

THE PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTIC STATES IN INDIA

By :
Dr. Krishna Kodesia
M.A. Phd. (Pol. Sc. & History)



Sterling Publishers (P) Ltd.

Delhi-6.

Jullundur City.

**The Problems of Linguistic States
in India**
Copyright © 1969 by Dr. Krishna Kodesia

STERLING PUBLISHERS (P) Ltd.
Jullundur : 695 Model Town
Delhi 6 : 3640 Mori Gate

First Edition 1969

Price : Rs. 15.00

Printed in India

Published by Sri S K. Ghai, Managing Director Sterling Publishers (P) Ltd.
Printed at Kapur Printing Press Delhi-6. & composed by International
Agency, Doriwala Delhi-5.

PREFACE

The present work deals with the problems of linguistic States in India. This is one of the most burning topics of the day and one of the most serious. Not a day passes without our being reminded of the gigantic proportions which this issue has attained. Unless this problem is solved without delay and in a statesman like manner the peace of the country is in grave peril.

The problem is certainly not a new one. It made its first appearance as early as 1905 at the time of partition of Bengal under Lord Curzon and since then it has been the product of different forces at work at different times and places and still remains unsolved. With the creation of the Andhra State in 1953 as a separate unit the demand became more insistent. The cry for linguistic redistribution and *regrouping of the States* has arisen firstly from the fact that the States in India had not been organised on any scientific basis during the British regime and secondly, because the monopoly of power and patronage of some powerful groups in certain areas have created difficulties for the minority groups. In some cases the complaints are real; in some imaginary. But what is certain is that they lie at the root of the demand for the separation and reorganisation of the States. It is obvious that the problem in the context of today need a thorough and dispassionate study and present work is a small effort in this direction.

No published material in book form being available on the subject, it is hoped that this study will prove of some help. The material for this work has been mainly drawn from the Government of India documents, reports of various commissions and committees, data papers, investigations undertaken by private individuals and organisations and similar materials in other parts of the world supplied by the courtesy of foreign embassies in India.

The work has been classified in seven chapters, each dealing with a particular aspect of the subject.

The first Chapter deals with the historical survey of the subject. It gives an account of various nations which came and settled in India at different times, brought different languages with them and thus created *linguistic variety* in the country. It was this linguistic variety which ultimately gave rise to linguistic controversy and to the question of linguistic redistribution of the States.

The first half of the second Chapter deals with the arguments

mainly put forward in favour of linguistic redistribution and thus gives a clear picture of the bases on which the demand reset. The other half of the chapter deals with the arguments which contradict the arguments in favour and thus explains why the demand cannot be accepted and the prevailing conflict.

The third chapter deals with the constitutional provisions and implications which are likely to arise in case linguistic redistribution is carried out because ours is a written constitution and nothing can be done which is against constitutional provisions.

The fourth chapter deals with the administrative, financial, economical and other implications of this problem. The reorganisation of the states is a serious administrative problem and is very closely connected with the day to day administration of the country. Any sort of reorganisation of the States is seriously going to affect the country in respect of administration, economy and finances etc.

In the fifth chapter, a comparative study has been made of this problem i.e., its nature in other countries and the ultimate solution, so that some useful solution may be found or at least some help derived from the examples of other countries.

The sixth chapter contains concluding observations based on the facts which come to light after a thorough study and scrutiny of this subject and finally concluding that the demand is not only untimely but harmful for the country from all point of views.

The seventh chapter had not been mentioned in the Synopsis but has been added with a view to give an account of the new demand for certain additional States and thus showing the nature, sphere and intensity of demand in different regions of the country.

As this is a current topic and no final policy has yet emerged in this connection, it cannot be claimed that the present work is fully complete still, as far as possible, an attempt has been made to cover every aspect of the subject on the basis of available material. Every day new horizons, new opinions and new implications are coming into view, it is, therefore, very difficult to set any historical limits to the subject. My study though comes down to October 1960 however, I have tried to cover latter developments which led finally in formation of New States in Indian Union on language basis by adding some lines in the end of the respective matters.

Finally, it is my pleasant duty to express my great obligations to Dr. Prakash Chandra, M.A., L.L.B., Ph.D. (Econ.) (London), my former teacher and Head of the Civics and Politics Department, Maharani Laxmibai College, Gwalior, whose constant wise and ungrudging guidance has been most helpful in enabling me to complete my work. Thanks are also due to Dr. S.N. Verma, M.A., L.L.B., Ph.D. (Columbia), Reader in the department of African

studies in the University of Delhi, who suggested the topic and guided me in the initial stages. I am also indebted to the High Commissioner for Ceylon in India, the Ambassadors of Switzerland and Belgium, and to the High Commissioner for Canada in India for supplying me with some literature on the subject of my thesis. The knowledge thus gained has helped me in making a comparative study of the problem of linguistic States. I cannot also forget to express my obligations and thanks to Dr. Lanka Sundaram, M.A., Ph.D (London) because it was by his courtesy only that I could get a lot of important material from his office in Delhi and to the Secretary Shri Thapalayal, who helped me greatly in the absence of Dr. Lanka Sundaram.

CONTENTS

	Preface	... VII
1.	The Problem of Linguistic Re-distribution.	... 1
2.	Bases of the Demand for the Linguistic Re-distribution.	... 17
3.	Constitutional Implications of the Problem.	... 45
4.	Administrative and Financial Implications.	... 52
5.	A Comparative study of the Techniques and Methods.	... 61
6.	Concluding observations.	... 71
7.	Newly Demanded States.	... 82
	Reference Books	... 127
	Index	... 131

The Problem of Linguistic Redistribution

India is the name of various races which came from outside and settled down in this country. The oldest people to have settled in India were a Negroid or Negrito race from Africa, who died out leaving very little trace. They survive with their language in the Andaman Island. After them came Proto-Australoids, dark skinned and snub-nosed. They came from Palestine and they furnished some present day lower classes all over India. They passed into Ceylon and through Burma and Malaya into Australia. Their language does not survive.

Next we have the speakers of the Austric dialects. They settled largely in North India, and mingled to some extent with the Proto-Australoids. Groups of these Austrics passed into Burma and Indo-China, Malaya and Indonesia and even beyond, into the Island of Malenesia and Polynesia. They mingled with Negriots, with Proto-Australoids and Mongoloids and outside India their language changed to Mon and Khmer and other speeches in Indo-China, into Malay and its sister speeches in the Islands of the Indian Archipelago and into the various Malenesian and Polynesian Dialects.

In India Austric speakers of the plains have entirely abandoned their original speech for the Arayan language which came to the country after 1500 B.C., the latter itself being modified by them to some extent. They got mixed with masses of Northern India along with Dravidian speaking people. Austric Dialects survive in India in some out of the way places, in hills and jungles of Central and North Eastern India. Austric speakers do not form more than 1.3 p.c. of the total India, numbering 5 million in all.

Following the Austrics, we have Dravidian speaker coming to

India before 3500 B.C. They are believed to have comprised two distinct races with one language—the long-headed civilised Mediterraneanans and short-headed Armenoids from Asia-Minor. When the Aryans came and spread over Northern India, the speakers of Dravidian and of Austric both accepted the Aryan language and three groups of language communities—Austric, Dravidian and Aryan—were fused into one people i.e. the Aryan speaking North India Hindu of ancient times. Aryan language could not spread in the South with its solid blocks of Dravidian language which are still current among some 71 million forming 20 p.c. of Indian people.

After Aryans came Sino-Tibetans or Tibeto-Chinese speakers, belonging to the Mongoloid races. They were in a backward state e.g. the Bodos, and in the plains they gave up and are giving up their language for modern Aryan speeches viz., Bengali, Assamese and in Nepal the Aryan Nepali is ousting them. Excepting Newari in Nepal and Meithei or Manipuri in Manipur, there has been no literary cultivation of these and they account for only 0.85 p.c. of Indian population. Finally we come to the greatest Aryan speech. This speech came in various waves from the West and it gradually spread over the Punjab and the Ganges Valley, the Austric speeches receding before it. So that gradually the whole of North India including Assam and a good deal of Northern Deccan became Aryan in speech. This Aryan speech in its latest phase in India is represented in Rig-veda, compiled probably in 10th century B.C. but portions of it are much older.

A younger form of this language became established as Sanskrit by 500 B.C. The later spoken forms of the Aryan speech, in the stage known as Middle Indo-Aryan, are represented by various Prakrits and Apabhraṅsas of the period 600 B.C. to A.D. 1000. After this they developed into new or modern Indo-Aryan languages of the present day. Sanskrit spread widely and became the feeder of all Indian languages for the last 2500 years. This was most important in India numerically, culturally and in all other ways and is current among 257 million and more accounting for over 73 p.c. population in India.

Four linguistic families are thus represented in India—the Austrics, the Dravidian and Indo-European (Aryans) and Sino-Tibetans. In spite of fundamental differences, they have been borrowing from each other and thus most of them have become bilingual.

At present Hindi certainly is the representative modern language. It is the natural *Lingua-Franca* of 257 million. Besides being understood by many others in either of its forms i.e. High Hindi or

THE PROBLEM OF LINGUISTIC REDISTRIBUTION

Urdu, it is the literary language of over 140 million. It is thus the third great language of the world coming after Northern Chinese and English. That is why after a long controversy it has been given the place of National language.

It was this multiplicity of languages which gave rise to the linguistic problem. This problem drew the attention of various people and parties as we shall see further.

The communal problem represents a survival of tribal consciousness lightly moored to the land and functions powerfully in our land. When an Agricultural Tribe settles on a tract it gains three unities (i) Unity of Territory (ii) Unity of Culture (iii) Unity of Language. If these settlers continue undisturbed we get a country of homogenous groups, each with a distinct language and culture. When they enter a union they can be its unit states and the union consists of cultural and language states.

This situation is always changed in the course of history by four factors i.e. immigration, conquests, military movements and trade. They break the homogeneity and heterogeneous social groups are formed. This happened in India too. These factors account for the Southerners in North and Northerners in South India. Conquests and military movement were the main disturbers of tribal unity. The strong communities of Telgus in Nagpur and of Marathas in the Punjab can be traced to these factors. Even before the foreign invasions, Northern kings—Pandawas, Ashoka, Chandragupta—conquered large portions of the country. Many cultural and language areas were annexed. Mohammedan and British conquests show that several language areas in parts were conquered and consolidated into multi-lingual units. Hyderabad had 3 linguistic areas as units i.e. Telgu-Marathi—Kannada—adopting Urdu as its official language. Mysore had Telgu, Tamil and Kanarese districts and Bombay had Marathi, Kanarese and Hindi tracts. In this way from the times of Mohammedan conquests for centuries India had multi-cultured and multi-linguistic provinces. It may also be noted that language was not relevant to State formation in mediaeval India or even in the mediaeval world, which was cast in the feudal mould. In this pattern language played no effective role. Caste (Varna) was the key-note of social division. The linguistic problem never arose. In fact people's voice never counted and they had no share in administration. The emergence of democracy, the rise of the merchant class and predominance of economics in the social order created a new pattern of society replacing caste by class and introducing motion into society. This resulted in mixtures and integration of cultures on the stable basis of

territory. With the conquest of Muslims and Westerners old moulds were broken and purely territorial divisions came into existence. The linguistic cry is a throw-back into mediaevalism and tribalism against the genius of modern democratic life. "Divide the land according to the languages" merely varies the cry "Divide the country by communities." "All are one who belong to a territory" expresses the genius of modern democracy and nationality which operates on a territorial basis as against a cultural basis. "Superficially the Russian method of granting nationality to tribes may appear to strengthen the case for linguistic division but deeply considered it will be found that Russia never passed through the stage of conquests after the mediaeval period and this makes all the difference",¹ says Shri P. Chenchiah, M.L. Thus we see that he does not believe in linguistic redistribution. There are many sharing his views but the movement is going on as we shall see ahead.

The movement for linguistic provinces took concrete form as a protest against the action of Lord Curzon who had ordered the break-up of the Province of Bengal in 1905. The opposition agitation became very violent and the partition had to be annulled.

The forces generated by the Bengal movement of 1905 had their repercussions in other provinces as well and the Andhras were the foremost to take the advantage of the same. The first conference for an Andhra provincial unification or separation on linguistic basis was held at Bapatla in 1913 under the presidentship of Sir B. N. Sharma and Deshakta Konda Puntulu was the Chairman of the reception committee. The movements soon spread to other provinces.

In 1915-16 the Andhra Conference asked the Congress Party to recognise the linguistic principle and to grant it a separate status in the administration of Congress affairs. Both Gandhiji and Mrs. Annie Besant opposed the proposal but it was finally accepted by the Congress and from 1921 it formed part of the Congress Constitution and later on was also accepted by the Hindu Mahasabha. In 1917 Andhra and Sind became separate "Congress Provinces". Thus it was not in the legislatures but in the Congress that the linguistic principle of redistribution was first accepted. In 1919 the Montague-Chelmsford Report also accepted the principle. In 1920 at the Nagpur Annual Session of the Congress it was decided to apply this principle on an all-India basis and to divide India into 21 Congress Provinces for party administration. This was done. Several provincial committees formed for the cities of Bombay, Delhi and Burma were also included in this division.

The above mentioned division was made on the basis of following 13 main languages namely (i) Hindustani (ii) Assamese (iii) Bengali (iv) Marathi (v) Gujarati (vi) Sindhi (vii) Tamil (viii) Phushtu (ix) Telgu (x) Kannada (xi) Malayalam (xii) Oriya and (xiii) Punjabi.

Attempts to secure recognition for the principle were made in the Central and State legislatures too. They were however, opposed by Government and generally received very little popular support. But the movement had the blessing of some eminent politicians and philosophers all over the country. This will be clear from the following :

In 1922, the outline scheme of 'Swaraj' of Deshbandhu C. R. Das and Dr. Bhagwan Das declared that "Provinces should be demarcated on the linguistic basis. Any which are considered too large may be divided into smaller units."²

In 1927, the 'Swaraja Constitution' of S. Srinivas Iyenger provided that the Parliament "shall as soon as may be after the coming into force of this Act appoint a commission for the purpose of making proposals for reconstituting the provinces on the basis of language grouping."³

In the same year legislative council of Madras passed a resolution by a vote of 40 to 32 calling upon the Governor-General to constitute a separate Andhra Province.

Late in 1927, the Simon Commission was appointed. The report of the Government of India to the Simon Commission and the Simon Commission itself accepted the principle of linguistic division and in spite of the hostility of the public, the Commission published a report in which it supported linguistic redistribution.

The Simon Commission summed up their views on the subject as follows :

"The existing provincial boundaries in more than one case embrace areas and people of no natural affinity and sometimes separate those who might, under a different scheme, be more naturally united. There are, however, grave administrative and financial difficulties of a very complex nature in the way of redistribution. If those, who speak the same language, form a compact and self-contained area, so situated and endowed as to be able to support its existence as a separate province, there is no doubt that the use of common speech is a strong and natural basis for provincial individuality. But race, religion, economic interest, geographical contiguity, a due balance between country and town and between the coast line and interior are also the relevant factors. There should also be largest

possible measure of agreement between those two provinces who will lose and gain the territory. One urgent case to be considered is that of Oriya-speaking people. Close union, as now exists between Bihar and Orissa, is a glaring example of the artificial connection of areas. In co-operation with the Indian Central Committee and Bihar and Orissa Provincial Committee we have arranged the appointment of a sub-committee."⁴

"This sub-committee consisted of Dr. Suhrawardy, the Raja of Kanika and Mr. Laxmidhar Mahanti of Bihar and Orissa Provincial Committee with Mr. Attlee as the Chairman. The Committee surveyed the distribution of Oriyas and it was as follows :

(a) Bihar and Orissa	...	4,798,768
(b) Orissa Feudatory States	...	2,940,338
(c) In Madras Presidency	...	1,566,966
(d) In Central Provinces	...	190,294
(e) C.P. Feudatory States	...	58,578
(f) Bengal Presidency	...	142,107
	Total :	<u>9,697,051</u> " ⁵

The Committee considered in detail the linguistic and racial composition of Oriyas and Biharis along with administrative factors and came to the following conclusions :

"The Oriya forms the natural nucleus of the population. Angul, though containing many [aborigines, should be included. The Orissa Feudatory States should be related to any administrative set up. Singhbhum contains less than 20 p.c. of Oriyas and 75 p.c. of aborigines. Its geographical and economic position is against its inclusion in Orissa. In Bengal there is only a possibility of minor adjustment of boundary in the circles of Mohanpur and Goballipur. In Central Provinces with the exception of Khariar, the Oriyas form 25 p.c. of population, so only minor adjustment is needed. In Madras no part of Vizagapattam Agency tract should be transferred as the lines of communication run South East and it is necessary that this backward area should continue to be linked with coastal area of which it is the hinter-land. As regards Ganzam it is recommended that all parts of the district north of a line drawn westward from the coast between Ichapuram and Sompeta to the agency and those parts where Khonds predominate should go to Orissa."⁵

The sub-committee was in favour of the creation of an Orissa Province and concluded that with strict economy the Province could pay its way, though large development schemes were not possible for

the needs of backward areas or for periodic rages of famine and flood.

Apart from this the Simon Commission considered the case of Sindh and on account of administrative difficulties objected to the separation of Sindh from Bombay. The Commission recommended that on the legislative side, special arrangements could be made for matters affecting Sindh as for instance, by the constitution of a Committee on which all the Sindh members of the Bombay Legislature would sit. The boundaries of Sindh and Orissa had none of the characteristics of natural frontier. As long the Government of India was entirely centralised and both the administration and finance of any area were provided and directed from the Centre, the frontier lines of the provinces were of less importance. The Commission however, thought that the situation was changing and a time was coming when each province would have its own provincial Government and its own recourses and would form a unit in a federated whole. It was, thus, important that the adjustment of provincial boundaries and the creation of proper provincial areas should take place. Once the mould was set, any maldistribution would be still more difficult to correct and the Commission recommended the setting up of a Boundary Commission.

At that time linguistic advocates were sure that if they would support the recommendations of the Simon Commission, they would get their provinces. But at that time national sentiment was paramount and it triumphed over provincial sentiment.

¶ In 1928 the Nehru Report fully endorsed the Congress view and strongly emphasized the desirability of creating these linguistic provinces. The report laid down, "Language, people's wish and administrative convenience, including geographical position, the economic resources and financial stability of the area concerned,"⁶ as the criteria forming these provinces. Since then the Congress has included the principle in its election manifestoes and various Congress Legislatures have passed resolutions in support of this demand.

Moti Lal Nehru Report i.e. All parties Report (1928), after declaring that there should be a redistribution of provinces discussed that what principle should govern this redistribution. After noting that geographical, economical and financial factors could not be ignored, the Report concluded that the main consideration must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned.

This Report further added, "If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it

must be necessarily a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area, difficulties will continually arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be ground on a linguistic basis. Language as a whole corresponds with a special literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the provinces.”⁷

Bearing this principle in mind the Report reviewed at some length the cases of Utkal, Kerala, Karnataka and Sindh. The All Parties Conference which met on 30th of August, 1928, finally recommended the separation of Sindh, provided it was financially self-supporting and passed a resolution appealing to the Government to appoint a Commission provided for in Clause 72 of the Constitution.

This Commission was to :—

(i) take steps to amalgamate the Oriya speaking tracts in the different provinces and constitute this amalgamated area into a separate province, if the people of that area were able or were prepared to bear the financial burden which was incidental to the separation,

(ii) take all necessary steps to constitute Karnataka and Andhra into separate provinces,

(iii) report on the cases of C.P., Hindustani, Kerala and any other linguistic area which may desire to be constituted into a separate province,

(iv) resettle the boundaries of Assam, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, C.P. Hindustani, Kerala and Karnataka in accordance with the principle recommended by the Committee.⁸

“On the eve of the elections in 1935, the Sapru Report, the Gandhian Constitution by Principal Agrawal, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Justice Party, the Radical Democratic Party, all endorsed the scheme of linguistic provinces and the Congress Election Manifesto declared, “The Congress had stood for equal rights and opportunities for every citizen of India, men or women . . . it has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger frame work, and for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be considered, as possible, on a linguistic and cultural basis.”⁹

In 1935 acting on the recommendations of the Simon Commission the British Parliament passed the Government of India Act of 1935 and created the new provinces of Sindh and Orissa. Thus Orissa was separated from Bihar, Bihar from Bengal and Sindh from Bom-

bay. The linguistic principle was accepted for division and not for unification. The areas in which the linguistic demand was strongest were ignored.

Under the Act of 1935 new legislatures were set up which in 1938 became the scenes of further linguistic agitation. In March 1938 Shri Konda Venkatappaya Pantulu introduced a resolution in the Madras Legislative Assembly, calling for the creation of separate Tamil, Telgu, Kannada and Malayalam Provinces. Supported by Shri C. Rajgopalachari, the Chief Minister, the resolution was carried. Next month in Bombay a resolution was proposed in the Legislative Assembly calling for the creation of a Karnataka Province and it was also adopted. The Bombay Legislative Council also passed a similar resolution. After this the linguistic provinces movement lapsed into a state of suspended animation, because the nation's attention was focussed on the struggle for the independence.

In December 1946, when the Constituent Assembly for the first time met to draft an independent India's Constitution, the linguistic movement sprang to life again. Conventions were called, and meetings were held all over India.

The convention of linguistic provinces met at Delhi on 8-12-46, on the eve of the Constituent Assembly under the Presidentship of Dr. S.B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and pressed upon the authorities a proposal for constituting Andhra, Tamil, Kerala and Karnataka as linguistic provinces under new constitution.

The All-India League of Linguistic Provinces, which met at Bezwada on 13-5-47 urged the acceptance by the Constituent Assembly of the principle of linguistic provinces as one of the fundamental objectives of the New Constitution.

