 struggle). Institutional working papers from the Institute for Social and Economic Change (Kumar, 2018) and the *Economic and Political Weekly Engage* platform (Reddy & Rao, 2022) provide post-bifurcation fiscal and social-sector data. Quantitative data on literacy, population, and workforce composition are drawn from the Census of India (2011) and the Government of Telangana's official state profile statistics (Government of Telangana, n.d.). Fiscal and expenditure data are drawn from Comptroller and Auditor General reports as summarized in EPW Engage analyses (Reddy & Rao, 2022). All data tables cite their primary source directly beneath the table, and no figures have been extrapolated or estimated without a cited empirical basis.

3. Hyderabad State and the Structure of Indirect Colonial Rule

3.1 The Asaf Jahi Dynasty and Paramountcy

Hyderabad State was founded in 1724 when Mir Qamar-ud-din Khan, a Mughal viceroy of the Deccan, established effective autonomy from a weakening Mughal center and took the title Asaf Jah. In the next 200 years, the Asaf Jahi dynasty, known as the Nizams, ruled the richest and largest of the Indian princely states, stretching from the present-day districts of Telangana to those of Marathwada and Kannada-speaking areas that were later merged into the Maharashtrian and Kannadian states of India, respectively (Cohen, 2021). Importantly, British paramountcy over Hyderabad was not achieved through direct annexation, but rather through a process of subsidiary alliance that was formalized in 1798, during which the Nizam relinquished

foreign policy and received a British Resident and a British-officered force (the Hyderabad Contingent) in return for retaining internal sovereignty (excerpt from the Cambridge University Press, n.d.).

This led to a hybrid colonial modernity: the architectural and administrative discourse of Hyderabad city embraced European forms and idioms, but the state's formal political structure remained superficially pre-colonial, in the form of a monarchical system (Merit Minds analysis in Anveshana India, 2025). This has been termed as 'colonialism without colonization' in which the Nizam's court enjoyed delegated sovereignty within the limits of British paramountcy and the agrarian surplus was actually extracted with the help of an indigenous landlord class (Cohen, 2021; Bhukya, 2020).

3.2 The Agrarian Order: Jagirdari, Deshmukhi, and Sarf-e-khas

The foundation of the Nizami rule was based on layers of land tenure. In Telangana districts of Hyderabad State, around 30-40 % of the cultivated land was under jagir, hereditary land grants given to nobles instead of salary or military service, and a large amount of land was also under sarf-e-khas, or personal ownership of the Nizam, or deshmukh and deshpande hereditary revenue-collection rights (Pavier, 1974; Ijaidr, 2026). This concentration of land in non-cultivating hands, with the use of usurious credit relations adopted by moneylenders (sahukars), gave rise to chronic indebtedness of the peasants and increased sharply during the Great Depression of the 1930s and during the World War II period of grain requisitioning (Ijaidr, 2026). It was this specific agrarian structure—rather than colonial land revenue policy per se, as in directly administered British India—that formed the immediate socio-economic backdrop to the peasant insurgency examined in Section 4.

Table 1: Structural Features of Hyderabad State under Indirect Rule

Feature	Description	Approximate Scale/Period
Political status	Princely state under British paramountcy via subsidiary alliance	1798–1948
Ruling dynasty	Asaf Jahi Nizams (7 rulers)	1724–1948
Population during the accession crisis	Approx. 16 million subjects	1948
Administrative language	Persian/Urdu (court); Telugu, Marathi, Kannada (regional vernaculars)	Throughout the princely period
Land tenure: jagirdari/sarf-e-khas share	Substantial share of cultivated land outside direct state revenue settlement	19th–20th century
British instruments of control	Resident, Hyderabad Contingent, subsidiary alliance	1798–1947

Source: Compiled from Cohen (2021), Cambridge University Press excerpt (n.d.), Sherman (2007), and Pavier (1974).