Presiding over the inaugural session of the League, Dr. Radha Kumud Mukerji declared, "India's culture is a synthetic complex made of a number of diverse elements, each of which makes its contribution to that comprehensive whole. These elements are chiefly represented by the languages of India. The linguistic map of India shows the vigour and vitality of some of these languages. Producing their own literature and some of them count as world literature. . . ." ^{10a} the languages are not an artificial creation but a natural growth and formation of its inner spring of thought pure and undefiled. Each language has its own soul which gives it body and shape. . . ." ^{10b}. Linguistic diversity is, therefore, to be maintained and fostered on principle by a national government, which must stand for the diversity of national culture." ^{10c} The Conference accordingly urged strongly upon the authorities concerned, "To immediately re-

constitute the provinces in India, as far as possible, as linguistic cultural and homogeneous units,"^{10d} as a preliminary to the formation of the Union of India.

After the Mountbatten Plan was announced the League demanded the formation of these new provinces with provisional boundaries as from the appointed day *viz.*, 15-8-47 or at least an acceptance of the principle of linguistic provinces by the powers that be under the New Constitution of India.

In 1946 the Madras Legislature passed a resolution calling upon the Constituent Assembly to regard the principle of linguistic States as, "A necessary requisite in framing of a constitution for India."¹¹ Reflecting the bitter Hindu Muslim relations in North India, the opposition to this resolution centered among the Muslim members. Those were the days of transitional period. India was not yet independent. Pakistan had not come into existence and the fate of many princely States had not yet been decided. The Assembly met all through the hectic days of partition and integration and concluded its deliberations in November 1947, and in June 1948 it appointed the linguistic provinces commission under the Chairmanship of Shri S.K. Dar.

This Commission published its 56 pages report on December 10, 1948. The Commission acknowledged that the idea of linguistic States made "a strong appeal to the imagination of many of our countrymen."¹² and there existed "A large volume of public support in their favour."¹² But it concluded that a state of national emergency existed in India which gave a higher priority to other problems. The report said, "Everything which helps the growth of Nationalism has to go forward and everything which throws obstacles in its way has to be rejected. . . . we have applied this test to the principle of linguistic provinces also and judged by this test, in our opinion they fail and cannot be supported."¹³ The Dar report also stated, "The formation of provinces on exclusively or even mainly on linguistic consideration is not in the larger interest of the Indian Nation and should not be taken in hand."¹⁴ Thus for the first time a warning was issued against the accepted principle of the Congress. Now Congress had to face a new situation. On the one hand, it was impressed by the arguments advanced by the report and on the other, was committed to the principle of linguistic provinces by its declarations and resolutions.

The Dar Commission mainly concerned itself with four proposed States of South India, namely, Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala, and Maharashtra. In each of these cases it presented detailed financial arguments against their creation. The most significant

recommendations of the Commission were those regarding the cities of Bombay and Madras. For Madras the Commission's recommendation was less definite. Although it conceded a stronger claim on the part of Tamil community by virtue of numerical superiority in and around the city, it suggested that some sort of an independent State might be desirable.

The wide-spread opposition which greeted the publication of the Dar Report prompted the Congress meeting in its annual session in Jaipur in December 1948 to appoint its own Linguistic Provinces Committee. The Committee consisted of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Vallabh Bhai Patel and Shri Pattabhi Sitaramayya and was asked to consider the question of linguistic provinces, to review the position and to examine the question in the light of the decision taken by the Congress in the past and the requirements of the present situation. It was to study the problem (1) In view of the Report of the Dar Commission and (2) The new problems that had arisen out of the achievements of Independence.

The Report of this JVP Committee was submitted on April 1st, 1949 and endorsed the conclusions of the Dar Committee and stated, "The old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces can only be applied after careful thought being given to each separate case and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country. We would prefer to postpone the formation of new provinces for a few years, so that we might concentrate during this period on other matters of vital importance and not allow ourselves to be distracted by this question. We are clearly of opinion that no question of rectification of boundaries in Provinces of North India should be raised at the present moment, whatever the merits of such a proposal might be."¹⁵

The Report also affirmed that, "Taking a broad and practical view, the present is not an opportune time for the formation of new provinces. It would unmistakably retard the process of consolidation of our gains, dislocate our gains, dislocate our administrative, economic and financial structure, let loose, while we are still in formation state, forces of disruption and disintegration, and seriously interfere with the progressive solution of our economic and political difficulties."¹⁶

The above view gained considerable support among other leaders i.e., Shri V.V. [Giri, Shri S.K. Patil, Shri K.M. Munshi, Dr. Somerawall and Shri M.S. Golwalkar. In Central Assembly during the debate on the Andhra Bill, opposition to linguistic States found

clear expression and associations were formed in Delhi, Madras and Bombay to oppose the creation of linguistic provinces.

Regarding the facts of the cities of Bombay and Madras the JVP Report did not differ substantially from the Dar Report. The JVP Report did no more to satisfy the advocates of linguistic States than did the Dar Commission Report which preceded it.

Neither the JVP nor the Dar Report was popular in Andhra, for both asked the Andhras to give up the Madras City. Moreover, their general tone was that of postponement. Emotions in Andhras began to simmer and India's 'Unique Political Weapon', the fast, was brought into use for an Andhra State. On August 16th, 1951, Swami Sita Ram, a respected Gandhian and several of his followers undertook a fast 'Unto Death' for the creation of the Andhra State. As the fast went on, the tension increased. Several of his followers broke the fast earlier but Swami Sita Ram continued his fast until September 20th, when after 35 days he broke it on the request of Shri Vinoba Bhave.

On December 15, 1952, a 56 days fast claimed the life of Potti Siramulu. The reaction in Andhra was electric. Violence broke out in several places. The police fired on a mob at Nellore, killing three and wounding several others. In Madras several Andhra Legislators resigned their seats in protest but the attempt by the Andhra members to raise the issue in the Central Parliament was unsuccessful.

However, on December 19th, 1952, the Government of India declared that it would go ahead with the creation of new States. The Andhra State Bill was debated in the House of the people during the summer of 1952, and on October 1st the new State of Andhra was inaugurated.

It is interesting to see that the Cabinet Mission (1947) was also in favour of creating some four or five new provinces, including a divided Bengal and Punjab but the suggestion was not availed of just at that time. The Late Maharaja of Cochin in the same year called for the co-operation of all States in Kerala and to devise ways and means to form a scheme of Government for the whole of Kerala. But the Diwan of Travancore Shri C.P. Ramaswamy discouraged the move.

Sardar Patel was also in favour of linguistic provinces. The following extract from the White Paper on the Indian States (1950) shows it. The paper says, "The problem of integration of States, was not alike in all regions. There were several groups of States, which with due regard to the geographical, linguistic, social and cultural affinities of the people could be consolidated in sizable and viable units."¹⁷ Para 134 says, "The Rajasthan Union was originally formed

by smaller Rajputana States in South-East, Banswara, Bundi, Dunderpur, Jhalawar, Kishangarh, Kotah, Pratapgarh, Shahpura and Tonk. These States formed a contiguous area with ethnical, linguistic and cultural affinities."¹⁸

In Para 128 we read, "The United States of Gwalior, Indore and Malwa constitutes the largest of the Unions of States, so far formed. It comprises 20 States in Central India including major States of Gwalior and Indore. Linguistically, culturally, and historically and economically they form a complete block."¹⁹

The Orissa and Chhattisgarh States, the Deccan States, the States in Saurashtra and elsewhere have been merged or united on the same principle more or less and in Para 99 of the White Paper we read, "There are still some small States left which have not been affected by any merger or integration scheme. It is the intention of the Government of India to integrate them in such manner as may be found appropriate with due regard to their geographical contiguity and linguistic, administrative, cultural and economic considerations."²⁰

And lastly, Mr. V. P. Menon, the able adviser of the Sardar in the States' Department said that the merger of Mayurbhanj with Orissa was decided on cultural, administrative and linguistic considerations.²¹

While it is true that in Andhra the linguistic movement was most active, it has affected all the provinces and all the parties more or less. Next to Andhra, the Maharashtra movement is the largest and most important. The problem is about the creation of Samyukta Maharashtra (United Maharashtra). In North India the Punjab attracts most of the attention. Three main languages are found in the area of the Punjab, PEPSU, and Himachal Pradesh. They are Hindustani, Punjabi and Bihari. The Inter-State boundaries do not correspond with language but are the result of the integration of various Princedom. The other North Indian linguistic problem is about the border dispute between the West Bengal and Bihar. The movement had been blessed by selected people of our political thought all over the country. It has affected all the political parties. Congress has felt the burden most because it was first party to support it before independence but after coming in power, it clearly stated in its party programme of 1951 that the time was not opportune for it.

The decision to all the Andhras to separate from Madras, became the signal for linguistic groups all over India to increase their agitation. New organisations and pressure groups, dedicated to the linguistic idea, sprang all over India.

In order to appease public opinion, the Indian Government set up a reorganisation committee which submitted a report on November 1st, 1956. On the basis of this report 14 States and 6 Union territories were established. The details have been discussed in a separate chapter.

The linguistic issue has also created a problem for the Communist Party of India (CPI). The CPI first became seriously concerned with this question in the days before Independence, when the issue of a separate Pakistan was still in doubt. Taking their cue from Soviet writings on nationality question, the communists at that time divided India into several nations to each of which they proposed granting the form of autonomy and the right of secession available to the various nationalities of the Soviet Union. Thus instead of endorsing the idea of Pakistan as such, they endorsed, "What was just" in Pakistan demand, namely, the right of self-determination for the Pathan Nation, the Punjabi Nation, the Baluchi Nation, the Sindhi Nation and so forth. They also gave Nation's Status to the Telugus, Tamils, Maharashtrians, and other important language groups of South India. Indian public opinion failed to appreciate the subtle difference between supporting 'what was just in Pakistan' demand and in supporting the demand of Pakistan as a whole. The Communist Party itself ultimately realised that its policy had weighted slightly on Pakistan's side and this was repudiated clearly at Calcutta Congress of 1948.

After Independence, the CPI tried to criticise government on linguistic issue. Thus in 1948 the party organ the, 'People's Age', stated, "We supported the demand for linguistic provinces because we know that through it the people of various linguistic units are taking their first step against the Central Bourgeois leadership and its policy of suppression of National Groups."²²

In June, 1954 the Central Committee of CPI published a memorandum which it submitted to States Re-organisation Commission.²³ This called for a redivision, reducing the number of States from 28 to 20 and the State borders to be determined by linguistic province. Whereas the 1953's statement of party tended to favour the case for the inclusion of portions of Bihar in West Bengal, this emphasis is missing from its above mentioned Memorandum. A merger of Himachal Pradesh with PEPSU and the Punjab into a Punjabi speaking State advocated in 1953 was abandoned in favour of separate States for Himachal Pradesh. These changes coupled with the party's advocacy of separate provincial States for Tripura and Manipur, tend to support the idea, that the party is shifting its stra-

tegal emphasis to the border areas of North India.

Moderation has characterised the attitude of the Praja Socialist Party (PSP) on the question of linguistic States. It has recognised the need for reorganisation, but it has not favoured a hasty decision on a purely linguistic basis. When it held its special convention at Betul in June 1953, it adopted a cautious resolution on linguistic reorganisation and its bearings and welcomed the Government decision to appoint a commission to consider the problem in all earnest. In general however, the socialists favour a non-emotional approach and lay primary emphasis on national unity.

Among the right Wing communal parties, the two most important ones, the Jana Sangha and the Hindu Mahasabha, agree that some form of the reorganisation is necessary. The Mahasabha, "does not regard the language as the only basis for reformation of States even though it recognises language as the most important basis for such reformation."²⁴ The Jan Sangh says that language is important but should not be the sole criterion. It argues for a unitary form of government and favours the disintegration of Hyderabad.²⁵

The main opposition to the linguistic principle comes from conservative economic interests. Both the All India Manufacturers' Organisation and the All India Exporters' Association have presented Memoranda to the States Re-organisation Commission opposing linguistic reorganisation. Whereas the latter wishes to retain the status quo, the former agrees that some reorganisation is necessary, but it should be based on economic and political principles rather than language.²⁶

As far as the government is concerned it appears that they are not yet fully committed to the idea of linguistic States. The Home Ministry concedes that, "The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance," but the first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India, financial, economic and administrative considerations, it is pointed out, are almost equally important."²⁷



N.B.—General reference for the first 10 paragraphs :—

Language and linguistic problem by Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Languages of India contributed by G. H. Grierson, C.I.E., Ph.D., D. Litt., to the Report on the Census of India—1901

published in 1903 by Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing India—1903.

- ¹ Problems of linguistic States in India by Shri P. Chenchian, M. L. Retd. Chief Judge of Pudukkottah. Page 6, para 6.
Quoted by Brahmshree G. V. Subba Rao in 'Linguistic Provinces and the Dar Commission Report' Pp. 7, para 2.
Quoted by Brahmshree G. V. Subba Rao in 'Linguistic Provinces and the Dar Commission Report' Pp. 7, para 3.
Indian Statutory Commission (The Simon Commission) Report. Vol. II Pp. 24-25, para 38.
Indian Statutory Commission (The Simon Commission) Report. Vol. II Pp. 50 (Appendix VI).
The All Parties Report (Moti Lal Nehru Report) 1928 Pp. 61-69, para 85.
Ibid quoted by Brahmshree G. V. Subba Rao in 'Linguistic Province and Dar Report' Pp. 7, para 7.
Ibid Pp. 8, para 2.
Linguistic Provinces and the Dar Commission Report by Brahmshree G. V. Subba Rao Pp. 10, para 2.
Presidential Address of Dr. R. K. Mukerji at All India League of Linguistic Provinces published by the Working Committee for 1947-48 of the league
(a) Pp. 3, para 4.
(b) Pp. 4, para 7.
(c) Pp. 5, para 8.
(d) Pp. 7, para 21 (Extracts).
Madras Legislative Assembly Debates. Vol. 5, (March to April, 1947), Pp. 1686-1770.
The Dar Commission Report. (Report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission, 1948). Pp. 37, para 146.
Ibid. Pp. 33, para 147.
Ibid. Pp. 34, para 152.
The J.V.P. Report (Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee of Jaipur Congress, 1948). Pp. 15, para 1. Summary and conclusions.
Ibid. Pp. 9, para 1.
White paper on Indian States (1950), Pp. 39, para 94.
Ibid. Pp. 53, para 134.
Ibid. Pp. 50, para 128.
Ibid. Pp. 41, para 99.
Ibid. Pp. 180. Appendix XII. "Mayurbhanj Merger Agreement."
People's Age Vol. VII. No. 10 (September 5, 1948), Pp. 16.
Memorandum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India to the S.R.C. Delhi, CPI 1954. Pp. 9.
'The Hindustan Times', Delhi, June 1, 1954,
'Times of India', Delhi, May 28, 1954.
'The Hindustan Times', Delhi, June 10 and 16, 1954.
Ministry of Home Affairs Resolution, New Delhi, December 29, 1953, Government of India, 1954, Pp. 1.
(The last four have been quoted in Linguistic Regionalism in India by Marshall Windmiller).

Bases of the Demand for the Linguistic Redistribution

Various arguments have been, and continue to be advanced for a linguistic division of India. Of these, the one, which the ruling party finds most difficult to contradict, is the fact that the Indian National Congress itself had given a pledge for its implementation. As Prof. Hari Rao forcefully remarks, "The policy of linguistic provinces was nurtured by the Indian National Congress, adopted as an integral part of its political creed and reaffirmed in its election campaigns."¹ If the Congress has given back on its former policy there must be some weighty reasons for its doing so. Perhaps the change of view is due to the mellowing influence of provincial administrative experience. So it is better that a policy likely to entail grave risks should be abandoned than that an effort should be made to adhere to some past utterances made under different conditions. Indeed, it is up to the people to absolve the Congress of its former commitment in a matter of this kind. National leaders, whose patriotism is above doubt and whose sole endeavour is to create conditions in which India should develop into a prosperous and powerful country, should be permitted to orient themselves in accordance with the changing conditions.

The Dar Committee after an exhaustive analysis of the existing circumstances came to the conclusion that in view of the dangers involved in putting into effect the policy of linguistic provinces, Congress might be relieved of its pledge. The same truth was underlined by the JVP Report which stated :—

"It becomes incumbent upon us therefore, to view the problem of linguistic provinces in the context of today; that context demands above everything the consolidation of India and her freedom; the

progressive solution of her economic problem in terms of masses of of her people ; the promotion of the unity of India and of close co-operation among the various provinces and States in most spheres of activities. It demands further stern discouragement of communalism, provincialism and other separatist and disruptive tendencies.”²

Another argument for linguistic provinces, which has a great deal of plausibility is the fact that the present States were formed in a haphazard fashion to suit the administrative exigencies of the British Government. They were not based on any rational or scientific principle and paid no heed to the emotional urges of the people. This criticism is largely true and universal. Even the Montford Report says, “The present map of British India was shaped by the military, political or administrative exigencies or conveniences of the moment and except in the case of reconstitution of Bengal, with small regard to the natural affinities or wishes of the people.”³

The famous All-Parties Report (1928) also says, “The present distribution of provinces in India has no rational basis. It is merely due to accident and the circumstances attending the British Power in India as a whole. It has little to do with geographical or historical or economic or linguistic reasons. Even from administrative point, it is not a success. It is clear that there must be a redistribution of provinces.”⁴

Likewise, the learned members of the Simon Commission wrote, “The existing provincial boundaries in more than one case embrace areas and people of no natural affinity and sometimes separate those who might, under a different scheme, be more naturally united. These boundaries as a rule have none of the characteristics of a natural frontier. The lines they follow are largely due to the way in which British authority happened to spread over the sub-continent and to the order of the times in which different accretions became joined to what was already organised as an administrative unit.”⁵

Even the Day Report has to admit that, “The existing Indian Provinces are administrative units of British Imperialism. They came into existence in a somewhat haphazard way and were not designed to work as democratic institutions ; they are certainly susceptible of more scientific and rational planning.”⁶

It must be admitted that very often the arguments for linguistic states are sentimental. A strong reason for the linguistic demand lies in the feeling that language area in a multi-lingual State has not received adequate attention from the Government in power. The Andhras, for example, gave as the reason for separation ‘the step-motherly treatment’ they received from Tamils and said that if they

were separated they could pay more attention to the development of the resources of the language belonging to them. This complaint may or may not be justified, but this happened to and happens to be the strongest motive for separation. It should be remembered, however, that such complaints may arise in new linguistic States too and the very complaint made by these Telgus is made by Rayalseema Telgus against them and against Poona Marathas by other Marathas. Such a situation arises because the causes for the struggle, rivalry and for alleged neglect are not in languages but in the communal, caste or class interests and conflicts.

The Dar Committee perhaps rightly remarked that, "the only public good, seen from linguistic States, is the possible advantage it has in the working of the legislature in a regional language. But for this solitary advantage India need not be reconstituted. If our profession of love for Hindi is sincere at all, the adoption of the National language in all the legislatures can easily meet this difficulty."⁷

In his pamphlet, "Linguistic States in regional plan" Mr. A.S.N. Murthy says, "We may have these linguistic States so that the institutional forms of democracy may become dynamic in nationalising the life of the people."⁸ Mr. Murthy says that the idea of linguistic States has become a part of our current political thought. If democracy means that the will of the people should prevail then in view of the demand for linguistic provinces it is clear that provinces should be reconstituted on this basis.⁹ As Mr. Hobson points out, "A Government shall keep itself in the closest sympathy with the concrete feelings and ideas of the people, maintaining such contacts as shall enable its acts or policy to render as substantially correct interpretation of general will."¹⁰

The advocates of linguistic States take care to point out that their formation will be in keeping with the spirit of the Indian Constitution. This step is advocated for the purpose of building up of democratic life on a sound basis and for the socio-cultural progress of the people. It has nothing to do with the concept of sub-nations, exclusive possessions, inviolate territories or right of secession. They say that it is a gross libel to interpret it as a demand for the division of the country.

The protagonists also say that the formation of linguistic provinces does not mean an allotment of territory to a majority linguistic group. The linguistic majority basis is only a criterion to be adopted in drawing boundaries. To say that thereby we allot a territory to a linguistic group is not to say that democracy functions for the majority alone and not for all. This is never meant by linguistic

States. The advocates admit that in the given constitutional set up of the country, the moral and material resources of a province, whether formed on linguistic basis or not, belong and should belong not only to those who reside in it but to all India nationals.

The demand for linguistic States is inspired not only by utilitarian considerations but by the prospect of achieving certain positive results. Thus it is claimed that it is not only a question of inconvenience or strains of a multi-lingual State but a matter of building up a democratic life which lies at the back of the demand. A linguistic province with its administration in the language of common people would make it possible for the people to feel and understand the working of democracy and the need to participate in it. It would provide them with a purpose and with emotional unity for working it up. The people, therefore, see in these linguistic provinces natural units of their socio-cultural advancement and a rational foundation for the national set up.

Reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis may throw up in special relief the problem of linguistic minorities. Other special groups i.e. religious groups, tribal and scheduled caste groups will present no special problem for the reorganised States. These problems are within the existing States and they will neither be modified nor intensified in the reorganised States. The problem of linguistic minorities to-day also exists. It is, therefore, desirable to visualise what the problems of linguistic minorities are and suitable provisions for dealing with them should be made.

The linguistic reorganisation does not involve any change in the status or position of residents in any area whether they are speakers of majority language or minority language. A language being taken as the basis for the formation of a State does not, however, lead to any discrimination between the speakers of that language and the speakers of other languages. The main ground put forward for the reorganisation is the desirability of having certain linguistic, social and cultural features in common. This does not involve either any discrimination against the speakers of other languages or any desire to exclude them from the areas of these States. It should be emphasised that the conditions in this regard in the new State will and cannot be different than those in the present uni-lingual or multi-lingual States. The position of speakers of other languages than the main language of the reconstituted State will not be much different from the position of the speakers other than the Hindi in Uttar Pradesh; languages other than Bengali in West Bengal; languages other than Oriya in Orissa; languages other than Gujrati in Saurashtra.

A very forceful argument for linguistic States depends on the utility of language as a unifying force. The advocates of linguistic provinces contend that in the somewhat fluid conditions of our country, the unifying and consolidating influence of language offers a *via media* for National Unity. The statement requires scrutiny. Whatever binding effect language, culture and caste may have, has already been achieved. The Telgus, Tamils and Malayalese are already bound by common ties of language. This unity stands unbroken whether they are in common or separate States. The statement that language binds, expresses only a truism. The real issue is whether a provincial language can have the way for inter-provincial or supra-provincial or national unity or not? Languages, like religion, both unite and separate. The linguistic movement itself expresses in some cases a separatist tendency as in the case of Andhra. In some cases it is a movement of unity, as in the case of Samyukta Maharashtra. To urge that language unites a nation is to overlook the facts about languages which instead of uniting only tend to separate the people in South India. A State language is likely to operate as a barrier where languages are unintelligible to the people. This happens in the case of the five Dravidian languages. The unifying force of language should not be exaggerated. The partition of Bengal into East and West Bengal (between Pakistan and India) in consequence of the agitation of Bengal Muslims clearly proves that religion is more powerful than language as a tie of unity. Moreover, language plays no part in the pattern of political life of today as a formative influence. It only serves the purpose of communication and mutual understanding. In the legislature the political life moves on party lines. Even in the linguistic States it is so. Language has no power to unite two parties. In Andhra Communists and Congress both speak Telgu and are not very near to each other. Their party cuts across the common language. Ideologies, not the languages, are the uniting and dividing forces of the modern world. Language has no bearing on economic issues which depend upon resources. Within the same language speaking people gulfs have appeared. The Deccan, Konkan and Maha Vidarbha, all Marathi groups till recently lived separate lives.

The supporters say that India is naturally divided in linguistic areas. Major language areas are not too many. People speaking the same language and inhabiting a compact area, though loyal and devoted to the country as a whole, have certain affinities, and would like to live their lives in their own way and this is a very strong point in favour of linguistic states.

Language basis for reorganisation of States is justifiable not merely on the ground of convenience but also because commonness in language denotes over most areas of the country membership of regional society and organisation of distinctive cultural, literary and historical traditions.

The All-India League of Linguistic Provinces supported the formation of linguistic provinces by a resolution at the proceedings of 13-5-1947. The resolution may be summarised as follows :—

‘The Provinces in British India have grown up by force of circumstances or by uncontrolled process of history and are not scientifically planned. This mal-adjustment causes various conflicts of communities. There have been insistent demand from the people concerned, both in legislatures and outside for a reconstitution of India on a linguistic and cultural basis and this should be done as a primary necessity and a preliminary to further constitutional reforms by the Congress.¹¹ The resolution further says that the King Emperor Proclamation of 1911 and recommendations of the Simon Commission and Cabinet Mission had also recommended such reorganisation.’^{11a}

Dr. Radha Kumud Mukerji, at the session of All India League of linguistic provinces, Bezwada, 13-5-1947, supported linguistic provinces, on the following grounds. He said, “the supreme end of the State is to promote culture because culture is one’s country and the country is one’s culture. India’s culture is a synthetic complex made up of a number of diverse elements, each of which makes its own contribution to the comprehensive whole. These elements are chiefly represented by different languages of India. The linguistic map of India shows the vigour and vitality of some of these languages which have produced their own literature and some of it counts as world literature. For example, the Madras presidency is the home of four languages. These four are Dravidian languages and each of them has developed a great literature. They are :—

- (i) Telgu or Andhra (spoken by more than 30 million of people).
- (ii) Tamil or Dravid (owned by nearly 25 million in India together with extra 2 million settled in Ceylon).
- (iii) Kannad or Karnataki (spoken by more than 11 million of people).
- (iv) Malayalam or Keral with Laccadivian (claiming more than 10 million as its speakers).

“It is not possible nor desirable to reduce this linguistic diversity to dead uniformity. It is unthinkable that Madrasis should culti-

vate a common language. A language, which is artificially created and cultivated as a common medium of communication between speakers of different languages is devoid of vitality which creates literature. Language is not an artificial creation but a natural growth and formation out of its inner spring of thought, pure and undefiled. Each language stands for its own thought and order of ideas. Hindi and Urdu differ in their characteristic ideas for example and both have excellent literatures. Thus each language that has produced a literature is the vehicle of a particular type of ideas and culture associated with the manners and customs of a people and their ways, modes of thinking, their mental and moral outlook."

"Linguistic diversity is to be, therefore, maintained and fostered on principle by a National Government which must stand for the diversity of culture. Madras Government is charged with the responsibility of promoting four principal languages and the culture they represent. Tamil ranks next to Sanskrit in the value of its thought and its contents. Its originality, diversity and antiquity may be traced to the early centuries of Christian Era. Kannad is almost equally so. Telgu goes back to about 1000 A.D. and is the younger sister of Tamil. All these four Dravidian languages derive words of higher thought from Sanskrit which links them with Northern Arayan languages except Urdu."

"Here, then, is a case for a linguistic division of the Madras Presidency into four units. Same is the case with other areas and States. What is needed for the purpose, is what may be called the cultural autonomy of each linguistic unit to enable it to make its complete contribution not merely to South India but also to the culture of India as a whole. The consequence of this cultural autonomy for each linguistic division will be that within the territorial limit of each division education will be imparted in and through the medium of its mother-tongue as far as possible in all its grades—primary, secondary and advanced. Universities in the linguistic areas will be organised more and more as centres of separate culture."¹² These are the views of Dr. R. K. Mukerji, one of the great Historians and linguistic authorities of India.

The advocates of linguistic provinces also say that the linguistic reorganisation will not raise any constitutional or political problem of its own. In one direction no doubt certain transitional difficulties will have to be faced by immigrants in all States. This is due to a transformation which will take place throughout India in near future. Immigrants from one linguistic State will not in future be able to neglect the regional language as they used to do formerly. The

regional language will more and more predominate in State administration and a knowledge of it will be compulsory to those who will want any employment within the region. This must be considered on the whole to be a beneficial development. Hitherto in spite of large movements of intellectuals from one region to another there has arisen no effective understanding between various parts, because with the prevalence of English the migrants did not feel called upon to familiarise themselves with the language, habits and ideas of the people of the region to which they have migrated. The new requirement, though beneficial in the long run, may no doubt create some difficulties in transitional period. It may also create hardships wherever large linguistic minorities are permanently settled, unless a liberal linguistic policy is followed by all the States.

Apart from these arguments many economic arguments are put forward by the linguistic advocates and they are as follows :—

✓ Linguistic division will promote administrative economy. The administrative machinery for a part of an old province would necessarily be less costly but it is true only about provinces which are carved out of bigger provinces e.g., the Andhra province, but it cannot apply to new States which are likely to be larger than the old provinces such as the contemplated province of Maha Delhi. Even in smaller provinces economic gains appear more apparent than real. A smaller province needs as many departments and officers as a bigger one. The Governors, the High Court Judges and other high officers will have to be paid the same salaries. The higher officers are paid by their status and not by the quantum of work turned out by them and their salaries cannot be reduced. Any economies that may be effected by the reduction of clerical staff and the size of public buildings are more than counter-balanced by new development departments and the amount to be spent on the new capitals which some of the new provinces will require.

✓ Another problem regarding the plans for economic development will be that of reconciliation. With all areas clamouring for greater expenditure and waiting for development, it will be very difficult to adjust their claims. However, it is the peculiarity of multi-lingual States that in each one of them suspicion of favouritism and charges of partiality have centered round the linguistic division. Each linguistic group in a multi-lingual State considers that it has been unfairly treated. It is irrelevant whether the suspicions are well founded or not. What they indicate is not necessarily the exercise of favouritism but a basic situation in which whatever happens, is called favouritism. It is not a part of statesmanship to perpetuate a situation which

gives rise to constant bickerings. For all these reasons the working of multi-lingual States has proved to be of continuously increasing difficulties. With a negative role for the State under a foreign rule, the difference did not matter greatly but with an emphasis on development and welfare activities, it is bound to be accentuated.

A considerable data in the Reports of the Finance Commissions of 1952 and 1957 shows how far the new linguistic States will be economically viable. The Commissions indicate that financial strength is not directly connected with the size. The most striking feature of the statistical data given by the Commissions is the large difference in per capita revenue from State to State. It might be argued that even though a small State might have a high per capita revenue, the cost of collection, the cost of administrative services and other charges which might be considered as over head charges, would be comparatively high and this would make it impossible for the State to maintain an efficient service or undertake development expenditure. Cost of collection could be seen to be very high proportionately in States like Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Hyderabad and very low proportionately in States like Saurashtra and Mysore. Partly this might be a function of density of population. A large but sparsely populated State might have high costs of collection.

The extent of expenditure on social services in general is also not always smaller proportionately than in the smaller size States. In both Saurashtra and Travancore and Cochin the expenditure was near the average or higher than in the larger States like Bihar. The per capita expenditure on such services as education, medical and public health appears to vary chiefly in relation to per capita revenue receipt, so that Bombay with a higher per capita revenue is able to spend higher per capita sums on these services while Bihar and U.P. with low per capita revenue spend much smaller per capita amount than the average for the whole of India on these services.¹³

The general conclusion drawn from these data is that the extent to which a State is able to spend on development or social services, is a function not so much of its area or population as of per capita revenue. Per capita revenue in turn appears related much more fundamentally to the level of regional incomes than to any other factor. In considering the financial weakness or strength of States in India the most important point would, therefore be the comparative poverty or richness of the particular region which forms the State.

It is also clear that the increase of size alone does not lead to a substantial change in financial strength. A large State in a poor region may be considered as less viable than a fairly small State in a

comparatively rich region. However, general principle adopted for the organisation of States cannot differ from region to region in India and the poorer cannot be treated separately because States within them are likely to be less viable. Ultimately the final problem must be considered for the country as a whole and a necessary adjustment between the richer and poorer must be made through the action of Union Government. Therefore, the first conclusion in this discussion is that no absolute tests of viability are available such as will veto definitely the formation of a State when other considerations point to the desirability of this being done. V2.1306P K9

It must be remembered that the concept of viability will have importance only to the extent of indicating where the pooling of resources by the formation of a larger unit is likely to prove beneficial. A larger State even in a moderately well off region may have considerable economic strength, which will be lost, if in such a region units are unnecessarily duplicated. 78840

It is argued that none of prospective States is likely to be less viable than a large number of States actually functioning today and in which no question of reorganisation on grounds of viability or any other, has been raised. Among the States which conform to the test of linguistic, social and cultural homogeneity are three, namely Assam, Orissa and Rajasthan and deserve in this connection particular attention. Assam has a population and size much smaller than any of the reorganised States in South and West India. It has, however, a comparatively high per capita revenue and barring the special burden imposed on it, of expenditure in connection with development of tribal areas, the State does not need external financial assistance. Orissa and Rajasthan are both States large in area and fairly populous but in terms of per capita revenue both are low among existing States and both have considerable needs of finance for developmental and welfare activities. The comparative irrelevance of viability in the formation of States is illustrated by the case of Orissa and Rajasthan. By any test they would be among the less viable, that is the less economically strong, in the States of India. They should form part of any larger unit to increase their viability.

Reorganisation will prove beneficial for economic development. It will pave the way for comparatively full integrated plans being prepared within boundaries of each State. Homogeneity of political sentiments and the urge for common achievements will make the process of democratic planning easier to initiate and more fruitful when started. The emotional response so necessary in arduous planning for development will be much more readily forthcoming within

the reorganised States than within the present mixed States.

Social problems in India differ in particular characteristics from one linguistic group to another linguistic group. The strains and stresses of relations between Brahman and Non-Brahman communities are not noticed in the North while being very prominent in the South. Within the South itself they differ from one linguistic region to another. The problem of scheduled castes in particular differs widely from region to region. In Maharashtra an important problem enters round the improvement of economic and social status of the Mahar community. This problem is of a similar character throughout the area from Konkan to the Nagpur Division. The Dravid movement is a peculiar problem of the Tamil country and in religious castes like Lingayats the social problem is even more acute. Though the general approach to all these problems should be on the lines indicated by the directives of the constitution, the particular aspects in which they are manifested can be successfully tackled only in the context of particular regional societies.

Thus it is not only a question of language or of historical memories which is here involved. In each caste society all these major problems of social evolution are present. In these societies are also found many of the factors which influence the functioning of political life in the country. For an appreciation of the essential socio-economic and political problems and concerted solution, it is, thus, absolutely necessary that the primary political unit i.e., the State, must be socially homogeneous. This homogeneity may best be achieved on linguistic basis.

It may be mentioned that not only the members of an upper caste society are held together in a common social structure in a region but that the people, outside the castes have also had traditionally well defined relations with it. During the British Rule a process of disintegration set in by which members of these societies fell away from each other. Now within the new Indian Republic with its emphasis on secularism and its directive towards social democracy some new integrative process should be set in motion. The creation of a real homogeneous society could only be attained by treating deliberately and carefully the special problems of each differentiated social structure. Adherents of the various religions must be encouraged to consider themselves as members of one undifferentiated regional society. For this purpose, however, an appropriate political setting needs to be provided and it is one of the merits of the reorganisation of States on linguistic basis that it provides just that setting.

Apprehension has been expressed that with the formation of linguistic States particular social groups in each State will attain a position of overwhelming importance and may be in a position to exercise political power. With regard to the general exercise of political power there is no apprehension. The ordinary working of constitutional democracy will not be seriously effected by such a factor. However, we realise that in relation to the position of scheduled castes or scheduled tribes special safeguards are necessary in existing conditions irrespective of above mentioned apprehensions. Therefore, it is necessary to safeguard the primary means and interests of these classes which though provided for in the constitution are not yet always met in practice. This problem could only be solved by finding suitable ways of attempting a solution of this problem in consultation with the leaders of the community.

In this large country with its vast population, with its historical complexity and diversity the formation of a single homogeneous society functioning democratically all over the country is well outside the bounds of practical expectations. The important target that can be attained, is large undifferentiated societies, in areas where already some element of commonness and homogeneity exists. The linguistic, cultural and social regions of which in the main India is formed, presents the only possibility in this direction. The formation of States on the basis of these linguistic cultural-societies is thus not only politically highly desirable but is almost a necessary condition for progress to be made in the direction of social democracy.

Some people contend that reorganisation of States on linguistic or other basis will cut up the Indian Society. This contention presupposes that Indian society is a single homogeneous unit,—which is not correct. The recognition of importance of regional societies is as helpful to the growth of the sentiment of all India unity as the growth of civic consciousness is to the working of national democracy. Those who talk loosely about regional grouping antagonistic to all-India unity are ordinarily moving on a restricted plane. They usually belong to the urban class holding economic, administrative or political power. They fear that the establishment of a number of new States will destroy that monopoly of power which they have hitherto enjoyed.

A primary unit, which evokes spontaneous loyalty and is fully democratically governed, is a much greater asset to a federation than a primary unit of diverse elements in which continuous frictions are present. The experience, whether in India or elsewhere, of the history of heterogeneous units of administration has been the same. After

more than a century of association, Orissa heaved a sigh or relief on its separation from Bihar. The demand, "Bihar for Biharis" is noted in the Hardinge Despatch of 1909 and the residual of Bengali-Bihari controversy has still a considerable disturbing potential. The bickerings of the various elements forcibly held together in Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad and in Bombay State had been notorious. An association however, long, is incapable in itself of building up an emotional background, if the essential ingredients needed for this, are lacking.

To say that the straining of relations between linguistic groups is a result of the demand for the creation of linguistic provinces, is to reverse the actual causal relation. Different linguistic groups have lived without friction in a multi-lingual unit only when the aspirations of all of them have been suppressed. With the acquisition of political power and the possibility of self-development, differences have arisen which have become deeper and deeper as the power and possibilities have progressively increased.

Experience since the attainment of Independence has shown that continued existence of multi-lingual States not only denies the advantages following the commonness of language and tradition but also creates unnecessarily a number of chronic insoluble problems. The most important is the problem of the language. The fact that Bombay State was a multi-lingual State led the Bombay Government at one time to introduce a bill for using Hindi as the official language of administration instead of the regional languages. The bill had to be withdrawn because of the opposition encountered. In the same way an attempt was made by the Minister of Education through departmental action to introduce Hindi as medium of instruction in all Government colleges; most of the universities encountered opposition, particularly the universities of Gujarat and Poona. Such strains and stresses, would be entirely avoidable and unnecessary in a uni-lingual State. The language of administration and of education is a matter that touches in practice many vital aspects of life of every one. Such matters arouse feelings readily. It is obviously unwise to continue arrangements where such difficulties are bound to be chronic.

There are important administrative considerations to be noted in connection with this linguistic reorganisation of States. The advocates of linguistic reorganisation say that there are no special administrative factors which dictate one particular basis of reorganisation of States rather than the other. Too large areas or areas cut off by inseparable physical barriers or too small areas are barred by the administrative considerations. Between these extremes, administrative

considerations do not provide any guide for the reorganisation of States. Here again, keeping strictly to the task in hand, it is clear that the suggested basis of reorganisation yields units which are on the one hand, neither too small for the proper functioning of State Government nor, on the other hand, too large for efficient administration.

It is argued that large States are inefficient but experience of Indian Administration since Independence does not in any way support this conclusion. It may be safely asserted that in some of the largest States in India there is disorder at peripheries, but this disorder is not related to their size. It may be also asserted that law and order and efficiency of administration are connected not with the size of the States but with economic and social conditions within them and with the tempers and traditions of their people. In recent history special difficulties have been created by happenings arising out of the partition, which have made for a weakening of administration in particular States. For example, it can be said that Bombay was one of the largest States but was not certainly one of the least efficient or one in which authority was not exercised efficiently at the peripheries. The traditions regarding the maintenance of law and order and administrative efficiency in the South and West again are such that any reasonable administrative units formed out of these regions are likely to prove administratively as efficient as existing ones. Therefore on grounds of pure administrative convenience or efficiency there is no special directive or principle emerging which can be used in the planning of the reorganisation of States on any basis whatsoever.

With regard to administration it is not particularly desirable that the area of a State should be formed of a homogeneous economic region. As a fact, in relation to such possibilities as the failure of the season or the collapse of a particular crop, it is better to have if possible, a balance of regions within a State. It is clear however, that the Constitution of States in economic or geographical terms will depend on the type of regions in which they are formed and economic or geographical considerations cannot help in shaping the basic principle for determining the boundaries of State as an administrative unit.

It may be said that the larger considerations of economic geography should prevail while considering an administrative unit. The physical and geographical considerations have varying importance in varying contexts and give different answers in relation to different tests. It is a matter of common knowledge that even in current administration, whereas the revenue unit is formed of fairly compact contiguous areas, other units of departmental administration i.e.

Forest or the Irrigation, have to follow peculiar lines of their own.

Thus it is argued that a common history, a common cultural and literary tradition and a sentiment of oneness form the proper basis for an administrative unit. Other factors, such as that of financial viability, administrative convenience, or economic geography are also very important but they cannot hinder in any significant way the adoption of linguistic principle. At the most these considerations can suggest certain extreme limits for the size of States as an administrative unit.

There is, however, a limiting condition for the administrative working of purely linguistic provinces and it is the economic factor as pointed out by Dr. Radha Kumud Mukerji, a prominent supporter of linguistic States. He says, "A province as a separate administrative unit must be a self-sufficient economic unit as far as possible. Where a linguistic unit is not economically independent and self-contained, it may still be possible to assure its separate cultural evolution by suitable administrative arrangements. The linguistic areas may still hold together under common provincial administration with arrangements for their separate working in the sphere of linguistic and cultural interests. The provinces will have a cabinet, responsible for the administration of the whole State but care will be taken to compose it in such a way that it includes the representatives of different linguistic sub-divisions. Details of this scheme of provincial administration providing for cultural autonomy of its leading linguistic communities, will have to be worked out by a committee of experts."²⁴

The supporters say the linguistic States do not mean any danger to national unity because our national Constitution gives full control to Government at the Centre about banking, finance etc. The Central budget which helps the progress of these States has also its distinctive influence in co-ordinating and regulating the activities of different States. All important departments are controlled by the Centre. So linguistic provinces will help and not retard the progress of the country.

It is also emphasised by the supporters of the linguistic principle that a large number of smaller States will make the working of federal constitution smoother than if the States are larger but this is not a balanced argument because a federation is based on division of power between states and the Centre and not on the size of the units. In most of the federations there are clear cut provisions in this regard. Our constitution is not an exception in this respect. Constitutional conflicts, if they arise at all, will arise whatever the size of

the units may be. It depends more on the working of the Government and on the spirit of adjustment than on the size of the units.

The reference may also be made to the breadth of outlook, habit of working together etc. which are supposed to be cultivated in a multi-lingual State as contrasted with parochialism of uni-lingual States. In support of this opinion these virtues of multi-lingual States are illusory, the defects of their working patent and large. They say if the country as a whole decides that the multi-lingual principle of reorganisation gives the best results, it must perforce be adopted universally, so that reorganisation may take place on one or other line. If multi-linguism has its merits then all the uni-lingual States must be reorganised so as to follow that pattern. Otherwise reorganisation on a uni-lingual line must go forward. Mere continuance of present position is an evidence of indifference of those who are in power to the acute difficulties felt by large groups within the Union. And if a final solution is evolved or perpetuated, suspicion must rightly be entertained that the demands and the feelings of all groups have no equal weight with those in authority.

We have seen what the arguments of the advocates of linguistic redistribution of States are. It is time now that we should look at the other side of the picture. The arguments on the other side may be summarised as follows:—

Linguistic distribution will necessarily entail a radical recast of States and is fraught with great practical difficulties. It is as if bones are broken for the simple fun of resetting them again.

The first difficulty is that as soon as a new State is formed it begins to lay claim to neighbouring areas and the old passions and claims and counter-claims, instead of cooling down remain simmering and are easily set aflame again. It is to be noticed that the cry which is being raised for Statehood is not confined to narrow areas but spreads over to larger chunks of territory. Thus Maharashtra leads to Samyukta Maharashtra, Karnataka to Maha-Karnataka and Kerala to Eikya-Keral. The only effect of meeting such demands which will increase in crescendo will be the complete annihilation of some existing States and the substitution of a map, vastly different from the present one. The adoption of linguistic States principle has changed Bombay State beyond recognition and Hyderabad has disappeared as a separate State and if linguistic reorganisation is carried to its logical conclusion there will be many more such changes.