4. The Telangana Peasant Armed Struggle, 1946–1951

4.1 Origins and Escalation

In July 1946, the Telangana Rebellion started in the village of Kadavendi in the Nalgonda district and rapidly ramped up after the murder of peasant activist Doddi Komarayya on 4th July 1946 in a violent encounter with men of a landlord (Telangana360, 2026; Wikipedia contributors, 2024). From a localised protest against forced levies on grain and eviction by the deshmukhs, resistance quickly escalated, and a coordinated insurgency developed in about 3,000 villages spread throughout Nalgonda, Warangal, and Khammam districts, increasingly organised under the leadership of the Andhra Mahasabha and, later, the Communist

Party of India (Pavier, 1974). Established parallel local governments and abolished forced labor (vetti) in what would later be known as "liberated areas" (Revolutionary Democracy archive, n.d.), village-level sanghams (associations) redistributed an estimated one million acres of land that had been seized from landlords.

4.2 Gendered engagement and social aspects

In more recent scholarship, the significant role played by women in the armed struggle, as couriers, intelligence gatherers, and combatants, and the impact this role had on the subsequent gender politics within the Communist movement in the region have been emphasized and often overlooked (Anveshana India publications, 2024). The caste issues also became entangled in the conflict, with the dalit and backward caste peasantry facing oppression from both landlords and the coercive force of the Nizam's government and irregular army, the Razakars (with support from the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen movement). (jstor: Pavier, 1974).

4.3 State Response and Withdrawal

The Nizam's government responded with the *Razakar* militia, which conducted large-scale reprisals against both communists and, more broadly, the Hindu peasantry, contributing to communal polarization before the Police Action (Sherman, 2007). Following the September 1948 Indian military intervention (discussed in Section 5), the insurgency continued for a further three years against the new Indian administration, reflecting Communist Party demands for land redistribution that the Indian state was unwilling to concede on the movement's terms. The struggle was formally withdrawn by the Communist Party of India in October 1951, following a change in the party's national strategic line toward parliamentary participation (Frontier Weekly archive, n.d.; Pavier, 1974).

4.4 Historical Significance

The Telangana struggle is historiographically significant for two reasons. First, it demonstrates that anti-feudal and anti-colonial impulses in Hyderabad State were not reducible to the accession question alone; peasants targeted landlordism regardless of whether the state acceded to India or Pakistan or remained independent. Second, it produced an enduring political memory and organizational infrastructure—invoked repeatedly during the later statehood movement—that framed Telangana's regional identity around themes of sacrifice, land, and resistance to external (later, coastal Andhra) domination (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013).

5. The Police Action and Forced Integration (1947–1950)

5.1 The Accession Crisis

Unlike most princely states, whose rulers acceded to India or Pakistan in 1947, the Nizam Mir Osman Ali Khan sought to retain independence, entering a Standstill Agreement with India in November 1947 while simultaneously exploring alternative arrangements, including appeals to the United Nations (University of Texas repository, n.d.). The Government of India, concerned about a large non-aligned or Pakistan-leaning state at the geographic center of the Union, and citing the breakdown of internal order amid the ongoing peasant insurgency and Razakar violence, launched a five-day military operation—codenamed Operation Polo and popularly called the "Police Action"—in September 1948 (Sherman, 2007).

5.2 Integration and Military Governance

Following the Nizam's surrender, Hyderabad State was placed under a military governor (General J. N. Chaudhuri) and subsequently under civilian administration, before being fully absorbed into the Indian Union (Sherman, 2007). Sherman's (2007) examination of The Indian Economic & Social History Review shows that it was not a seamless process of "integration" for Hyderabad, as the anti-communist drive against the peasant insurgency continued, attacks of communal violence were witnessed during the immediate aftermath

of the operation, and administrative improvisation took place during the 1948–1950 period, undermining the triumphalist nationalist story of a seamless integration. The scholarship is important because it challenges the idea that Telangana's 'decolonisation' started on 1 August 1947 and continued for an entire year after, and that the idea of 'accession' was negotiated rather than imposed by force.

Table 2: Timeline of Political Transition, 1946–1956

Year	Event
1946 (July)	Outbreak of peasant insurgency in Nalgonda district
1947 (Aug)	Indian independence; Nizam signs Standstill Agreement, seeks continued autonomy
1948 (Sept)	Operation Polo ("Police Action"); Nizam surrenders; military governance begins.
1948– 1950	Continued anti-insurgency operations; civilian administration restored under the Indian Union
1951 (Oct)	Communist Party formally withdraws from the armed struggle
1952	Hyderabad State holds its first general elections as part of the Indian Union.
1953	State Reorganisation demands intensify; Potti Sriramulu's fast leads to the creation of Andhra State.
1956 (Nov 1)	States Reorganisation Act merged the Telangana region of Hyderabad State with Andhra State to form Andhra Pradesh.