There will arise acute border problems. Borderland disputes between European and Indian experience shows, leave a trail of painful feelings and a spirit of retaliation. The Trieste problem in Europe :

the Bellary problem in Andhra in India are instances in point. Telugus claim Bellary for Andhra while Mysore State claims it for itself. Arbitration and judicial decisions are of no use because the losing party denounces the judgment.

The debatable land may consist of a solid block of one language or blocks of two languages, one major and the other minor. Now, on what principle the division be made? Should districts, Taluqs or villages with bare, substantial or preponderant majority be taken as a unit? Accordingly as one or the other principle is adopted the size and dimensions will vary. The desire to get back what is lost always remains with the losing party and disputes are not settled. If the preponderant majority rule is adopted, Karnataka will not have the taluqs of Hospet and Siruguppa and some portion of Mallapura sub-taluq. It was on this ground that Akhand Karnataka Parishad denounced the S.R.C. Report and presented a memorandum to the Central Government. This is one of the many other examples which prove that border land disputes are an obstacle to linguistic division.

Capital cities also present difficulties. Most capital cities and ports tend to be cosmopolitan and multi-lingual in population. They are more or less biological organisations and not mere compositions. In linguistic divisions they will be dismembered and degraded. These towns have created non-communal and non-caste units of invaluable worth to India. At this juncture of her history when we are fighting communalism, provincialism and fanaticism, to disintegrate them would be an irreparable loss to the Indian nation. Linguism foments and promotes the resistance to all-India Unity.

Language serves as a separatist factor. Without denying that language binds, it must be admitted that it separates also by erecting speech barriers between linguistic States and communities. It acts like the other two factors in a trio—religion, language and community. The history of India says how religion and community have broken us to pieces; we cannot reasonably hope that the third factor will operate in a different way.

Linguistic States will certainly impose insurmountable barriers between State and State. The pattern which linguistic States produce resembles separated points connected to the centre like spokes in a rimless wheel. The unity of India to be abiding and enduring should not only connect States with the Centre, but also connect the States with each other. Unified India should be a circle with a centre. Linguistic States cannot achieve this. Language will be put to the same use as communalism and provincialism. Linguism by its inherent

tendencies allies itself with the other two, communalism and sectarianism and forms a trio of evil repute. It can easily be used for interstate animosities, rivalries and destructive competition. Diversity of language cannot impair the integrity of culture or religion. Multilingual provinces, far from harming culture and language have nourished them. In the last analysis linguistic provinces are the expression of the tribal feeling and outlook in modern conditions, with this difference that while in the past they formed smaller communal union in the present they may prevent the large national union.

The supreme need of the time is the creation of a living sense of Indian Unity and biological integration of India into a body with States as limbs. The Dar Report stresses this point as follows :—

“The first and last need of India at the present moment is that it should be a nation. All the multifarious problems which clamour for an immediate solution have got to be considered in relation to this paramount necessity. Everything that help nationalism has to go forward and anything which throws obstacles in its way has to be rejected and should stand over. We have applied this test to linguistic States and in our opinion they fail and cannot be supported.”¹⁵ “The J.V.P. Report reiterated this view, “The first consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendencies should be rigorously discouraged.”¹⁶

The advocates of the linguistic provinces by their exclusive concentration on provincial needs are creating conditions which will only succeed in retarding India's progress towards unity. They pay only lip-service to the national ideal and are unable to grasp its true significance. National unity cannot be achieved by any manipulation of old factors of limited unity—religion, community, culture and language or by their extension. The only way in which it can be attained is by evolving within the Nation a new outlook. Communalism and linguism can never take us to the conception of a united India. Communal and linguistic homogeneity may make for Hindu unity but cannot achieve the unity and vaster integration of three communities—Hindus, Muslims and Christians. The precondition for Indian nationality is not to identify it with Hindu nationality alone but to conceive it in terms of India as a whole. The history of England teaches us this lesson. Composed of three divergent societies—English, Scotch and Irish—it evolved a new British-unity not by exploiting the powers of these communities for synthesis and fusion, but by engaging itself in building an empire which at every turn required a new quality of the spirit and the mind. In the process of empire building England reconstituted itself into a being not synthetic but new and vitally different

from its parts. We can ascend to a new India by transcending provinces and communities and languages and by evoking altogether new powers and potencies. In such an ascent three factors play a determining part (i) a new language (ii) a new context of life demanding a new renunciation (iii) a new vision of India.

✓ *New language*:—The constitution lays down that Hindi in Dev Nagri script should be the language of the Indian Union. This Hindi, stands apart from State language and provincial Hindi. The Hindi of Constitution belongs to Hindustani genus i.e., the language of the Union of Muslims and Hindus. It shall be the duty of the Union to promote and spread the Hindi language and to develop it in such a way that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of India. Thus Hindi far from being the old parent of many provincial languages of the north is really the child of all languages of India in north and south. It transcends Hindustani, Persian, English and Sanskrit. It broods over them all, instilling into them an all-India breadth and depth, not attainable by old languages—a new creation to serve a new purpose—a new Indian tongue born of old ones. Hindi cannot serve this mission if it exists side by side with other provincial languages, having no higher function than that of an interpreter between different provincial languages. Regional Languages will prevent Hindi from performing its appointed task if they are to be all in all as they promise to be in linguistic provinces. One language only spoken throughout the province might weld the people together. But this will happen at the expense of Hindi and to the extent that the progress of Hindi as an all-India language is retarded, national unity will suffer.

2. *A new vision of India*:—We need a new vision of India. We should conceive India in terms of a living body of which provinces are the limbs and not as a mechanical structure, made up of disjointed self-sufficient parts. The poetic and emotional realisation of India requires that we should think of it as a personality that expresses itself through a body which it animates and permeates. We have such a conception in Bharat-Mata. There are maps of India which with a touch here and a touch there, are turned into the figure of a lady—Bharat-Mata. Such maps symbolise correctly the new vision of India. Linguistic provinces creat limbs which they want to unite into a body. That is not the way of life. 'Pinda' energised by life differentiates itself into limbs. We should not, rather we cannot, ascend from the limbs to body but can only descend from the body to the limbs. The words of our Prime Minister are apt in this concern. In his message to 'The Hindu' (Andhra State Supplement), he

says, "There is no progress today without that essential unity and a considerable measure of centralisation. We weaken politically, if we think too much of the parts and less of the whole—one of the primary tasks today as the real emotional integration of India."

3. *A new context for the new India*:—There are two gifts of the British rule for which we may be grateful, one, the inundating of Indian mind with fertilizing streams of a new dynamic culture, the other, bringing together of different languages, and cultural communities on a territorial area and welding them together into a homogeneous whole. The second gift was all the more precious as it unwittingly solved a problem, which was present in Indian history with persisting tenacity—the creation of one India. The strongest argument against linguistic provinces arises from the fact that reducing India into homogeneous linguistic units would not contribute to Indian oneness but only would succeed in magnifying communities making it difficult to transcend them. The true solution of the problem consists in having heterogeneous units of multi-language and multi-cultural groups. We have to replace tribal units by a new national integration.

To create a new India we need, not only a new ideology but also a new context of life. Our schools, colleges, conferences and fellowships should be all-India. The combined effect of provincialism, linguism is to promote the sentiment,—'My province, My all.' In such an environment, India becomes a pale, bloodless sentiment devoid of all effectiveness and emotional vitality. The fusion of people of different nationalities, religions and languages constitutes the historic mission of India. To abandon this experiment of creating heterogeneous units and to go back to cultural and communal unities is to prove false to our call and mission.¹⁷

Both in Europe and India, multi-lingual groups were able to integrate themselves into territorial units. Mr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji points out that 'Britain, France, Soviet Russia, China, Mexico, Spain, the States of Central and South America, Canada and South Africa, Czechoslovakia, Eire, Afghanistan are polyglot States.'¹⁸

Linguistic States are not desirable because they lead to narrow provincialism, mutual bickerings and rivalries. "If each province will begin to look upon itself as a separate sovereign unit, India's independence would lose its meaning and with it would vanish the freedom of various units as well. The spirit underlying the movement is not unlike what brought the partition of the country. Such a spirit would bring the end of our nationhood. The world outside does not know us as Gujratis, Maharashtrians or Tamilians but only as Indians.

We must, therefore, resolutely discourage all these fissiparous tendencies and should feel and behave as Indians"¹⁹ said Gandhiji.

The Dar Commission opposed linguistic provinces on the following ground. In para 137, the report stated:—

“Nationalism and sub-nationalism are two emotional experiences which grow at the expense of each other. In a linguistic province, sub-nationalism will always be a dominant force and will always evoke greater emotional response and in a conflict between the nascent rationalism is sure to lose ground and will ultimately be submerged.”²⁰

The report further states—“This is certainly not the time for embarking upon the enterprise of redrawing the map of the whole of southern India, including the Deccan, Bombay and the Central provinces (Para 132). The commission pointed out that there were a number of problems with which this country was confronted and that they were enough to tax the ingenuity and energy of her people. To add to the problems by raising the question of linguistic States would merely mean creating another headache. It is a formidable list which was compiled by the commission and most of the difficulties to which it drew attention have not so far been removed i.e., the major operation of Indian partition and its after effects; an undeclared war with Pakistan; the refugee problem and that of feeding its teeming millions; a depleted and over-strained administration; the experiment with autonomous States and adult franchise;²¹ the defence problem; the food problem and many other problems with which India is burdened today.²² are to be solved foremost in the opinion of the Commission.

The linguistic provinces will result in the formation of groups into nation with pride in their race, language and literature. The Central legislature will be a league of nations and the Central Executive may become a meeting ground of separate and solidified nations, filled with consciousness of their being separate in culture and therefore, in interests too. They may develop the mentality of political insubordination i.e., refusal to obey the majority or of staging walk-outs and this will make the working of Central Government impossible.

The creation of linguistic provinces will be fatal to the maintenance of necessary administrative relations between the Centre and Provinces. If each province adopts its own language as its official language, the Central Government will have to correspond in as many official languages as there are linguistic provinces. This will be an impossible task. How great a deadlock linguistic provinces will create

in the working of governmental machine can be better understood by studying the linguistic provinces in connection with the judiciary. In the new set up, each province will have a High Court with a series of subordinate courts below it. At the apex of these High Courts will be the Supreme Court with the right to hear appeals against the decisions of the High Courts. On the basis of linguistic provinces courts of each province will conduct their proceedings in the language of the province. What is the Supreme Court to do when its jurisdiction is invoked for rectifying a wrong done by the High Court? The Supreme Court will have to close down. For, if it is to function, every judge of the Supreme Court and the lawyers must know the language of every province, which is impossible to provide for.

It may lead to a break up of India. Instead of remaining united, India may and is becoming Europe, faced with prospects of chaos and disorder. In a country where communalism and castism have already a powerful hold, the language question too has explosive possibilities, which must be held in check if the hardwon unity and freedom of the country are not to be placed in peril once again.

We may, in the end, glance at the views expressed by some prominent politicians, leaders of public opinion, commercial associations and legislative assemblies on the subject of linguistic States.

After the report of the S.R.C. was published, the Madras Legislative Assembly passed a resolution expressing the opinion, "in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bilingual States, with regional councils for each linguistic area."²⁴

While on a tour of Karnataka, Prime Minister, Shri Nehru arrived in Gokak on April 8, 1956. In his speech here he said that India was one nation and linguistic agitation a self-infliction of injuries and warned that it would only result in further division and disunity, ultimately affecting the very existence of the nation. He also said, that agitation was taking the form of 'pressure tactics'.²⁵

He said, "Remember we are part of one body. If a single finger is hurt, the pain affects the whole body. India is the body and States are its limbs."

"Let us not repeat the history, let us not divide and destroy ourselves" he declared. He further said agitation in the name of language was abhorrent. It would lead to unhappiness. Indians must condemn such activities with one voice." The best way of settling differences for both parties to a dispute is to meet, discuss and come to an amicable settlement. Government will gladly accept such

settlement.²⁶

Speaking at a dinner-meeting of the Cochin Rotary Club on October 4th, 1955, Dr. Jivraj Mehta, Bombay's Finance Minister, expressed the fear that a redistribution of States on linguistic basis might create several administrative problems and difficulties for the Centre. It would cause chaotic conditions in the country and would lead to disharmony. Referring to Mahatama Gandhi, he said that Gandhiji conceived of the linguistic redistribution for a very different purpose. In the days of freedom struggle, to give an impetus to the fight and to enable leaders to develop real contacts with the people of their region, Gandhiji originated the idea of forming the committees on the basis of language in various parts of the country. Dr. Mehta said that now the conditions have changed considerably. There is a strong Centre to look after important internal and external problems. Linguistic States will do nothing except lead to disharmony.²⁷

The Working Committee of the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation in a memorandum submitted to the S.R.C. emphasized that the formation of the States should be geo-nomic and geo-politic, because on this basis each State can develop its resources fully. The memorandum made it clear that it is unable to understand the demand for linguistic States because except for the narrow and limited purpose of encouraging a vernacular language, it has no economic or geographical foundation and is not in the interest of the unity and freedom of the country. It will be very risky to cut the country into uneconomic units whose very existence as viable units would be a matter of permanent concern to the Union Government and consequently to the people of the country as a whole.²⁸

R.S.S. Chief Mr. M.S. Golwalkar vehemently opposed the move for the formation of linguistic States in the country and said that it would undermine the unity of the nation. Mr. Golwalkar, who was presiding over the Anti-provincialism Conference on May 23rd, 1955, in Bombay said that this craze for linguistic States was fraught with grave dangers and those who had the interest of the country at heart should oppose this move. He declared, "If India was to remain one and united we should not divide the country on linguistic basis as this will jeopardize our hard won freedom." He characterised the linguistic States move as "Anti-national, anti-social and anti-cultural."²⁹

Mr. Dayabhai Patel, Mayor of Bombay, who inaugurated this Conference, said that the linguistic move would divide the loyalties of the people.³⁰

A memorandum submitted jointly by the All-India Exporters' Association and All-India Importers' Association to the S.R.C.,

declared, "The present agitation raging for the redistribution of the country on a linguistic basis is fraught with most dangerous consequences in as much as it would provoke a score of bitter border disputes, which might jeopardize the peace in the country." It also added, "The country is still groaning under the after-effects of the most unfortunate partition of India bringing in its wake untold misery and innumerable hardships to millions. It is a tragedy that while the wounds are still fresh the lesson of recent history should have been lost on those leaders who now vociferously champion again the division of the country on a linguistic basis."³²

The Citizens' Committee of Bombay also opposed the linguistic States. It declared that they were basically unsound. A linguistic State by the very logic of its formation was based on the principle of intolerance and unwillingness to work with other linguistic groups in a spirit of co-operation and collaboration and thus they negate one of the basic fundamentals of democracy. Mere linguistic affinity provides a superficial bond for binding the people in terms of spontaneous loyalty to the ideal of Democracy.³³

Dr. K.B. Menon, leader of the P.S.P. in Madras Assembly on January 19th, 1957, at Salem said that linguistic division of India was a retrograde step likely to result in 'narrow provincialism' and will work against national unity.³³

Shri C. Rajagopalachari said in Madras on January 20th, 1956, in a speech that linguistic competition going on in the country was fight among men, not among languages. In order to maintain political liberty, we had to recall again the principle of cooperation. Otherwise it was not necessary that America or England should conquer us, internal degeneration was enough to deprive us of our hard won freedom. Linguistic division of States was a 'Tribal idea'. Time had not arrived when we could have mono-lingual States. Whatever line they might draw they would have border disputes. There were only two solutions for the problem." said Shri Rajagopalachari. "One was the Zonal proposal making Zonal areas as the base and the Centre as a federation. The other one was to have bilingual and trilingual combination."³⁴

Shri Ashok Mehta, while presiding over the Ahmedabad Praja Socialist Workers' Sammelan on January 30th, 1957, said that the linguistic agitation was harmful to the unity of the country. Referring to the incidents in Bombay and elsewhere over States reorganisation controversy he said, "If brotherhood and confidence among different language groups were weakened, entire nation would be in a danger of disintegration and national interest would be undermined."³⁵

Principal Devprasad Ghosh of Bengal, while presiding over State Jan Sangh conference in Calcutta on February 6th, 1957, opposed linguistic States and reiterated the State Jan Sangh's proposal for division of the country into half a dozen big multi-lingual zones, so that the economy in administration and greater integration could be secured.³⁶ ✓

Dr. S.K. Sinha, Chief Minister of Bihar, supported multi-lingual States as against linguistic States. He said that the creation of multi-lingual States would achieve the object of cutting at the very root of the whole ideal of subnationality and the tribal feelings associated with it. When people speaking different languages and with some cultural differences will have to line up and work together in a single administrative unit, they necessarily will begin to understand each other and will develop a tolerant and wide outlook. In a State with a single language and culture on the other hand, the feeling of separateness will tend to grow and with it will grow degree of suspicion and intolerance towards other units.³⁷ ✓

Mr. N.C. Chatterjee M.P., declared on February 12th, 1957, in Amritsar that regional frenzy could never contribute to India's unity. He added, "Narrow loyalties, whether based on communal or provincial or linguistic considerations ally themselves with disruptive forces and become instruments of inter-State discord. The basic principle of our politics is AKHAND BHARAT."³⁸ ✓

Dr. B.C. Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal also declared that any attempt to reorganise States on a linguistic basis would lead to excitement and disturbances as unfortunately occurred in Bombay and Orissa. He further said, "Linguistic division of States was fraught with dangers of producing commotion and disorder."³⁹ ✓

It would be interesting at this stage to refer to Mahatama Gandhi's views on the subject of linguistic States. Was he a supporter or an opponent of this idea? Broadly speaking, he favoured the establishment of linguistic States. In the first place, he thought that such a division of India would put an end to mutual suspicions and jealousies which existed in States comprising different linguistic areas. In the second place, he thought that linguistic States would contribute to the cultural development of the country. Cultural development implied the development of various languages and the best way to do so was to split India into linguistic regions, each with its distinctive language. This language would be the medium of instruction in schools and the official language of the region. These two factors could be depended upon to stimulate the development of the language and its corresponding culture.⁴⁰ ✓

Mahatma Gandhi pondered over the question whether linguistic States would add to the unity of India or lead to her dismemberment. He had no hesitation in saying that if there was any likelihood of their endangering the unity of India, they must be ruled out. Nevertheless, he did not fear such and unfortunate development. "Linguistic States," he asserted "will work for India's unity," but he added a word of caution. "The attempt to introduce linguistic States should be preceded," he warned, "by a healthy atmosphere of mutual friendliness and trust. It was only if such an atmosphere were present that the different language groups should decide—and decide themselves—the boundaries of their States." It is significant that he did not want this work to be entrusted to a boundary commission. The decision of the boundary commission, he feared, might be welcomed by a certain linguistic group and assailed by the others. If that happened then the unity of the country, instead of being enhanced, would be disrupted. "To go to a third party in the shape of a boundary commission for a settlement," Mahatma Gandhi said, "would be a negation of their independence."¹¹ If however, the linguistic redistribution could be arrived at by mutual agreement and not in a bargaining spirit, the unity of the country would be further cemented. He also said that the delimitation of boundaries should be motivated by a desire to serve the best interest of the inhabitants instead of by the desire of greatest amount of territory and the wealth.¹²

To summarise we can say that if India is not to be a nation in the making but a nation made then people must develop more and more the habit of working together in the bilingual and multi-lingual units. There can be no better way of roughing out provincial angularities and seeing ourselves as others see us. So long as the British people were here, they were quite anxious to break down the barriers which existed between different provinces and languages, with the result that even where people from different parts of the country were brought together, as in metropolitan centres like Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi, they tended to club on provincial lines with no wide contacts—cultural or otherwise—with local population. Like the Englishmen, who were reported to carry wherever they went, their 'Own England' we too carried our little Tamil Nad or Kerala or Karnatak wherever we went. This tendency must go and bilingual and multi-lingual States will do the needful. This is a fact that any language can flourish only by coming into healthy contacts with other languages and not by burying its head into the sand.

- 1 Quoted by Shri P. Chenchiah, M.L. in his 'Problems of Linguistic States in India'—Pp. 11, para 1.
- 2 The Report of Linguistic Provinces Committee (The JVP Report; 1948. Pp. 4, para 2.
- 3 The Montfort Para 39.
- 4 All-Parties Report (The Nehru Report) 1928, quoted by Brahmshree G.B. Subba Rao in 'The Linguistic Provinces and the Dar Report', Pp. 5, para 2.
- 5 Indian Statutory Commission Report (The Simon Commission Report) Vol. II. Pp. 24, para 38.
- 6 The Linguistic Provinces Commission (The Dar Commission Report) 1948. Pp. 29, para 130.
- 7 Ibid. Pp. 31, Para 137.
- 8 The Linguistic States in Regional Plan by A.S.N. Murthi, Preface, para 2.
- 9 Ibid. Pp. 1, para 1.
- 10 Ibid. Page I, para I.
- 11 Presidential Address and Proceedings of the Inaugural Session of The All India League of Linguistic Provinces, Bezwada, 13-5-1947. Pp. 7 (Extracts).
- 12 Ibid. Pp. 1 to 5, paras 1 to 9 (Extracts).
- 13 Report of the Finance Commission for 1957 (Summary of budgetary position of the States). Pp. 143.
- 14 Presidential Address and Proceedings of the inaugural session of the All-India League of Linguistic Provinces, Bezwada, 13-5-47. Pp. 5 to 6, para 10.
- 15 Report of Linguistic Provinces Commission (The Dar Commission Report) 1948. Pp. 33, para 147.
- 16 Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee (The JVP Report) 1948. Summary and Conclusions Pp. 15, para 1.
- 17 Problems of linguistic States in India by Shri P. Chenchiah, M.L. Pp. 19-22, para 5 (i, ii, iii).
- 18 Language and Linguistic Problem by Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterji. Pp. 3-4, para 2.
- 19 Linguistic Provinces by M.K. Gandhi, edited by Bharatan Kummaraappa. Pp. 14-15.
- 20 The Report of linguistic provinces Commission (The Dar Commission Report) 1948. Pp. 31, para 137.
- 21 Ibid. Pp. 29, para 132.
- 22 Ibid. Pp. 2, para 8
- 23 Ibid. Pp. 29, para 132.
- 24 'Hindustan Times', Nov. 26, 1956.
- 25 Ibid. April 9, 1956.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid. October 5, 1955.
- 28 Ibid. June 11, 1954.
- 29 Ibid. May 24, 1955.
- 30 Ibid. May 24, 1955.
- 31 Ibid. June 15, 1954.
- 32 Ibid. June 14, 1954.
- 33 Ibid. January 20, 1957.
- 34 Ibid. January 22, 1956.
- 35 Ibid. February 1, 1957.
- 36 Ibid. February 7, 1957.