Source: Compiled from Sherman (2007), Pavier (1974), and Wikipedia contributors (2024), cross-verified against the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.

6. Linguistic Reorganization and the Buildup of Regional Grievance, 1956–2001

6.1 The 1956 Merger and the "Gentlemen's Agreement"

The States Reorganisation Act of 1956 merged the Telugu-speaking Telangana districts of the former Hyderabad State with the existing Andhra State (itself carved from Madras State in 1953) to create Andhra Pradesh. This amalgamation took place even though the States Reorganisation Commission had suggested that Telangana be kept as a separate entity, "Hyderabad State", because there were huge differences in the administrative development, revenue systems, and education levels between the two regions (Suri, 2014; ISEC Working Paper 397). Political leaders from the two states, Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, negotiated a "Gentlemen's Agreement" to protect Telangana's representation in government jobs, revenue collection, and reservation of local posts by domicile, which Telangana political parties later claimed was being violated over the next few decades (Anveshana India, 2025; Kumar, 2018).

6.2 Recurrent Sub-Regional Mobilizations

Telangana's grievance was not a single continuous movement but recurred in identifiable waves: the *Jai Telangana* agitation of 1969, led initially by students protesting violations of the Mulki (domicile) rules governing local employment; the *Jai Andhra* counter-movement of 1972–73 among coastal Andhra elites; and a long period of institutionalized but unresolved discontent from the mid-1970s through the 1990s, during which successive Telangana Regional Committees and Presidential Orders attempted (with limited success) to protect Telangana's employment and educational quotas (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013; ISEC WP 397). Political scientists have identified irrigation investment bias toward coastal Andhra's Krishna-Godavari delta, disproportionate allocation of government jobs to non-Telangana domiciles in Hyderabad, and

underrepresentation in state cabinets as recurring, empirically documented grievances underlying these mobilizations (Kumar, 2018; Suri, 2014).

6.3 The Telangana Rashtra Samithi and Renewed Mobilization (2001–2009)

The founding of the Telangana Rashtra Samithi (TRS) by K. Chandrashekar Rao in 2001 marked the transition of the statehood demand from episodic student and employee agitation to sustained electoral mobilization. The TRS entered coalition governments at the state and national levels on the condition of statehood commitments, and organized further rounds of agitation, including hunger strikes, that culminated in the Union government's December 2009 announcement of intent to initiate the process of forming a separate Telangana state—an announcement subsequently stalled amid counter-agitation from coastal Andhra regions (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013).

7. The Statehood Movement and the 2014 Settlement

7.1 Civil Society, Students, and the 2009–2014 Mobilization

The final phase of the movement (2009–2014) was marked by unusually broad coalition-building across employee unions, student organizations (notably at Osmania University), lawyers, journalists, and cultural figures, alongside sustained TRS-led political pressure (role of civil society analysis, *Journal of Political Science*, n.d.). Scholars analyzing this period emphasize those movements' capacity to combine identity-based cultural mobilization (Telangana dialect, folk culture, and the 1946–1951 struggle as historical touchstones) with material claims regarding water rights over the Krishna and Godavari rivers, coal and mineral revenues, and public-sector employment (Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013).

7.2 The Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2014

The Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, passed by the Indian Parliament in February 2014, created Telangana as India's twenty-ninth state with effect from 2 June 2014, comprising ten districts (subsequently reorganized into thirty-three) and designating Hyderabad as the joint capital of Telangana and residual Andhra Pradesh for a period of up to ten years (academia.edu, State formation analysis, n.d.). Political-science accounts characterize the 2014 outcome as resulting from a "complex interplay of strategic interests among multiple political actors," including the ruling Indian National Congress's electoral calculations ahead of the 2014 general election, rather than from statehood demands alone (academia.edu, n.d.).

8. Socio-Economic Data: Continuity and Change

Table 3: Selected Census 2011 and Post-Bifurcation Indicators, Telangana

Indicator	Value	Source
Total population (2011, undivided AP basis apportioned to Telangana region)	~35.19 million	Census of India (2011); Government of Telangana (n.d.)
Overall literacy rate	66.54%	Government of Telangana (n.d.), citing Census of India (2011)
Male literacy rate	75.04%	Government of Telangana (n.d.)
Female literacy rate	57.99%	Government of Telangana (n.d.)
All-India literacy rate (comparator)	74.04%	Census of India (2011)
Urban population share	~38.9%	Census of India (2011)

Source: Census of India (2011); Government of Telangana, "Facts, Demographics & Key Stats," State Profile (n.d.).

Table 4: Post-Bifurcation Social Sector Expenditure, Telangana vs. Andhra Pradesh

Indicator	Telangana 2014–15	Telangana 2021–22	Andhra Pradesh 2014–15	Andhra Pradesh 2021–22
Education expenditure (% of GSDP)	1.4%	1.2%	3.2%	2.2%
Health expenditure (% of GSDP)	lower than AP in comparative terms (see note)	1.0%–1.2% range	comparatively higher	comparatively higher

Source: Reddy & Rao (2022), "Education and Health Expenditures in Post-bifurcation Telangana and Andhra Pradesh," Economic and Political Weekly Engage. Note: The EPW Engage analysis finds Telangana's social-sector spending as a share of GSDP consistently below that of residual Andhra Pradesh across the period 2014–15 to 2021–22, despite Telangana's higher per-capita income, raising distributional questions relevant to post-2014 development historiography.

Interpreting the Data

The data in Tables 3 and 4 illustrate two distinct but related points. First, Census 2011 figures—collected while Telangana was still part of undivided Andhra Pradesh—confirm the education and gender disparities that regional activists cited as evidence of developmental neglect before bifurcation, with female literacy nearly seventeen percentage points below male literacy and overall literacy below the national average (Government of Telangana, n.d.). Second, post-bifurcation fiscal data complicate any simple narrative of statehood as a developmental panacea: despite achieving one of India's highest per-capita incomes among major states after 2014, Telangana's social-sector expenditure as a share of its economy has remained comparatively modest relative to Andhra Pradesh, suggesting that the fiscal and policy consequences of statehood are historiographically distinct from, and should not be conflated with, the political achievement of statehood itself (Reddy & Rao, 2022).

9. Historiographical Debates and Synthesis

9.1 Was Hyderabad "Colonial"?

A first debate concerns whether Hyderabad State should be considered a colonial space at all, given the absence of direct British administration. Cohen (2021) and the Cambridge University Press volume excerpt (n.d.) argue for treating Hyderabad as a site of "colonial modernity"—a space where British paramountcy structured elite institutions, military dependency, and economic orientation even without formal annexation. This paper follows that position: the subsidiary alliance system, the stationing of British-officered forces, and British control over Hyderabad's external relations constituted a substantive, if indirect, colonial relationship, rendering any account of Telangana's "postcolonial" history that begins only in 1947 or 1948 incomplete.

9.2 Class or Nation? Interpreting the 1946–1951 Struggle

A second, long-standing debate in the historiography concerns whether the Telangana Peasant Armed Struggle is best understood as a class-based agrarian revolt or as a proto-nationalist assertion of Telangana regional identity. Pavier's (1974) classic account emphasizes class relations and Communist Party strategy, while more recent scholarship (Bhukya, 2020; Janardhan & Raghavendra, 2013) situates the struggle within a longer arc of Telangana regional consciousness that later fed directly into the 2001–2014 statehood movement's self-narration. This paper suggests these readings are not mutually exclusive: the movement's

anti-*jagirdari* class content and its subsequent absorption into a regional identity narrative reflect the layered, cumulative character of Telangana's historical memory rather than a contradiction to be resolved.

9.3 Was 1956 a Merger or an Annexation?

A third debate, closely tied to contemporary Telangana political discourse, concerns whether the 1956 unification of Telangana and Andhra should be characterized as a voluntary merger or as an effective annexation of the less-developed Telangana region by the better-organized coastal Andhra political and business elite. The ISEC working paper (Kumar, 2018) and Suri (2014) present detailed employment and investment data supporting the grievance narrative, while acknowledging that the 1956 decision was formally consensual and legislatively enacted. This paper treats the "Gentlemen's Agreement" and its documented violations as central evidence that formal constitutional consent and substantive regional equity are analytically distinct, and that Telangana's fifty-eight years within Andhra Pradesh must be assessed against implementation, not merely origin.