- 37 Ibid. February 7, 1956 (Speech at Patna).
- 38 Ibid. February 13, 1957.
- 39 Ibid. March 4, 1956 (Speech at Calcutta)
- 40 Linguistic Provinces by M.K. Gandhi—edited by Bharatan Kummarappa.
Pp. 10 to 11, para 4 to 5.
- 41 Ibid. Pp. 13, para 6.
- 42 Ibid. Pp. 10 to 15, para 4 to 8.

Constitutional Implications of the Problem

Regarding reorganisation and redistribution of States, the Constitution of India has made comprehensive provisions and therefore no constitutional hinderance can come in the way of reorganisation of the States, if the President of India in confidence with the Parliament or as to use the famous English phrase 'President-in-Parliament', is convinced of the strong public opinion in favour of such organisation—neither on linguistic grounds or on any other ground.

According to constitutional provisions, the States may be redistributed. Under the provision of sections 2, 3, 4 of the constitution. They are elastic enough to provide for the necessary contingencies. It must be pointed out that the provisions do not contemplate the creation of a sub-federation. The States are to be created as units of the Indian Union only and to hold a relation to it in the same way as any existing State. There is not the remotest idea of setting any part of the Union in a conflicting position with the rest of the territory of the Union. It should thus be baseless to conclude that the redistributed parts will be so powerful as to assume an antagonistic position against the Centre.

The constitutional provisions on the subject are as follows:—

Section 2.—Establishment of new States—Parliament, by law, may admit into the Union, or establish new States on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit.

Section 3.—Formation of new States and alteration of areas, boundaries or names of existing States:—

Parliament may by law—

(a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any

territory to a part of any State;

- (b) increase the area of any State;
- (c) diminish the area of any State;
- (d) alter the boundaries of any State;
- (e) alter the name of any State.

Provided that no bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill effects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States, the bill has been referred to the legislature of that State or as the case may be of each of the States, for expressing its views thereon within such period as the President may allow and unless the period so specified or allowed, has expired.

Section 4.—Laws made under articles 2 and 3 to provide for the amendment of the First and the Fourth Schedules and supplemental, incidental and consequential matters:—(1) Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3 shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the law and may also contain such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions (including provisions as to the representation in Parliament and in the Legislature or Legislatures of the State or States affected by such law) as Parliament may deem necessary.

(2) No such law as aforesaid shall be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purposes of article 368. (Procedure for the amendment of the Constitution).

Part XVIII of the Constitution deals with the provisions of official language of the Union as follow:—

Chapter 1.—Language of the Union.

343. Official language of the Union:—(1) The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devnagri script.

(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (1), for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement; provided that the President may, during the said period, by order, authorise the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language and of the Devnagri form of numerals in addition to the international form of Indian numerals for any of the official purposes of the Union.

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may

by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, of—

- (a) the English language, or
- (b) the Devanagri form of numerals,

for such purposes as may be specified in the law.

344. Commission and Committee of Parliament on official language (i) The President shall at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter and the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a Commission which shall consist of a Chairman and such other members representing the different languages specified in the Eight Schedules as the President may appoint, and the order shall define the procedure to be followed by the Commission.

(ii) It shall be the duty of Commission to make recommendations to the President as to:—

(a) the progressive use of Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union;

(b) restrictions on the use of English for all or any of the official purposes of the Union.

(c) the language to be used for all or any of the purposes mentioned in article 348;

(d) the form of the numerals to be used for any one or more specified purposes of the Union;

(e) any other matter referred to the Commission by the President as regards the official language of the Union and the language for communication between the Union and a State or between one State and another and their use.

(iii) In making their recommendations under clause (2) the Commission shall have due regard to the industrial, cultural and scientific advancement of India, and the just claims and the interests of persons, belonging to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to the public services.

(iv) There shall be a constituted Committee consisting of thirty members of whom twenty shall be members of the House of the People and ten shall be members of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the members of the House of Peoples and the members of Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

(v) It shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) and to report to the President their opinion thereon.

(vi) Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may,

after consideration of report, referred to in clause (5) issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report. ✓

Chapter 2—Regional Language

345. Official language or languages of a States—Subject to the provisions of articles 346 and 347 the Legislature of a State may, by law, adopt any one or more of the languages in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of that State.

Provided that, until the Legislature of the State otherwise provides, by law, the English language shall continue to be used for those official purposes within the State for which it was being used immediately before the commencement of this Constitution.

346. Official language for communication between one State and another or between a State and the Union—The language for the time being authorised for use in the Union for official purposes shall be the official language for communication between one State and another State and between a State and the Union.

Provided that if two or more States agree that the Hindi language should be the official language for communication between such States, that language may be used for such communication.

347. Special provision relating to language spoken by a section of the population of a State—On a demand, being made in that behalf, the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State desires the use of any language spoken by them to be recognised by that State, direct that such language shall also be officially recognised throughout that State or any part thereof for such purposes as he may specify. ✓

Chapter 3—Language of the Supreme Court, High Courts etc.

348. Language to be used in the Supreme Court and in the High Courts and for Acts, Bills etc :—

(i) Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this part, until Parliament by law otherwise provides, English shall be the language of :—

- (a) all proceedings in Supreme Court and in every High Court,
- (b) the authoritative texts—

(1) all Bills to be introduced or Amendments thereto, to be moved in either House of the Parliament or in the House or either House of the Legislature of a State,

(2) all acts passed by parliament or the Legislature of a State and of all Ordinances promulgated by the President or the Governor

of a State, and

(3) all orders, rules, regulations and bye-laws issued under the Constitution or under any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of a State.

(ii) Notwithstanding anything in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) the Governor of a State may, with the previous consent of the President, authorise the use of the Hindi language, or any other language used for any official purposes of the State, in proceedings in the High Court having its principal seat in that State ;

Provided that nothing in this clause shall apply to any judgment, decree or order passed or made by such High Court.

(iii) Notwithstanding anything in sub-clause (b) of clause (1), where the Legislature or a State has prescribed any language other than the English language for use in Bills introduced in, or Acts passed by, the legislature of the State or in Ordinances promulgated by the Governor of the State or in any order, rule, regulation or bye-law referred to in paragraph (3) of that sub-clause, a translation of the same in the English language published under the authority of the Governor of the State in the official Gazette of that State, shall be deemed to be the authoritative text thereof in the English language under this article.

349. Special procedure for enactment of certain laws relating to language :—During the period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, no Bill or amendment making provision for the language to be used for any of the purposes mentioned in clause (1) of article 348 shall be introduced or moved in either House of Parliament without the sanction of the President, and the President shall not give his sanction to the introduction of any such Bill or the moving of any such amendment, except after he has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (2) of article 344 and the report of the Committee constituted under clause (4) of that article ⁴ -

Chapter 4—Special Directives.

350. Language to be used in representations for redress of grievances :—Every person shall be entitled to submit a representation for the redress of any grievance to any officer or authority of the Union or a State, in any of the languages used in the State, as the case may be.

350-A. Facilities for instruction in mother-tongue at primary stage :—It shall be the endeavour of every local authority within the State to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother-

tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority group; and the President may issue such directions to any State as he considers necessary or proper for securing the provision of such facilities.

350-B. Special Officer for linguistic minorities :—

(1) There shall be a Special Officer for linguistic minorities to be appointed by the President.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Special Officer to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for linguistic minorities under this Constitution and report to the President upon those matters at such intervals as the President may direct, and the President shall cause all such reports to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to the Governments of the States concerned.

351. Directive for development of Hindi :—It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of Hindi Language, to develop it so that it may serve as medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating, without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages.

Eighth Schedule of the Constitution (Article 344(1) and 351)

Languages of the Union :—

(1) Assamese (2) Bengali (3) Gujarati (4) Hindi (5) Kannada (6) Kashmiri (7) Malayalam (8) Oriya (9) Punjabi (10) Sanskrit (11) Tamil (12) Telgu (13) Urdu.

All the above mentioned provisions are comprehensive enough and enable the President in confidence with the Parliament to order the reorganisation of States in India, to safeguard the interests of linguistic minorities and to appoint the Commissions from time to time for gathering the public opinion and for investigating the possibilities of reorganisation. It was under these provisions that the Linguistic Commission of 1948, the S.R.C. in 1953 and the Committee on official language in 1958 were appointed. Bombay province was divided into two unilingual States of Maharashtra and Gujerat, Nagaland was established as a separate State and Assam was given a bilingual formula without any constitutional objection.

It can, thus, be safely concluded that if the linguistic formula is adopted as a convenient principle for the reorganisation of States,

no constitutional difficulties will arise even though—and this cannot be minimized—there may be grave problems to which such a solution may lead.

¹ The Constitution of India (as amended upto-date) published by Central Law Agency, Allahabad. Pp. 2, Part I—The Union and its territory—See 2, 3, 4.

² Ibid. Pp. 85, Part XVII—Official Language—Chapter I—Language of the Union.

³ Ibid. Part XVII Chapter 3—Regional Language—Pp. 86-345.

⁴ Ibid. Chapter 3—Language of the Supreme Court, High Courts etc. Pp. 86.

⁵ Ibid. Chapter 4. Pp. 87.

⁶ Ibid. Article 344(1) and 351. Pp. 127.

Administrative and Financial Implications

As we have already seen the redistribution of States in India on language basis, has been demanded mainly on cultural and democratic grounds. Along with other arguments, it has been mainly emphasized that no democracy is real if a particular linguistic group is not awarded the freedom of developing its culture. The idea of linguistic distribution has been advocated and opposed by great leaders and scholars of the country. From time to time the Government has tried to solve the problem. In 1948 the Linguistic Commission was appointed. In 1953 the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed. In 1956 the Language Commission was appointed. But none of these was able to recommend the redistribution of States purely on linguistic grounds because redistribution of States is always related to the unity and defence of India and is apt to create administrative and financial difficulties. Although many financial and administrative aspects have been discussed before hand in a previous chapter, we can examine some more implications as follows :—

The existing States in India do not follow an uniform pattern in size and population and have great diversity in these matters. The viability of a province in the Indian Union commonly is a relative question. These new provinces, which will be faced with deficit budgets in most of the cases, will be hardly able to adjust the things by reducing expenditure and imposing fresh taxation. The margin of reserve in most of them is so small that for many years to come, if left to themselves, they can function only as mere police States and may thus be a great handicap to national development.

The question is, why these provinces will have deficit budgets? The advocates of every proposed province argue that the province

proposed by them will be economically a viable unit, then where does the question of a deficit budget come in? The budgets are likely to be deficit because of the following reasons :—

It is clear that the administration of the same areas and same population, which had hitherto been carried on by a smaller number of provincial governments will in future have to be carried on by a greater number of provincial governments and the setting up of these will involve an annual recurring expenditure of about 60 crores, as estimated by the Linguistic Commission (1948). For this the Indian tax-payer will have to foot the bill at a time when money is urgently wanted for defence and nation building.

The new Governments, with the only exception of Maharashtra, will be under the necessity to build their capitals immediately, which may approximately involve an expenditure of about 40 to 50 crores. These housing and building programmes of the new provinces are likely to clash seriously with the refugee problem and the building and housing programmes of the Central Government and it is unlikely that the country's already overtaxed resources in building materials will be able to bear any further strain. Besides such heavy expenditure in buildings is also likely to worsen the inflation problem.

The new provinces in common with the rest of India, stand in need of agricultural and industrial development for which various projects have been prepared, the execution of which will fall upon the new provinces in relation to their respective areas. It is doubtful whether these provinces will be able to meet the expenditure needed. Centre will always have to be ready to come to their help and finance them and this will be an unnecessary burden on it.

The administrative services at present functioning in Provinces are maintained on a provincial basis and include in their personnel a proportion of each large linguistic group. Whether the partition of provinces can properly be carried out without causing hardship in individual cases and whether sufficient technically qualified talents will be available in each linguistic group is doubtful. Anyway it is certain that for sometime to come the administrative efficiency of the services will be lowered. The sudden withdrawal of British personnel from the administrative service has already taxed its administrative ability and experience. The reorganisation will worsen the position more. Thus in administrative experience and efficiency the new province will be at a further disadvantage till they have trained their own officers and it cannot be said with certainty that the new services will be able to stand up to any serious crisis in the maintenance of law and order

and that they will be able to conduct the administration with the same efficiency.

The new provinces will immediately bring into existence new kind of minority problem which did not exist before. In heterogeneous provinces it is not possible for any linguistic group residing in the province to call the area even its homeland as exclusively its own and to regard any person residing there as an alien or outsider. But the moment a province is allotted to a majority linguistic group as such and that group forms a majority government in it, it begins to regard every person speaking other language residing there as an alien or outsider and the area as exclusively belonging to itself and, by a natural reaction, people not speaking the majority language resent the intolerance of the majority or begin to have their own affinities with separate linguistic groups elsewhere and thus a vicious circle of mutual hostility begins and the minority problems again come into existence. The best illustrations in this case are of Orissa and of the Tamils of Southern Travancore, and in a minor degree, of the complaints of minorities in all border districts. The linguistic groups do not form in any area a majority of more than 75 to 80% and therefore it is impossible to form any province without leaving a minority of 20 to 25% which will be a constant source of embarrassment to the administration of the province.

Moreover, because the principle of linguistic States has been conceded and a few States formed on this basis a process has been set in motion to which there may be no end. Just because Andhra and Bombay have been reorganised on this basis, the advocates of new provinces feel that they need not produce any substantial argument for their support. They only say that when one province can be created on the language basis why not their own province be similarly created? This is a problem which can never be solved completely because population is not static. The people move from one place to another and therefore, even if today a province is formed purely on linguistic basis, after some years again a substantial minority of people speaking other language is bound to grow in the province and again the complaints of various sorts are bound to arise and will hamper the smooth running of administration:

The border problems are already very acute and they will be multiplied with the creation of new States. Whatever decision has been taken by the Government or by the Border Commissions appointed by it, has never been accepted calmly by disputing parties as is apparent by the violent incidents which occurred in Bombay and Orissa and in the dispute of West Bengal and Bihar, after the decision

taken by the Government after the publication of the S.R.C. report in 1956. The agitation in Punjab is a more burning example in this respect. So hotly some of the border areas are contested that plebiscites will have to be held here. This will be a long drawn out process in which feelings might arise to a great extent and however carefully and conscientiously the work may be done, one or the other party is bound to be left dissatisfied with a bitterness of feelings. These feelings will take a long time to disappear and thus will impede all efforts at nation building and running the administration efficiently and smoothly. It was because of this that the formation of Karnataka was not favoured by the Government, even though it was recommended by the S.R.C.

The problem of communication in some of the proposed provinces is also pretty serious one. The areas proposed to be merged in these provinces are not accessible by rail and therefore, they cannot be merged in one province.

In a multi-lingual land like India, the adoption of the policy of linguistic distribution will harm the academic unity of the Country and there would be no free flow of teachers and students from one University to the other.

In view of the uneven development of India's languages, education as a whole is bound to suffer and will lose its national character. If the different States pursue their own education policies, there will be no co-ordination and unity of purpose in education. In fact this tendency might lead to education itself being used as a vehicle of regional particularism and revivalism, resulting in inter-State conflicts and the weakening of the national tie.

Already in schools of some of the States, songs exalting the regional idea, have been introduced into text books. History books taught in lower classes have disclosed a marked tendency to exaggerate the past achievements of dominant linguistic groups. These inevitable tendencies in language-based States will unavoidably weaken our sense of national unity and will hamper the administration also.

Financial stability depends a lot on river projects, minerals and forests. Rivers did not and still do not determine their course according to the language of the people living on their banks and similarly mountains and mines did not or do not follow any linguistic pattern.

A large number of small linguistic groups, therefore, will come in the way of planning because it discourages the spirit of working together which is very necessary for the success of any planning.

The linguistic and local sentiments will resent the utilisation of the resources of one area for the benefit of the other.

Planning on a national scale necessarily cuts across linguistic affiliations. Economic development obviously proceeds on such considerations as the capital-income ratio, the more remunerative projects, being preferred to the less remunerative ones, the employment possibilities of various projects, the requirements of river valley projects the optimum utilisation of natural resources etc. This will not be possible in case linguistic redistribution is done because it will lessen the spirit of co-operation as mentioned before-hand.

In case of reorganisation a difficult question of the unification of laws in force in the areas to be grouped together will arise. The laws in existing administrative units, including those governing such vital matters as land tenure, agrarian reforms and prohibition are not the same even in geographically contiguous states. Some states had not been able to unify the laws because of the prevalence of special and economic conditions in those areas justifying disparity in laws. But this condition can not last for any indefinite length of time. Apart from objections on general grounds of justice and the administrative inconvenience which it involves, lack of uniformity in the application of tax laws will make budgeting difficult. For these reasons every reorganised state will have to undertake, in the initial years, a laborious and exhaustive task of reviewing its existing legislation and of unifying its laws.

The process of disintegration and re-integration will also entail a serious dislocation of administration. It involves a difficult process of integrating the service personnel belonging to one state with the service personnel of another State, retrenchment of surplus and unsuitable personnel of another state, if necessary, introduction of unified pay scales, refixation of cadres, re-determination of relative seniority in the different services etc. All this will involve an increase in the expenditure. To the extent that revision of salaries after reorganisation becomes inevitable (and such a revision it must be remembered, can only be upwards) there will also be a direct recurring cost on the state Government in this respect. It has been estimated that the introduction of uniform scales of pay will need ten or eleven crores per annum. Without accepting this estimate rigidly it must be accepted that one of the consequences of reorganisation will be the intensification of the existing demands for salary revision to such an extent as to render an increase in state Governments expenditure unavoidable. Along with this financial side we can not ignore the psychological side because of which the service personnel of one state

is bound to feel dissatisfied and discriminately treated. As for example in the present Madhya Pradesh the service personnel of Madhya Bharat region, Mahakoshal region and Madhya Pradesh region always complain against each other.

The separation of administrative records will create a considerable amount of work and will add greatly to the responsibility of state Governments and will take time. Administrative integration always proves to be a very complex problem, in case of Andhra it was possible to hasten the separation to some extent. But for various reasons, (such as that seniority was disturbed, surplus staff was retained by the residuary state, and no great change in the number of the constitution of the districts was involved) the Andhra administration has itself had to face such difficulties as the dispersal of its offices, absence of duplicate records, and lack of experienced staff. Therefore it can not, on the whole, be anticipated that reorganised administrative machinery will start functioning smoothly very soon.

The integration of princely states involved administrative changes in area of about 360,000 square miles inhabited by about 59 million people not counting the major and minor units the boundaries of which were not changed. Impressive as the scale and swiftness of these changes were, it can now be seen in retrospect that the process of rationalising the administrative system in these areas has been spread over seven or eight years and is still not complete. If the reorganisation of the states at the present time is to be done on a nation-wide scale, the effects of the change are bound to be considerable.

The linguistic reorganisation will create in the country a large number of small states and the want of co-operation and imperfect adjustment will hamper the administration of the country as a whole and will result in inefficiency and delay.

Moreover, in order to face such calamities as failure of crops or any other type of financial emergency, it is desirable to have a balance of economic regions in one state instead of dividing them in to small linguistic areas. This will be helpful in achieving financial stability.

On whatever basis and whenever the reorganisation of states is done, the practical difficulty of making various administrative and financial adjustments comes before the Central Government. The greater the number of states, the greater is the extent of this problem. As we have already seen the redistribution of states on language basis can never be fully and rigidly achieved. The problem of redistribution and administrative and financial adjustments will again and

again present itself before the Central Government, resulting in unnecessary waste of time and money. It will form such a circle from which there will be no way out. Even after all this trouble, there will be no guarantee that all the parties will be satisfied, even for a short time.

As a practical example of this sort may be cited the efforts of Government in making the administrative and financial adjustments soon after the publication of the S.R.C. report in 1956. After long considerations, and great efforts following adjustments were made and even these did not satisfy all the parties concerned.

Regarding the assets and liabilities it was arranged that assets like land and buildings, store articles and other goods, arrears of taxes and the assets of state undertakings would pass to the successor state in which they were physically located or with which they were connected. Certain other assets like treasury and bank balances, the right to recover external loans and advances and credits in certain funds were divided between states according to population ratio in case they were more than one in number. Central Government ascertained the population ratios in relative cases according to the constant figures of 1951.

Regarding public services the provision was made for the reconstitution of all the states which were affected by the re-organisation as follows :—

The scheme provided that all the persons serving in those parts of 'B' and 'C' states which were completely to be merged in new states, were allotted to these new states. Those, serving in other existing states which were in any way affected by the re-organisation, were provisionally to continue to serve in the principal successor State, unless ordered by the Central Government to the contrary.

The Public Service Commissions for the then existing states of Mysore, Punjab, Rajasthan and Travancore Cochin were to be the Public Service Commissions for the corresponding new States.

The Public Service Commissions for Bombay, Hyderabad, Madhya Bharat, Madhya Pradesh, Patiala and East Punjab States Union and Saurashtra were to be abolished. Every person holding offices as Chairman or as the member of any of the Public Service Commissions in above mentioned States was to be the member or if so specified, the Chairman of one of the P.S.C. constituted for the states of Andhra-Telangana (Andhra Pradesh) Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab and Mysore.

Wherever a project concerning one or more states affected by the reorganisation had been taken in hand, but was not complete or

had been accepted by the Government of India for inclusion in second five year plan, neither the project nor the provisions relating to its administration, maintenance or operation or the distribution of benefits to be derived from were to be varied except:—

(a) in case where two or more successor states were concerned with the project by the agreement between those successor states or if no arrangement was reached, by the orders of Central Government.

(b) in case where a single successor state was concerned with the project, with the previous approval of the Central Government.

As regards electric and water supply it was stated that if it appeared to the Central Government that the arrangement with regard to the generation or supply of electric power or the supply of water for any area has been or was likely to be modified to the disadvantage of that area because of its transfer from the state controlling the generation and the supply of such power, or the catchment area reservoirs and other works for the supply of water, as the case may be, the Central Government may give such directions, as it deemed proper to the state Government or other authorities concerned for the maintenance, as far as practicable, of the previous arrangements.

Any arrangement or arrangements entered in to between the Central Government and one or more existing states relating to :—

(b) the administration, maintenance and operation of any project executed before 1st of October, 1956. (The day appointed for the operation of reorganised scheme.)

Or

(b) The distribution of benefits, such as the right to receive and utilise water and electric power, to be derived as a result of the execution of such project, which was subsisting immediately before 1st October, was to continue in force subject to such modifications and adaptations, if any, not affecting the general operation of the agreement or arrangements as were to be agreed upon between the Central Government and the successor state concerned as the case might be, by April 1957, or, if no agreement was reached by the said date, according to the order of Central Government.

The territorial changes and the formation of new states and union territories involved a complete revision of the Fourth Schedule to the constitution also by which the seats in the Council of states were allocated to the then existing states. The number of seats allotted to each part 'A' and 'B' state was according to the formula, one seat per million for the first five millions or part thereof exceeding one million. After the reorganisation the constitution amend-

ment bill was passed which did not change the basic formula and Manipur and Tripura were given one seat each, instead of one seat between them, since the population of each of these territories had become more than half a million. In the house of people no change was made of any sort.

In the new states interim legislative assemblies were set up and after the last general elections proper assemblies were set up. It was also decided that second chambers should be established in all the states but still this scheme has not been yet fulfilled.

By one clause the provision for the apportionment of public debts of the states affected by reorganisation was settled. In case of public debts of Bombay and Hyderabad it was proposed that they should stand transferred to the Central Government on September 30, 1956, which should be deemed to have made a loan to each of these states of an amount equal to the public debt so transferred.

The object of this was to ensure that Andhra and Maharashtra as the principal successor states of Hyderabad and Bombay might not be saddled with an exaggerated public debt, which might affect their future.

All this shows that the re-distribution of states on any basis and still more so on linguistic basis will be an extra headache for the Central Government, both from administrative and financial points of view.

¹ Report of the States Reorganisation Commission (1955), Pp. 217 to 228 (Extracts).

A Comparative Study of the Techniques and Methods

The major problem confronting almost all the newly independent countries of South and South-east Asia today is national unity and in many, one of the great impediments to the achievement of that unity is language. Throughout this area the demand for linguistic autonomy has challenged the authority of the Central Governments and threatened their stability. It has been encountered by the Government of Burma, which has been forced to concede a separate Karan state and by the Pakistanis, whose Bengali speaking population in April 1954 elected a provincial ministry that spoke openly of secession until the Central Government suppressed it.¹

It is not a new phenomenon nor it is peculiar to Asia. Belgium and Switzerland, to quote the best Western examples, have both had to contend with it.

Other classic examples are Canada and the Soviet Union. It must be noted that these countries widely vary from one another in climate, geographical position, culture, racial composition, religious practices and population. Their internal differences are also wide, at least in case of Canada and Soviet Union. Their Historic evolutions too have been different. In India to-day this problem has reached an acute stage and all the resources of the Government are being taxed to cope with it. The magnitude and complexity of India's linguistic problem is greatest in the world because of India's size and population and the great number of languages and dialects spoken within her borders, still we can not dismiss the examples of these countries as insignificant and at this stage it will be beneficial to do a comparative study and will certainly help in finding out a suitable solution of the problem in our country.

Canada :

Canada started her career as a French Dominion. It was the French who first occupied and settled in that country. After France was defeated, as a result of bitter seven year's war, her overseas empire was snatched away from her. Canada thus passed into the hands of the British who became the masters and rulers of the cultured and rather sensitive French people. Owing to the long and bitter war the feelings between these two peoples had become much embittered. Quite conscious of all this, the English took care to do nothing which could exacerbate these feelings of the French people. And even though the French were in a minority, representing only 30% of the population, the Government allowed them to retain their culture, their religion, their legal and administrative system and recognised French as an official language and never tried to impose the English language on the French. $\sqrt{2,1306P} \quad K9$

This wise policy created such a united and viable state that it could withstand all the advances of a powerful and prosperous neighbouring state like America.²

78840

Switzerland :

Like Canada, Switzerland too has linguistic and racial history. The Germans were the early settlers and still they are in majority. The French and Italians came later and are still in minority. Of 1/2 million Swiss, 73% speak German, 21% French, 5% Italian and 1% Roman. It may at first sight seem that this linguistic diversity might necessarily hurt the national unity of Switzerland but in Switzerland the contrary is true. It seems to be a miracle that Switzerland with all her multiplicity of languages knows nothing of linguistic conflicts. Nowhere in Europe are found so many languages in so small a country as this, yet internal peace is nowhere so secure as here. This is because Switzerland does not only tolerate the plurality of language, she even favours and defends it with all her means because she sees in it, contrary to other countries, not only a certain intellectual utility but one of the fundamental presuppositions of her existence. "The Swiss have understood," said Valery, "that diversity is wealth". Their civic, moral, political and economical ideals finding expression in several languages strengthen the feelings of patriotism and the spirit of community is fostered to a higher extent, than if the same ideals were translated into one language. This is why the idea of a linguistic state is totally foreign to Switzerland and linguistic diversity has never disturbed that country.

Linguistically Switzerland is divided into three parts viz. Ger-

man speaking, French speaking and Italian speaking but the states (cantons) which form the Swiss confederation are not formed along linguistic lines. All the cantons lying on the linguistic borders between German and French speaking parts are bilingual and in the Eastern part of Switzerland there is a canton where even three languages are spoken viz. German, Italian and Romans. Thus as we have already observed the idea of linguistic states is totally foreign in this country.

It is remarkable that there is no such thing as the Swiss language. There are however, the Swiss dialects. In the German speaking parts of Switzerland for instance, there is a great variety of German dialects. They are so different from proper German that a German national has difficulty in understanding them. In the same way an Italian national has difficulty in understanding the dialect of Italian speaking part of the country, whereas the language spoken in the French part of Switzerland is not different from the French spoken in France.

One of the first things a child has to learn in school is proper German in German speaking part and proper Italian in Italian speaking part of Switzerland. These are the languages used in writing whereas the dialects are used in conversation even among the most sophisticated Swiss when they are among their country men while in Germany, France and England dialect is looked down upon by the educated people. This rather strange situation allows the Swiss on the one hand to preserve their linguistic peculiarities and on the other hand to take part in the activities of greater linguistic communities.

Another idea too is foreign to the Swiss, the idea of a single official language. Seventy-three per cent of the population speak German, 21% French, 5% Italian and 1% Romans but it is unthinkable that the language of the majority should become the single official language. It is contrary to their notion of Democracy. According to the Swiss it is the duty of the majority not to impose itself on the minority but to protect the minority and therefore Switzerland has four "National Languages" viz. German, French, Italian and Romans. All four are recognised as such by the Federal Constitution. Romans, however, is spoken only by 1% of the Swiss population and is not one of the "Official Languages". Official languages are German, Italian and French. The "Language clause" of the Federal Constitution runs : "German, French, Italian and Romans are the national languages of Switzerland. The official languages of the Confederation are German, French and Italian".

What does this mean ? This means that in the National Council

and Council of States every member may speak in one of these three languages and require the interpretation of any other. All statutes and public laws must be drawn up in these three languages, which are legally equal. Every Swiss has the right to hear judgement pronounced by the Supreme Court in one of these languages. The constitution provides that the supreme judicial body, consisting of twenty judges, shall also be representative of the three official languages. Proceedings in Federal courts are in any of the languages chosen by the parties to the trial.

Here a question may be asked how can this work unless every Swiss knows all the three languages? In fact the number of those who know all the three languages is rather small. The majority of the population speak and write one language only. Those who attend the Secondary School learn a second national language, but mostly they forget it in subsequent years. When the Swiss students learn a third modern language it is English because of its world wide use. As a general rule it can be said that most educated people speak German and French, if one of these languages is their mother tongue. Those who speak Italian as their mother tongue, know either German or French or both of them.

The arrangement of three official languages is sanctioned more by practice and tradition than by legal rules. The spirit to respect the cultural independence of its linguistic parts counts more than legal rules. As for instance according to a tradition strictly adhered in the Federal Council a body of 7 members at least two members are representatives of French speaking and one of the Italian speaking Switzerland. Though the German speaking Switzerland account for five sevenths of the population, it lays no claim to send five representations to Federal Council but rests content with four, so that the minority language groups are adequately represented. Thus minorities get a chance for the maintenance of their character and culture.

To obtain employment with Government it is not necessary to speak all the languages. It all depends on the kind of work one is called upon to perform. Of course those speaking more than one language have better chances for promotion since for executive posts a wider knowledge of languages is required.

The Federal Government has its seat in Berne, which lies in the German speaking part, but is at the same time the capital of a bilingual (German and French) canton. As regards administrative services situated in Berne the German speaking population is of course in a more favourable position, but the Federal Government, with view to give the linguistic minorities a proportionate share in Federal Services

strikes to employ as many French and Italian speaking nationals as possible without lowering the standard of its civil services. This can be reached by two other means widely used in Switzerland. One of them is the practice, which has become more frequent to locate certain Federal office in other part of the country. The other is the old and established practice of delegating Federal Powers to the cantonal administrations. In fact, many Federal laws are implemented by cantons. Thus over-centralisation of the administration is avoided with the effect, among others, that language problem is much less formidable.

This policy of protection of the weaker elements is in the best democratic tradition. In adopting it, the confederation is able to obtain excellent work done in Government and administration by such cantons as trilingual Grisons and bilingual Valais and Fribourg. And just as linguistic borders do not lie along cantonal frontiers, they do not coincide with denominational differences. If they did the whole problem will be more acute. It goes without saying that all the four languages are represented in the press, while the generous recognition of linguistic minorities also extends to the radio. There are three German speaking, two French speaking and one Italian speaking stations. This small, neutral country has proved that, given good will and understanding, welfare and loyalty are not only possible among people speaking different languages, but these languages themselves mean the enrichment of life. Of that Switzerland is a living example.

Impressed by this Woodrow Wilson wrote "The cantons having allied themselves. . . went on to show the world how Germans, French and Italians, if only they respect each other's liberties as they would have their own respected, may by mutual helpfulness and forbearance build up a Union at once stable and free."³

Ceylon :

Ceylon also faced the language problem and even after a long controversy has not been able to settle it. As early as 1955 the language issue became an important one in Ceylon. Sinhalese speaking people being in a majority were not ready to give Tamil the status of official and recognised it only as regional language in Northern and Eastern provinces. Tamil speaking people were prepared to create a separate Tamil state within Ceylon. In October, 1955 a round table conference of prominent Sinhalese and Tamil leaders in Ceylon was proposed, so that the language issue could be amicably discussed and difficulties ironed out. This proposal was supported by the Govern-

ment eagerly because unscrupulous people were exploiting the problem for political purposes but nothing came out of this proposal.

On the 10th September, 1955 a very large meeting was held and was presided over by Rev. Badde Vimalawansa. At this meeting a resolution was adopted which demanded that Sinhalese be made the only state language and Tamil be made a regional language in Northern and Eastern Provinces.

On January 20th, 1956, seven Tamil speaking members of Ceylon parliament resigned from the United National (Government) party. They demanded the deletion of the motion asking for Sinhalese alone as the official language from the agenda of the annual session of the ruling party. As their demand was not accepted they resigned from the party enbloc. The resignation of these seven members culminated the following day in the resignation of Mr. S. Natarsan, Minister of Posts and Broadcasting. Shri Lanka Freedom Party, the biggest opposition party, demanded amendment of the constitution for the adoption of Sinhalese as the official language. Prime Minister, Mr. John Kotelawala did not favour this demand and decided to dissolve the parliament. The parliament was dissolved in February and new general elections were held in April 1956.

In these elections People's United front coalition got majority and according to their election pledges, presented on June Fifth a bill which declared Sinhalese as the only official language. The bill was passed on July 6th and soon after the linguistic riots broke out in Ceylon.

As a result of the force used by the Government some people died in violent struggles. To handle the situation a pact was made between the Federal Party and the ruling party as a result of which a bill was passed on August 5th, 1958. According to this bill Tamil was also recognised as the medium of instruction in Government Schools or in Assisted Schools. It was also recognised as the medium of instruction in the University for students who prior to their admission to such University, had been educated through the medium of Tamil language. Persons educated through the medium of Tamil language would be entitled to be examined through such medium at any examination for the admission in public services provided they had sufficient knowledge of the official language of Ceylon or acquired such knowledge within a specified time after admission to the public services. Correspondence between persons, other than officials in their official capacity, educated through the medium of Tamil language and any official in his official capacity or between any local

authority in Northern or Eastern Province could be carried in Tamil language. In this way Tamil was awarded a reasonable status but it could not satisfy the Tamil people and the demand for Tamil Nad still continues in that country.⁴

America :

Language in America is considered not only a means of communication of thoughts but also a means of cultural development and there it is studied with concentration upon techniques, aims, methods and structure of language in general and not with a view to secure a linguistic division of state.

1924 and 1933, both the years claim to be the date of birth of modern American linguistics because it was in 1924 that the Linguistic Society of America was founded and in 1933, the famous work of Bloomfield 'Language' was published. This society stimulated the American linguistics and served as a unifying body of various organs of language study. The Linguistic Institute (1929), the Summer Institute of Linguistics (1934), the American Council of Learned Societies (1941), the Circle Linguistique de New York 1944, the Foreign Service Institute (1947) and Acoustic Society of America (1930) are the Institutions carrying on the studies of languages in various ways. Some of American universities have a separate department for linguistic studies. They have their own publications to propound and propagate their aims and objects in this field.

Thus in America the study of language is taken up with a scientific point of view and there we do not find linguistic division or demand for it.⁵

Belgium :

Belgium is one of the smallest countries of the world. She had also to face the linguistic problem and solved it in the following manner.

Belgium has two official languages, French and Flemish. In the Northern part of the country, Flemish is the only language to be used officially, whereas French is the official language in the Southern part.

Brussels and its suburbs and also some villages along the linguistic border have both Flemish and French as their official languages.

The provincial Governments have Flemish as their only official language in West Flanders, East Flanders, Antwerp and Limburg. Likewise is French in Namur, Liege and Luxemburg. The only bilin-

gual province is Brabant where both Flemish and French are used as official languages.

As far as the Central Government is concerned, it is completely bilingual.

In the Eastern part of the country about one lakh of people speak German and in these villages and towns, German is considered as the official language.⁶

Russian Example :

Soviet Union is now a powerful and rich country but it was not always so. During the time of Tzars she was even weaker and more backward than India was under the British. She was called the veritable prison of nations. Finally, national policy of Tzars was in no small measure responsible for her chronic backwardness. The policy of Lenin and the generous attitude of Russian speaking people towards the non-Russian peoples of Soviet Union, after the October Revolution have solved the age old national problem of Russia in a manner from which everyone can derive a lesson. Lenin did not fail to notice how strong and persistent was the popular discontent caused by Tzarist insistence on the "Russification" of all the national minorities within the empire and therefore he favoured the policy of 'Cultural autonomy' to national minorities included within the states.

From the first day of the revolution the Russian speaking people evinced a brotherly concern for the welfare and cultural advancement of the non-Russian peoples of their country. They were the largest group of people in Soviet Union and represented about 50% of the population, more than any similar group in India, where no language is spoken by more than 42% and that too at a very liberal computation. They were culturally more advanced and their language was one of the greatest in Russia whereas many of the nationalities did not have even the written scripts there. They had been historically the masters over all the nations in pre-revolutionary Russia. As they were the chief architects of the revolution, they might have at least demanded the adoption of their language by the comparatively helpless and quiescent non-Russian peoples as the national language, but they did not do anything of the sort and on the contrary showed a spirit of self-sacrifice. They helped the smaller nationalities to develop their culture and language even when both of these were practically non-existent in case of nationalities like the Uzbek, Tatar, Kazakh, Turkman and Azerbaijani. They accorded state recognition to almost all the languages spoken in the Soviet

Union and in course of time made fifteen of them official languages. In schools the teaching is done in all these languages. Mrs. Kamala Ratnam, an Indian Educationist who spent three years in Soviet Russia writes in her *Secondary education in Soviet Union*, "The biggest (of the states) is the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, a multi-national group where teaching in 42 Languages is carried on in Schools." She also adds "children of different nationalities in every Republic receive instruction through their mother tongue."

The above mentioned policy has not caused disunity in the country. Mr. Webbs declares that in spite of all this cultural autonomy the state as a whole maintains its unity unimpaired and has even like other federal states increased its centralisation of authority. But this centralisation involves no lessening of the cultural autonomy of the minorities.

This study of language and racial policies of the U.S.S.R. leads us to some clear cut conclusions which deserve careful consideration. They are as follows :—

In the wise and democratic states no nationality inhabiting a particular region claims for itself any special privilege as against other national minorities residing in that region.

Great concern has been shown towards the preservation and development of the languages of a racial minority resident in the territory of another nationality.

No wise nation has tried to force its language upon another section of its people, even when it is in an overwhelming majority.

The decision about the adoption of a particular national's languages has been left to the choice of those nationalities which do not speak that language, without any interference from those who speak it.

A policy based on these conclusions may well be followed and will certainly help in solving Indian linguistic problem.⁷

¹ 'Linguistic Regionalism in India' by Marshall Windmiller. Reprinted from *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4, December 1954, Pp. 291, para I.

² Information supplied by the courtesy of Canadian Embassy, dated 11th Oct., 1959.

³ (a) *The Language of Switzerland*.

(b) *Management of Three different Languages in Switzerland*.

(c) *The influence of language on the Natural conscience*.

(d) *Schwyz Dutch and High German*. All the papers supplied by the

- courtesy of Embassy of Switzerland in India—New Delhi, dated 25th August, 1959.
- 4 (a) Use of the Tamil language 1958, published by the Department of Information, Ceylon.
 - (b) Tamil language (Special Provisions Act, No. 28 of 1958, Sept. 4th 1958 supplied by the courtesy of High Commissioner for Ceylon in India, dated 9th Sept., 1959.
 - 5 'Linguistic in America' by P. D. Sharma. (The Vikram, Journal of Vikram University, Ujjain), Vol. 1, No. 4, Nov. 1957, Pp. 85-93 (Extracted).
 - 6 (a) 'Belgium, Land of peace and work' by Elsevier.
 - (b) Information supplied by the courtesy of Ambassade De Belgique, dated 10th Oct., 1960.
 - 7 'The linguistic problem and the Russian Example' by S.S. Chakravarty, M.A. Modern Review, August, 1959, Pp. 153-156 (Extracted).

Concluding Observations

The question of linguistic redistribution of states in India is quite a burning topic. We have seen that there is divided opinion today on this issue. Some are *impatiently clamouring for their immediate establishment* while others are shelving the problem for the time being till we have built up our nation on a stable basis. There are also some who are deadly against this for ever. As we have already examined in detail the arguments put forward in their favour and against them and also their financial, administrative and constitutional implications, we are now in a position to draw some conclusions.

The linguistic movement originated as early as 1905 at the time of the partition of Bengal, then it came to Andhra in 1915-16 in more intense form. After Andhra the linguistic movement was most vigorous in Maharashtra. Now, in north India the problems of the Punjab and in east Assam are attracting the greatest attention. The other North Indian linguistic problem of considerable importance is the border dispute between ~~West Bengal and Bihar~~. In May 1952 a resolution was introduced in West Bengal by Chief Minister Shri B.C. Roy which called upon the Government of India to increase the area of Bengal by adding to it certain allegedly Bengali-speaking sections of Bihar. The resolution was summarily rejected but the controversy has continued since then and has constituted another problem for the Government of India. The story of Nagas is also well known. These are only a few examples. Some have been settled, some are being settled while there are all the chances of the new ones coming up.

The movement for the creation of linguistic states has had a considerable impact on India's political parties and in recent years has subjected them to abnormal stress and strain. The Congress party has naturally felt it most keenly because it was the first party to sup-

port the idea by reorganising the party on linguistic lines in 1920 and after that many times it supported the idea. After coming into power, however, the Congress somewhat modified its attitude in the light of the conclusions reached by the Dar Commission.

The party's programme for 1951 election stated that although the policy of the Congress had been 'clearly and unequivocally in favour of the formation of linguistic provinces' now the Congress would stand by the conclusions of the J.V.P report that the time was not opportune for it. In the course of time the Congress, as the ruling party of the country was compelled to create provinces on linguistic lines because of the intense agitation carried out in their favour.

The linguistic states issue has also created an eagerly sought opportunity for the communist party. It has taken an active part in linguistic agitation and has infiltrated into various ad hoc organisations set up to promote the linguistic cause.

The Hindu Mahasabha has also shown interest in this subject. It has formed its constitution on the basis of linguistic provinces yet it wants greater circumspection in the formation of states. It admits that the present states were formed by the British on account of the conquest of different territories at different periods and do not take into consideration cultural and linguistic affinities. This has resulted in great inconveniences and some times even in the suppression of certain languages and linguistic groups. But the Hindu Mahasabha also condemns the separatist tendencies and feeling of provincialism. Thus Mahasabha is in favour of the formation of linguistic states but with due regard to administrative, financial, geographical and other considerations.

There is no doubt that without rapid and bold action by the Government the movement for linguistic states may develop, and is already developing into a threat to the power of the Government, to national unity and to India's very existence as a single nation state. It is a tribute to Indian democracy that the free play of idea on this question has had fullest scope. Opportunism and irresponsibility are at work on the one hand, on the other imagination and keen foresight. The outcome will have profound significance for the future of democracy in Asia.

The root cause behind all this is that when a conflict of interest—real or imaginary—arises between linguistic groups, differing in numerical strength and in mental and moral equipment, it does not take long for the minority to feel that it has no chance against the majority and it finds an easy solution of its difficulty in a desire for separation.

Whether this demand is due to the aggressiveness of the more successful groups or some inherent or accidental weakness in the less successful ones or both, it is not easy to determine, nor is it necessary to do so. It is sufficient to note the conditions which bring it into existence and to observe that it originates in a desire for power which in its lower sense is a desire for jobs and offices and in its higher sense a desire for service to the community and for its material and moral advancement. It actuates the conduct of both, the honest and patriotic persons and of self-seekers, in the groups in which such a demand springs up.

The intensity of the demand in and its duration as also its justification vary from province to province. True demand had a long and persistent history of agitation in Andhra and still exists in a very strong form in its coastal districts. Then come Maharashtra and Punjab, which achieved their aim after a long and bitter struggle. Assam also comes in the same category. In most of the cases it has become a "Passion and has ceased to be a matter of reason." The heat, passions and controversy which had been displayed and are being displayed from time to time in this connection is a clear proof of the intensity of feeling which exists behind this demand.

The most powerful argument behind the demand is that the ruling party i.e. the Congress had initially supported the principle and further that the principle has actually been applied in the formation of the States of Andhra, Maharashtra and Gujerat. This is a constant source of irritation to other linguistic groups which are living in heterogenous provinces thus adding more and more strength to the agitation in regions like Assam. The caste system and sectional group interests have always formed a major part of Indian emotions. To a very great extent they are influencing the demand of linguistic provinces also.

Whatever may be the genesis of this demand good or bad—the demand is an untimely one. People have failed to realise how this demand will affect and is already affecting the unity of India. It is a fact that Indian unity and Nationalism will not be able to bear this strain. People should cease to think in terms of mine and thine and in terms of narrow provincialism. In order to secure the stability and integration of India narrow attachments and sentiments should be sacrificed in the larger interest of the Country. Indian Nationalism which is deeply wedded to its regional languages and Indian patriotism which is aggressively attached to provincial frontiers should be sacrificed for Indian unity and India as a nation.

The danger to the unity of India stems from the all consuming desire for linguistic states because of which people have forgotten everything else. The enquiries in connection with the formation of linguistic provinces brought some astonishing facts to the surface in 1948 and in 1955 before the Dar Commission and the S.R.C. respectively. Some of the ablest men in the country confidently and emphatically stated that language in this country stood for and represented the culture, traditions, race, history, individuality and finally a 'subnation'; that the Government of a linguistic group could not be left in the hands of a multilingual group; that each linguistic group must have a territory of its own; that this territory should be inviolated and should not be shared by any other linguistic group. The bitter disputes which raged in the areas of Bombay, Ahmedabad, Naga hills, Assam and the Punjab are surely a death-knell of Indian Nationalism. All this very clearly shows that on how unstable ground we had been standing during the days of the National movement.

The frictions and differences which exist between different linguistic groups constitute a serious threat to good Government and have also become a major administrative problem. The mere fact that two large communities can not get on together is no valid reason for breaking up a province and reorganise it on a linguistic basis even when these linguistic communities are numerically large enough, economically strong enough and geographically contiguous to form provinces of their own. The principle underlying such separation is so dangerous that even the strongest advocates of linguistic provinces have been compelled not to base their demand on this ground only, which is really at the back of their minds, but to cover it up with other ostensible grounds such as the benefit to democracy, preservation and development of their culture, traditions and language etc.

No one can deny that states in India need a rational reorganisation but strictly speaking this is not the time for any sort of reorganisation and more certainly not on linguistic grounds because there are more urgent problems to be dealt with in the country, internal as well as external. The inflation problem, the food problem, the production problem, the unemployment problem and many other problems demand our utmost attention. In foreign sphere the situation of the whole world is very precarious. Indian independence being yet in its infancy, faces the danger even more. The dispute with China has not yet been settled. India's relations with Pakistan are also not satisfactory. The country is overburdened with foreign loan. All these must get priority and redistribution of provinces should wait till India has become a 'Nation' in the true sense of the word. If

India survives all her problems will be solved in due course. Nothing could be gained by attempting a solution of the linguistic problems alone.

Moreover, this should be remembered that reorganisation of states on linguistic basis will not solve this problem forever because linguistic homogeneity can never be attained in a perfect form. The population being mobile, after every few years a considerably large linguistic minority is bound to grow up in every province, again complaining and demanding separation. Even at a very liberal computation nowhere will it be possible to form a linguistic province of more than 70 to 80% of the people speaking the same language and thus leaving in each province a minority of 20 to 30 percent speaking other languages. Considering the evidence given before the Linguistic Province Commission, 1948 with regard to different minority groups, specially Telugus and Tamils of Southern India, this minority problem will always harass the administration.

Linguistic homogeneity in the formation of new provinces is certainly attainable but within certain limits and that too only at the cost of creating a fresh minority problem. More than half of the Malayalam and Kanada speaking people are living in various provinces of India. A little less than half of the Telugus and Marathi speaking people are also scattered throughout India. They cannot be transferred to new linguistic provinces either for want of geographical contiguity or for want of their consent to be so transferred. These must remain at least for many years to come outside the sphere of a linguistic province. The case of border districts is also very difficult to be solved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

From the financial and economic points of view also linguistic provinces are going to do more harm than good. Such divisions are harmful for economic planning and as this question of redistribution on linguistic grounds is going to arise again and again after every few years, the Government will have to bear a recurring financial burden. The splitting up of India's monetary, material and moral resources and administrative talents in so many small states cannot be afforded. It has added and will always add to the anxieties of the Government, the heat, controversy and bitterness which the demarcation of boundaries and allotment of Capital cities have involved and will involve in future.

Moreover, according to linguistic survey of India (1901), there being 179 languages and 544 dialects, one wonders in how many parts and how many times the map of India will be redrawn. The plea that there are only 15 major or literary languages and only they

will be counted, will not carry any weight, because people speaking any language or even a dialect will not accept their language as an undeveloped one and will not remain behind in demanding a separate state, as soon as the principle is accepted as a policy. It is very clear from the demand of a separate Jat State and the establishment of Naga Land what utmost can be done is to avoid the demand for a more or less period of time. But the policy of accepting it at one place and denying it at the other will not work even on the plea that a particular language or dialect is undeveloped because it may develop in future and according to the speakers, it will develop in a separate state—more quickly and in a better form too. It took about three years for the S.R.C. to investigate and report on the reorganisation of the states and it spent an amount of Rs. 10,22,263-0-6.² This waste of time and money can not be tolerated again and again. Even after the publication of the report the atmosphere of the country became so poisonous that it came on the verge of civil war. This is too much to be borne in the face of more urgent problems already waiting to be solved.

The re-distribution and planning of the states should be on a rational and scientific basis. In any such planning homogeneity of language alone can not be a decisive factor. Administrative convenience, history, geographical contiguity, economy, culture and many other factors should be given due weight. Linguistic homogeneity should enter only as a matter of administrative convenience and not as an independent force. The true nature and function of a province under a federal constitution like India's, should be that of an administrative unit functioning under delegated authority from the Centre. They should never be made autonomous as some of the advocates of linguistic provinces demand. The provinces should always be subject to the powerful authority of the Centre, which is required to form new province and prevent a breakdown of administration on account of disputes amongst linguistic groups, to check fissiparous tendencies and to strengthen national feeling and above all to build up an Indian Nation. Already some of the states are demanding to have a public sector industry of their own and to have new industries whether profitable or not. These claims look harmless now but they are a step forward in the direction of state autocracy. If once economic self-sufficiency is the goal of each individual state, competition between states and between states and the Centre will follow. Negation of the economic unity of country will also follow. Even Zonal planning can not save the situation unless emotional integration is brought about and the feeling of national unity is strengthened by firm and constant

efforts.

/ A common national language, development and protection of regional language and safe-guard to linguistic minorities are the necessary steps to be taken to bring about and strengthen the feeling of National cohesion.

The credit for creating political unity in India goes to the British people. The use of English as a common medium of instruction also helped greatly in creating the unity and English very well served the purpose of a national language or as we call it of a '*Lingua franca*'. After independence the Indian Constitution adopted Hindi as the official national language. Unfortunately effective and energetic steps were not taken to promote Hindi. An indefinite policy was followed about English. It receded in the back-ground and the vacuum began to be filled by the regional languages."

The Hindi speaking states naturally took the advantage of Hindi being accepted as the all-India language and to develop intolerance towards other regional languages while others reacted by developing resistance to Hindi 'imperialism'.

The South revolted against it most and in the country began a bitter controversy over the question of Hindi and English. Some fiercely advocated the adoption of Hindi as the only official national language and discarding the use of English totally. Some went to the extent of advocating the adoption of Sanskrit while some advocated the use of English as the official language. Shri C. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Frank Anthony (M.P. nominated) being most prominent amongst the latter. As a result, the official language body was appointed by the Government in 1959. According to its report and looking at the condition in the country the Government decided that after 1965 Hindi should be used for all official purposes while English should be used for some specific purposes. This adoption of English as the second official language did not create any good will among the people and controversy once started has not subsided. Therefore, in this direction there is a great need of a firm and decisive policy, promoting Hindi on one side and protecting regional languages on the other.

A nice policy will be the adoption of the suggestion given by Shri K.M. Munshi in his pamphlet '*Dangers of Linguism*', that is of using English in all India communications and high level intercourse, post graduate studies and studies for higher services, till Hindi is accepted by the whole country as an all-India national language in good-will. A good step in this direction of emotional integration and in creating the very much needed good-will, will also be in establish-

ing of a Central University in each zone or if possible in each state, where education may be imparted in Hindi. It may start with advanced studies, having power to affiliate colleges.⁴

The protection and development of regional languages is also necessary and can be done by the states, if they adopt the policy of recognising Hindi as the official language along with their state language as has been done in Gujerat. Having more than one language as the official language has proved not only workable in U.S.S.R., Switzerland and Belgium but has also avoided a good deal of bitterness, controversy and all other implications. The same policy may be adopted in Indian states also to the satisfaction of all. In services and offices a liberal policy should be followed and no discrimination should be made on the ground of language in this sphere. The services should rather maintain their all-India character as in the British times. Highly placed officers, who are experts, should be transferred from state to state as the need for expert guidance arises. In every language there is great treasure of literature and classics of its own. The habit of indifference, intolerance and ignorance towards these should be done away with. The languages in India have already so intermingled that it is almost impossible to trace out the origin and growth of one without appreciating the development of other languages. Therefore, it becomes necessary to study other languages besides one's own or at least not to be prejudiced about them. Fortunately in Indian democracy there is ample scope for various linguistic groups to develop their respective language and literature. The constitution provides all the facilities to different languages and language groups. Thus the only thing needed is to develop a healthy atmosphere to kill suspicion and mistrust existing between different groups. A very good and effective step in this direction will be to arrange radio talks, and programmes to discuss the literature of different languages and also to arrange inter-state literary conferences for the same purpose.⁵ It is really praiseworthy that the All India Radio has begun to arrange such programmes of music and literature. The suggestion given by Dr. Rajendra Prasad in Calcutta on January 19th, 1957, at the ninth Annual Convocation of Bharatiya Hindi Siksha Parishad of adopting a common script for all regional languages is also good but the selection of script will again result in creating the same controversy which arises about the adoption of a certain language in a certain area or about the official national language.

Regarding the safeguards for linguistic minorities the constitutional provisions are ample and wide enough and have been discussed

in detail in a previous chapter. On the constitutional side there is nothing wanting for safeguarding the legal and reasonable rights of any linguistic minority. What is needed is a practical point of view and a firm policy on the part of the country. The country cannot gain by adopting the linguistic principle at one place and denying it at another place and thus adding fuel to the fire. Besides the constitutional provisions the steps taken for the development of regional languages will in themselves protect and safeguard the legitimate interests of minorities.

In every manner a rational division of states will be more advantageous against a purely linguistic division. The factors that ought to enter into such a division, according to Prime Minister Nehru are (1) Geographical feasibility; (2) Security and defence of the country; (3) Economic viability, (4) Effect on All-India Unity; (5) The desirability of having equal or nearly equal sized states as the units of the Indian Union; (6) Agreement of all parties concerned; (7) Contiguity of territory and prevalence of single language; (8) The question of priorities.⁷

Mahatma Gandhi had also supported the linguistic states but he had also suggested the creation of a healthy and peaceful atmosphere prior to a linguistic redistribution. Gandhiji gave priority to the unity of India before anything else. He worked hard for India's Unity in many ways i.e. by preaching for Khadi, by abolishing untouchability and caste-system etc. Gandhiji for one would never have given his support to linguistic states if he had suspected the spirit of disintegration and disunity of India behind this demand as we see it coming up now. He who lived and died for India's unity could not bear such dismemberment. So he had said, "Redistribution should not militate against the organised unity of India... if such province began to look upon itself as a separate sovereign unit, India's independence would lose its meaning and with it would vanish the freedom of the various units as well... It would be fatal if it (linguistic distribution) led to narrow provincialism, mutual bickerings and rivalries. The world outside does not know us as Gujeratis, Maharashtrians or Tamilians but only as Indians. We must, therefore, resolutely discourage all fissiparous tendencies and feel and behave as Indians." (Harijan, 1.2.1948).⁸

Yet he supported the linguistic states to be instituted without delay because he knew by his personal experience that cultural development of a people could not come except through their own mother-tongue. When a child is taught in a language he readily understands, and develops initiative and capacity to think for himself and that was

why he was against the use of English as the medium of instruction. Gandhiji wanted that before redistributing the states some preparatory work must be done, in other words the minds of the people must be 'Indianised'. Without such preliminary work mere clamouring for linguistic states must be condemned outright, for it sows the seeds of distrust and hatred amongst different language groups. "When the atmosphere is vitiated by linguistic antipathies and rivalries, then", wrote Gandhiji, "even a zealous reformer would postpone controversial issues to a more hopeful time when, in the interest of the country, the virtue of 'give' and take', would be freely recognised, and all sectional interests would be subordinated to the one interest of the goal of India, which will include the goal of all. Therefore, those who like me want constructive suggestions to come into play at this very moment, have to work to bring about a healthy atmosphere promoting concord in place of discord, peace in place of strife."⁹ (Harijan, 30.11.1947). This is the correct point of view to be adopted in connection with the redistribution of states on linguistic lines. Unfortunately little work is being done on these lines because selfishness and personal aggrandizement have entered in our acts and minds.

From every point of view, we can now conclude that purely linguistic redistribution is neither safe nor desirable because firstly it is impossible to be attained in a perfect form and secondly it will always harass the country in future if it is once given recognition.

Even though in some parts of the country and in certain circumstances it has been operated upon, in future it must be avoided. The problem of different languages and of linguistic groups can be successfully tackled without having recourse to a redistribution of states on a linguistic basis as is amply testified by the manner in which similar problems have been handled in the U.S.S.R., Switzerland, Canada and Belgium.

-
- 1 Report of Linguistic Provinces Commission (1948) (the Dar Commission Report) Pp. 33—para 146.
 - 2 Information supplied by the Ministry of Home Affairs dated 1st December, 1960.
 - 3 Danger of Linguism by Shri K.M. Munshi. Pp. 2 to 5 (Extracts).
 - 4 Ibid.
 - 5 Ibid.
 - 6 'Hindustan Times', January 20th 1957.

- 7 'Problems of Linguistic states in India' by Shri P. Chenchiah, M.L. Pp. 23-26, para 1-10.
- 8 'Linguistic States' by Mahatama Gandhi Edited by Shri Bharatan Kuma-rappa. Pp. 14-16, para 3-4.
- 9 Ibid. Pp. 11-12, para 3-4.

Newly Demanded States

Assam

The state of Assam is made up of Brahmaputra and Surma river valleys and the hilly areas to the North, South and East of these two river basins. Communications between this area and the rest of the state or for that matter with the rest of India, are still relatively undeveloped.

From a historical point of view Assam and North-East India seem to have been intended by nature to be the meeting place of tribes and races. Right through its history there have been immigration into and settlement in the state from various sources with the result that Assamese has not remained in fact a language spoken by a majority of the inhabitants of the state.

Assam also owes a great deal to the capital and enterprise from outside itself and its tea, coal and oil industries have been built up mainly as the result of such enterprise.

The major proposals put before the S.R.C. regarding the eastern and southern boundaries of Assam were as follows :

(i) The Assam Pradesh Congress Committee, The Local Communist Party, The Tripura State Congress Committee, and the Government of Assam were in favour of the status quo. They, however, were in favour of the merger, if possible, of Cooch-Bihar, Manipur and Tripura in Assam.

(ii) The hill districts pressed the formation of a separate hill state.

(iii) The Naga National Council wanted independence from Assam and India and to remain aloof from the proposed hill-state.

(iv) The formation of Kamatapur state consisting of Goalpara, Garohills, Cooch-Bihar, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri or of a Purbachal state consisting of the area round Cachhar was also suggested.

All these could be discussed as below :

The demand for a Hill state :—This demand is comparatively of recent origin having been first heard of when the sub-committee of the Constituent Assembly on the North-East Frontier Tribal and Excluded Areas (Bardoloi Committee) reported in July 1947. The Committee opined that this demand was not supported by moderate elements. The other proposals made to the Committee ranged from a quasi-independent status to a cultural autonomy for individual districts. The Bardoloi Committee rejected all these proposals. The proposal for a hill state was afterward put before the S.R.C. The factors which supported the demand were as follows :

(i) Suspicion and distrust of the people of the plains by the tribal people of this area.

(ii) The diversity of races and cultures and different levels of social, educational and political development in the different areas of this region which have prevented the tribal people from coming up to the level of the people in the plains.

(iii) Lack of communications in these areas which had made it difficult for various tribes to come in close contact with the rest of India.

(iv) The economic backwardness of the region.

(v) Lack of attention paid to these areas by the Government of Assam.

The S.R.C. did not recommend the Hill State on the following grounds :

(i) The establishment of such a state would separate Hill areas from the outside world.

(ii) The demand for this state was not universal. It was infact confined to Garo and the Khasi and Jaintia Hills while Mikir, North Cachhar Hills and Mizo Hills were against the demand and the district Council in Lushai Hills and the Karbi-a-Burbar were in favour of status quo. Thus according to the recommendations of the S.R.C. the Hill states remained a part of Assam.

Purbachal :—The demand for Purbachal was also not a new one. It was examined by the Congress organisation in 1948 but was not pursued. The demand was put before the S.R.C. The new scheme provided for the constitution of Cachhar, Tripura, The Mizo (Lushai) hills, the Naga hills, Manipur and N.E.F.A. hills into a new state. The genesis of the Purbachal demand was that since the major part of Sylhet was cut off from India at the time of partition, the Bengalis in Assam found themselves in an incongenial environment. The people complained that the activities of Assam Jatiya Mahasabha and

policies of local government had harmed these Bengalis. For instance, Bengalis complained that the number of primary schools with Bengali medium had fallen from 252 in 1947-48 to only one in 1952-53.

The S.R.C. considered these factors and recommended that arrangements should be made to safeguard the needs of Bengali speaking people but it did not recommend the establishment of new state because in its opinion it would only create new problems.

(3) On the same grounds it also disfavoured the creation of a Kamatpur state in the North-West of Purbachal consisting of Goalpara, Garohills, Jalpaiguri, Cooch-Bihar and Darjeeling.

The case of Tripura also came before the S.R.C. Bengali is the prominent language of Tripura and is spoken by about 59% of the population. It was a part 'C' state and the S.R.C. opined that as a small part 'C' state Tripura could not stand by itself and, therefore, it should be merged in Assam as this merger would bring the border between India and Pakistan under one single control namely that of Assam Government. It also observed that such a merger would make possible the co-ordination of development in Cachhar and on the contiguous area in Tripura. After the merger, the Bengali speaking population would become one fifth of the total population and the Commission recommended to the Assam Government to take adequate steps to safe-guard Bengali speaking population's linguistic and cultural rights.

Naga Hill Areas

The S.R.C. had not recommended the establishment of a Naga Hill State but the agitation for it took a very serious turn under the misguided leadership of Mr. Phizo. The situation became so serious only because in the beginning the Naga National Council had been given a long rope. Naga Hills had been treated with latitude even under British rule because the missionaries were expected to keep this area safe for the empire. When independence came it became apparent that this strategic north-east frontier could not be allowed to remain a no-man's land. A certain measure of direct administration was necessary there. The steps for promoting the economic well-being of the people of these areas were taken in the shape of starting of community projects and national extension service etc. Phizo and his fellow-conspirators saw in this move a danger to their independent existence. They mis-represented the motive of the Government before the people and chose the path of war, not because they were really the well wishers of the people but because they wanted to assume the

power for their own interest and to detach this territory from India. It was also proved that they were working under foreign influence. It was a revolt not of some primitive people demanding independence but of some educated people working under foreign influence, and therefore, it became difficult either to convince them or to suppress them. The situation worsened so much that military had to be sent there under Lt.-General K. C. Thimaya. After six month's military operations only the situation in Naga Hills could be controlled. The Phizo group was broken and Phizo himself took refuge in London. His followers and assistants surrendered by and by. A new party named Naga National Reform Committee was formed and Six Nagas met Mr. Nehru in Delhi. They were satisfied with the talks and then was called a convention in Delhi on July 26, 1960 in which 15 delegates and 5 consuls on behalf of Nagas took part under the leadership of Dr. Imkongliba. The convention discussed the things for about twelve days and as a result of these discussions Nagaland was declared the 16th unit of the Indian Union comprising Naga Hills and Tuensang area. It was also decided that this unit should be given a two-tier administrative set-up. The first tier will be a consultative committee comprising about 20 members from 14 major and minor tribes in Naga Hills and Tuensang Area, while most of the larger tribes were given weightage. This committee will function on a ad-hoc legislative body. The executive powers will be given to a smaller group of councillors, numbering not more than three to five who would be responsible to the Governor of Assam and Nagaland. Each councillor will draw a salary of Rs. 200 besides allowances. This interim Government will work for three years. At the second stage after this, the Nagaland will have a duly elected legislature and responsible Government like the other states.

As in the Punjab, the language controversy in Assam has not yet subsided. The reasons for this are as follows :—

The State of Assam is a 'philologist's Paradise', says the official handbook on Assam. Nearly 57% of the people speak Assamese while over 16% speak Bengali, 5 per cent speak the language of the Boro-Bodo group, 2.4% speak any one of the numerous Naga languages, whereas the same percentage speak the Mikir language. More important than any of these groups is the Khasi language spoken by more than 3.3 percent of the people of the state. Other languages account for about 6.5% of the population. The immigrant Muslims and tea garden labour have adopted Assamese as their mother tongue.

Perhaps it was on realising this that the late Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi, former Chief Minister of Assam felt that it would be

better to give the people time to adjust themselves to accepting Assamese as the language of the state.

Another consideration was that before partition Sylhet was part of Assam and its population, predominantly Bengali-speaking, was one-third of the population of the State. The proportion of the Bengali speaking people being high, it was felt, that to force Assamese would be bitterly resisted.

After independence, with Sylhet going over to Pakistan and the ratio of Assamese-speaking people rising to about 60% of the total population, the demand for its declaration as the state language gathered momentum. The Assam Sahitya Sabha started pressing the claims of Assamese people for a greater share in the services and other walks of life.

Mr. Bishnu Ram Medhi, the then Chief Minister, adopted a cautious language policy and the Assamese share in the services rose considerably. He satisfied Assamese people by giving them land in the Shillong area where the bulk of the property was owned by the Bengali employees. But he failed in satisfying the Khasis, who lived in hill areas.

After Mr. Medhi, Mr. Chaliha took over as the Chief Minister. His rivals had their own ambitions and, therefore, he could not have a smooth sailing.

In the budget session of 1959-60 Mr. Hareshwar Goswami raised the question of the state's official language. Mr. Chaliha in his reply said that the demand for making Assamese official language should come from the non-Assamese-speaking people. All that he presumably meant was that the non-Assamese-speaking people should be persuaded to accept Assamese rather than be forced to adopt it.

It was this statement of Mr. Chaliha, which 'set Brahmaputra on fire' in the words of a veteran Assam editor. His opponents had at last got an effective issue over which to weaken Mr. Chaliha's influence.

One reason for their anger against Mr. Chaliha was that his chief advisers in the Cabinet were not Assamese but the so-called 'outsiders'. They were Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, who belonged to Delhi, Mr. K.P. Tripathi, who came from a settler family from U.P. and Mr. Moinul Haq Choudhri from Cachhar.

In this connection there were prolonged discussions in the P.C.C. executive and at the joint meeting of the P.C.C. executive and the Congress legislature party. Finally, A.P.C.C. adopted a resolution which provided for the adoption of Assamese as the official language but left it to the Government to determine the spheres where it would

be used. It was to be introduced in Cachhar and the Hill districts "as and when they were prepared for it". The resolution enjoined upon the Government to 'Protect the just claims' of the non-Assamese speaking people in the matter of public services and 'fully safeguard' the languages spoken by the minorities in the State.

The resolution was acceptable to the Cabinet and the Chief Minister issued a statement that the necessary legislation would be introduced at the next session.

It, however, brought about an open rift inside the A.P.C.C. as all the 18 P.C.C. members from Cachhar were opposed to it.

It was at this stage that the ugly incidents occurred at Shillong which started a chain of incidents in the Assam valley. The non-Assamese-speaking residents of Shillong, mostly Bengalis and Khasis staged a demonstration at which provocative slogans against the Assamese language were shouted and some Assamese sign boards were removed.

There were incidents in Sibsagar and Lunding involving both Bengalis and Assamese. Calcutta papers were seized because some of them carried provocative and wrong reports and one of them had printed an obscene slogan. The situation became so serious that the Military was deputed to handle it, and it was with great difficulty that the situation could be controlled. The Union Government had to interfere and a conference of representatives of different political parties—Congress, Praja Socialist, Communist, RCPI leaders from Bengali-speaking Cachhar district and Hill districts with their dialects—met at Shillong on October 1st, 1960, but no settlement was reached. Mr. Chaliha offered his resignation but it was not accepted and on October 24th the Assam Assembly passed the official language bill, making Assamese the sole state language at the state level and different other languages at district level. The bill laid down that 'English shall also continue to be in use at Secretariat level and in offices till replaced by Hindi'. In regard to district administration the bill laid down "English shall be the language in the hill districts unless changed by the District Councils and Bengali shall be the language in Cachhar unless changed by Mahakuma Parishad (Village Panchayat) bodies and municipal boards in respective jurisdictions."

Though the bill was carried in the house but it did not satisfy the people and many members staged a walk out and some of the Bengali representatives also intended to see Prime Minister Nehru in this connection. The agitation in Assam Hill areas bore fruits when the Government of India decided to create a new Hill State in Assam on September 11, 1968 consisting of the hill districts of Garo, Khasi

and Jowai (Jaintia) with the option to Mikir Hills and North Cachhar to join the autonomous hill state through a two third majority vote in the respective district councils. No such option has been provided in the case of Mizo districts on account of the law and order situation.

The vexed question of the formation of this Hill State was on the forefront since 1954 and was only solved when the Congress Working Committee approved the Union Cabinet's proposals today virtually without any debate. This was possible only because the crucial subject of law and order with regard to Autonomous state was settled earlier by a series of top level discussions both at the ministerial and Congress High Command.

This Autonomous state will cover a population of 7,90,000. It will have a Legislative Assembly of its own and a Council of Ministers. A Chief Minister will head the Council of Ministers. At the same time, the hill areas of Assam, including those constituting the Autonomous state will have representatives in the Assam Legislative Assembly.

In choosing the ministers of the Assam Cabinet adequate representation will be given to the areas forming part of Autonomous state and other hill areas.

A standing committee of the Assam Legislature consisting of MLAs from the autonomous state and other hill areas will be constituted to advise the Assam Government on the administration of common subjects.

Shillong will be the capital of both of the state of Assam and the Autonomous Hill State. The Assam Government will continue to have administrative control over the cantonment and municipal areas of Shillong as at present. There will also be a common Governor, High Court and Public Service for the Autonomous State and Assam State. The State Electricity Board will also be common. There will be joint cadre of all-India services and some of the higher state services.

Matters affecting tribal interests and customs like marriages and inheritance will be the charge of the Assembly of Autonomous State. It will also be given taxation powers in respect of Subjects handled by the Autonomous State. The executive powers of the Autonomous state will vest in the Governor who will act on the advice of the Council of Ministers.

Subjects of common importance like major highways, major projects concerning irrigation, flood control, drainage water storage and water power, navigation and major industries and overall law

and order will continue to vest in the Assam Legislative Assembly.

The initial response to this proposal has been heartening though the All Party Hill Leader's Conference is yet to approve it formally. The only serious cause for disapproval will be the retention by the parent state of the law and order apparatus but that will not cause any serious obstacle as the new Hill state will have its own internal policing arrangements at the village level. With the convenience of consultation both Governments will be at Shillong—there need be no misunderstanding on the subject.

The plan allows for the largest consultative machinery since the Common Governor will have under his chairmanship the Council of the Chief Ministers of both states and the Chief Commissioners of the Union Territories of the region. The association of so large a body of representatives should give the Council the fullest popular consensus.

Nagaland was declared the 16th state of India on 1st December 1963 with a Governor, Cabinet and a Legislative Assembly. Before that it was under the control of the Governor of Assam. Nagaland includes the districts of Kohima, Mokokchung and Tuensang. Majority of the people are Christians and it is the only state in India with Christian majority. The tribes use different languages but all use Roman script. Assamese is the means of communication with different tribes.

Nagaland still is a problem area as group of 'Rebel Nagas' under foreign influence demand a separate 'sovereign' state of Nagaland and it is a fact that 'Sovereignty' can not be granted to any state under Indian Union. Moreover Nagaland being situated on North East Border of the country is vitally important from the point of view of security and defence.

Quite near to Assam there is the state of Manipur. It had been classed as a part 'C' state in our constitution. The racial and linguistic composition of this state is some what peculiar. The Meitheis or Manipuris, constituting about 65% of the population of the state, are the major linguistic group and are to be found mostly in the valley. There has been some settlement by Mizos from the southern parts, by the Hmars, Nagas and other tribes, and some immigration from Assam and Bengal, but the linguistic and cultural individuality of the valley has remained largely unaffected.

Manipuris have accordingly developed a special and cultural life of their own. This consciousness of a distinct linguistic and cultural individuality accounts for the opposition put up before the S.R.C. against the idea of merger with Assam to form a part of the

Purbachal state, extending from the Mizo (Lushai Hills) districts in the south to the North-East Frontier Agency in the North. The S.R.C. recommended Manipur to remain as a Centrally administered area because of the lack of communications, variety of languages and the difficulty regarding administration.

According to this recommendation Manipur was made Union Territory but there also the agitation is going on and the demand is being made for an independent status for Manipur.

Bombay

The state of Bombay had been one of the best administered states of the Indian Union. It had the highest percentage of literacy amongst part 'A' states. Judged by the measure of success it achieved in enforcing land reforms and in ameliorative legislation, it ranked amongst most progressive states of India. The financial position of the state was also very sound.

The demand for disintegrating the state into Samyukta Maharashtra and Maha-Gujarat started as early as 1948 and claims in this respect were put before the S.R.C., under Samyukta Maharashtra were demanded the Marathi-speaking areas of Bombay, Maharashtra area of Hyderabad, eight Marathi-speaking area of Madhya Pradesh and under Maha-Gujarat were demanded Gujarati-speaking areas of Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch.

The Demand for the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra rested on the arguments generally put forward in favour of linguistic states, which we have already discussed in an earlier chapter. It was also emphasised that Marathi-speaking people possessed a distinct culture of their own with common political and economic interests and therefore they had legitimate claims to a state of their own.

The S.R.C. never favoured the formation of any province only on linguistic grounds and, therefore, it considered other relevant factors also along with the linguistic factors.

The S.R.C. observed that the opinion in northern and southern districts in general seemed to be in favour of United Maharashtra state while important sectors of Marathi-speaking people in Madhya Pradesh did not favour this idea.

The position of Bombay city presented a difficult problem with regard to the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra. The advocates of Samyukta Maharashtra demanded Bombay on the grounds that it was a majority of Marathi-speaking area; that it was geographically an integral part of Maharashtra; that if it was deprived of its hinterland its further growth would be arrested and that as a separate state

it would become an arena of ideological and political conflict.

On the other hand, it was argued that Bombay could stand as a separate unit by itself, that it was not a predominantly Marathi-speaking unit ; that it had acquired its present commanding position by the joint endeavour of the different language groups and that it could not legitimately be claimed by one language group and that its integration would lead to a rapid decline in its importance.

The Dar Commission and J.V.P. Committee, it might be recalled, had paid particular attention to the future of the Bombay city and had come to conclude that in the event of disintegration of Bombay state, Bombay should be constituted in a separate unit.

The conclusions arrived at by them were that the city of Bombay stood in a special relation to Maharashtra, Gujarat and to India as a whole—industrially and commercially, it was the hub of India's financial and industrial activity and altogether it excited some of the deepest emotions in Marathi and Gujarati hearts, and they had, therefore, proposed that the Bombay State should remain untouched.

In all the non-Maharashtrian evidence that came before the Linguistic Province Commission there was practically unanimity that the City of Bombay should be formed into a separate province, either centrally administered or with a Government of its own and in no case should it be placed under an unilingual Government. Some evidence claiming to be based on experience was laid before the commission to show how the commercial and financial interests of Bombay City and of India as a whole would be affected by a sudden change in the form of Government in Bombay.

"The best fortune that we can see for the city of Bombay is that it should continue as it is to-day the meeting place of all communities, their source of pride and affection and a convenient centre for their joint labour and enterprise. It will be incongruous to make this multi-lingual and cosmopolitan city, the capital of an unilingual province" had been the final verdict of the Linguistic Province Commission on the subject (para 57, 65 and 7).

When the S.R.C. considered the question of Bombay, it observed that Bombay was one of the biggest cities of India and was the meeting-ground of various communities. It had been built by the labour of all kinds of people and communities. The population in the city was mixed and Maharashtrians were not in a majority. Even if they were, they could not take away the cosmopolitan character of the city.

The commission further reported that as regards minorities, the

Indian constitution forbade discriminatory treatment of minorities everywhere and so Maharashtrians or Gujaratis had no cause of any fears.

With regard to the suggestion of keeping Bombay as a separate political unit, the S.R.C. observed that Bombay had been the centre of political life of a democratically advanced state and its administration as a central enclave would be a retrograde step. Moreover, as Bombay depended for power and water supplies on Maharashtra area, the natural links of the city with its hinterland must be maintained and it should not be constituted into a separate unit. The commission also pointed out that if Bombay was to form a part of Maharashtra and was administered independently of Gujarat, it would cause psychological dis-satisfaction among the Gujaratis and other communities and would affect the industrial and commercial life of the country.

Taking into consideration all these factors the Commission suggested that composite character of Bombay should be maintained and recommended that Bombay Province should comprise the then existing Bombay State minus Abu Road Taluk of Banaskantha district, the Karnataka district of Dharwar, Bijapur, North Kanara and the district of Belgaum (except the Chandgud Taluk) plus the following area :—

- (i) Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani areas of the existing state.
- (ii) Saurashtra.
- (iii) Kutch and
- (iv) Mahrathawada.

This report of the S.R.C. Commission was accepted by the Government at that time and Bombay was not divided and was declared a bilingual State but the advocates of Samyukta Maharashtra could not accept the decision so easily. Agitation was intensified. Furious riots broke out in the City of Bombay and in Ahmedabad by the supporters of Samyukta Maharashtra and Gujarat respectively. The situation became so serious that Government was compelled to divide Bombay Province into two unilingual states : (i) Maharashtra and (ii) Gujarat.

Punjab

In pre-partition days, Urdu was the court language in the Punjab and also a medium of instruction in all government and local board institutions. Private schools had the option to introduce Punjabi or Hindi as the medium of instruction but few did so.

Then came the partition of the Punjab and the old educational structure was disrupted. By their resolution of August 14th, 1948, the Government of India recognised that the medium of instruction for children in various states should be their mother tongue. Punjab was recognised as a bilingual region—Punjabi-speaking and Hindi-speaking.

In June 1947, the state government issued a circular letter, stating that the medium of instruction in the primary classes should be the mother tongue of the pupil. The script should be either Devnagri script or Gurumukhi in the first two classes. An institution which adopted Devnagri script should introduce the teaching of Gurumukhi as additional script from third class onwards and vice-versa.

In January 1949 the senate of Punjab University adopted a revised scheme of studies for the matriculation providing two compulsory language papers for the examinations—Hindi as the federal language and Punjabi as the regional language. On June 9th, 1949, a meeting of the combined faculties was held at Simla to consider the detailed syllabus. A resolution recommending adoption of Punjabi as the medium of instruction up to the matriculation standard with option to the students to write it in Gurumukhi or Devnagri script, was put forward. It was, however, lost by 26 votes to 35 votes. The Sikh members staged a walkout and the meeting adopted another resolution, recommending the adoption of Hindi and Punjabi as the media of instruction and examination.

The agitation spread from academic sphere to the Public. Meanwhile, the Bhargava Ministry had fallen and Mr. Sachar had formed a new Government.

In 1949 the question of regional language was agitating the public mind in other states of the country. The Congress Working Committee discussed the matter in detail and adopted a resolution on this subject in August 1949.

The resolution enjoined on multilingual states to demarcate the undisputed areas belonging to the various languages and stipulated that for administrative purposes the language of the province or the area concerned should be used. In fringes of bilingual areas, if the minority was of considerable size, that is 20% of the population or more, the documents which the public at large had to use, should be open, however, to any person having another language and to submit petition in his own language which was officially recognised.

Armed with this resolution Mr. Sachar initiated talks with the Akali leader, Gyani Kartar Singh who had played a prominent part

in over-throwing the Bhargava Ministry.

The famous Sachar formula was the result of these negotiations and was evolved in October, 1949. The formula had six clauses and contained the declaration that Punjabi would be the regional language in Punjabi-speaking areas and Hindi would be the regional language in Hindi-speaking areas. The state government would determine such areas after expert advice. Punjabi was to mean Punjabi in Gurumukhi script, Hindi was to mean Hindi in Devnagri script.

The next four clauses dealt with the application of the formula in educational spheres. Besides providing that the medium of instruction upto the matriculation stage would be Punjabi in Punjabi region and Hindi in Hindi region, the formula gave freedom to a student to chose his medium. It was stimulated that provided a specific number of students came forward offering Hindi as their medium in Punjabi-speaking area and Punjabi in Hindi-speaking region necessary instructional facilities in their mother tongue should be provided to them.

The last clause said that English and Urdu would continue as official and court languages for the time being and would be replaced progressively by Hindi and Punjabi in the light of the principles laid down in the Congress Working Committee's resolutions.

Before the process of implementation of the formula could state in earnest the Sachar ministry fell in April, 1950 and Dr. Gopichand Bhargava again became the Chief Minister.

An expert Committee to demarcate the two linguistic regions was appointed. The members of this committee were the Chief Minister and the Education Minister of the Punjab, Dr. Tarachand, (The Education Secretary of the Government of India) Shri Zakir Hussain, (Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh University) Mr. Mehar Chand Mahajan, (then a judge of Supreme Court) Mr. Justice Harnam Singh, (Judge of the Punjab High Court) Mr. Badri Das, Goswami Ganesh Dutt, Mr. Jodh Singh and Harkishan Singh. The Committee did not have a smooth sailing and its deliberations came to an abrupt end.

The state was, however, demarcated into Hindi and Punjabi-speaking zones in 1950-51 in the following way :—

The Hindi-speaking zone comprised Rohtak, Gurgaon, Karnal and Kangra districts, areas of Hissar district to the South of the Ghaggar river and Jagadhari and Naraingarh Tehsils of Ambala district. The Punjabi-speaking zone comprised Amritsar, Jullundhar, Gurudaspur, Ferozpur, Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur district, a part of Hissar lying to the east of Ferozpur and Patiala side of the Ghaggar river, Rupar and Kharar (excepting the Chandigarh area). Bilingual

areas comprised : Simla, Ambala Tehsil and the Chandigarh area.

Meanwhile, public sentiments against the policy of Government were mounting to angry heights. The Sikhs were annoyed over the slow progress of Punjabi and Hindus felt that Punjabi in Gurmukhi script was being thrust on them. Resolutions were adopted demanding that Punjabi should be allowed to be written in Devnagri script.

It was, however, during the census of 1951 that the worst communal passions were aroused. Attempts were made from both sides—Hindus as well as Sikhs—to force people to record Hindi or Punjabi as their mother tongue. There were clashes and a few murders too. The Government of India was compelled to make a declaration that the census tables would have no entries against the language columns.

After the general elections Mr. Sachar assumed the office again and Sachar formula was enforced in the state.

Public reaction to the proposals of the Government was mixed. While there was satisfaction among the Sikhs that Punjabi was being given its due place, the Hindus did not want rigidity on the question of script. In its practical application the formula tended to divide Hindus and Sikhs into two linguistic groups and from the very outset the impression was created in the minds of children that they belonged to different linguistic groups thus giving rise to communal feelings.

As a result when the S.R.C was appointed by the Government of India, the claim for a separate Punjabi speaking state was put before it by Shiromani Akali Dal, while as a counterblast the Hindus demanded the formation of a larger Punjab State comprising the territories of the state of Punjab, PEPSU, and Himachal Pradesh and some portions of the existing Delhi state and some neighbouring districts of Uttar Pradesh.

The main arguments urged in favour of the proposed Punjabi Suba were :—

(1) It would remove all causes of unrest and discontent, would eliminate language controversies, would enable the imparting of education in the mother tongue and would help the people to grow and advance,

(2) It would be geographically compact, financially viable, would have surplus in food, and would also be rich in resources,

(3) It would be a homogeneous state inhabited by sturdy people and as such would strengthen the defence of North Western border, and finally,

(4) It would secure for the country a contented Sikh community.

The areas which were and are still being claimed to be Punjabi-

speaking and therefore, deserving of being included in the Punjabi state are :—

(1) *The Punjab* :—The districts of Gurdaspur, Amritsar, Ferozpur, Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur, Ambala, Jullundhar, Karnal, (except Panipat) and the Tehsils of Sirsa and Fatehabad and the Sub-tehsil thana of Hissar district.

(2) *PEPSU* :—The districts of Patiala, Barnala, Bhatinda, Kapurthala, Fategarh Sahib and Sangrur (except Jind and Nirwana tehsils).

(3) *Rajasthan* :—Ganganagar district.

A peculiar feature of the demand for Punjabi Suba has been that while in similar other cases the demand had the backing of an overwhelming majority of a particular language group, the demand for a Punjabi-speaking suba is strongly opposed by a large section of people speaking the Punjabi language and residing in the areas proposed to be constituted in the Punjabi Suba. This is because as stated by Grierson, the influence of Hindi has so concealed the foundation of Punjabi that the line of demarcation between Punjabi and Hindi as spoken now in the State is theoretical only.

Akali Dal claimed that Punjabi was a distinct and developed language with a script, devised to suit the phonological and inflectional peculiarities of Punjabi language. It also claimed that this language was the only language of the region which was being proposed to be constituted into a Punjabi Suba. It urged that those who opposed the demand were motivated by communal feelings because they did not want to improve the position