9.4 Synthesis

Read together, these three debates support the paper's central claim: Telangana's modern history is not a linear passage from colonial subjugation to postcolonial citizenship, but a series of overlapping and only partially resolved subordinations—to British paramountcy, to a feudal landlord class, to a centralizing and militarized Indian state in 1948, and to an intra-regional elite within composite Andhra Pradesh after 1956. The 2014 statehood settlement resolved the fourth of these subordinations institutionally, but, as Section 8's expenditure data suggest, did not automatically resolve the underlying developmental and distributive questions that had accumulated across the prior six decades.

10. Conclusion

This paper has reconstructed modern Telangana's history as a layered sequence of political formations rather than a single transition from colonial to postcolonial status. Indirect colonial rule under the Nizams established a distinctive agrarian and administrative order that generated the specific grievances underlying the 1946–1951 Peasant Armed Struggle; the 1948 Police Action forcibly integrated Hyderabad State into the Indian Union a year after national independence, complicating standard decolonization chronologies; the 1956 linguistic reorganization subordinated Telangana within a composite Andhra Pradesh under terms that were only partially honored; and the 2001–2014 statehood movement mobilized this accumulated historical memory into a successful, if contested, demand for separate statehood. Verifiable Census and post-bifurcation fiscal data confirm both the pre-2014 developmental disparities that motivated the movement and the more ambiguous distributive outcomes that have followed statehood. Future research should extend this reconstruction into a systematic comparative study of Telangana alongside other post-2000 Indian state formations (Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand), to assess whether the layered-subordination framework proposed here has broader applicability to India's ongoing federal restructuring.

REFERENCES:

1. Bhukya, B. (2020). *History of modern Telangana*. Orient BlackSwan. [Reviewed in Kannan, R. (2020). Book review: Bhangya Bhukya, History of Modern Telangana. *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973703019885490>]
2. Cohen, B. B. (2021). Social clubs in a princely state: The case from Hyderabad, Deccan. *Journal name (Sage Publications)*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03769836211052096>
3. Government of Telangana. (n.d.). *Facts, demographics & key stats: Telangana state profile*. Retrieved July 2026, from <https://www.telangana.gov.in/about/state-profile/>

4. Janardhan, V., & Raghavendra, P. (2013). Telangana: History and political sociology of a movement. *Social Change*, 43(4), 551–564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085713502593>
5. Kumar, A. V. (2018). *Politics in the state of Telangana: Identity, representation and resource allocation* (ISEC Working Paper No. 397). Institute for Social and Economic Change.
6. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India. (2011). *Census of India 2011: Andhra Pradesh village and town directory* [Data set]. Government of India. <https://censusindia.gov.in>
7. Pavier, B. (1974). The Telangana peasant armed struggle, 1946–51. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 9(28), 1195–1200.
8. Reddy, D. N., & Rao, P. (2022). Education and health expenditures in post-bifurcation Telangana and Andhra Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly Engage*. <https://www.epw.in/engage/article/education-and-health-expenditures-post-bifurcation>
9. Sherman, T. C. (2007). The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948–56. *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 44(4), 489–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001946460704400404>
10. Suri, K. C. (2014). Andhra Pradesh: Bifurcation and after. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(5), 10–13.
11. *Additional archival and institutional materials consulted:*
12. Anveshana India Publications. (2024). *Role of women in Telangana peasant armed struggle, 1946–51*. <http://publications.anveshanaindia.com>
13. Anveshana India Publications. (2025). *The socio-political impact of regional parties: A historical perspective on Telangana and Andhra Pradesh*. <http://publications.anveshanaindia.com>
14. International Journal of Advanced Interdisciplinary Research (IJAIR). (2026). *Peasant debt and agrarian crisis in Hyderabad State during the colonial period*. <https://www.ijair.com>
15. Repositories of the University of Texas. (n.d.). *The Nizam's last stand: Hyderabad's place in India's partition*. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu>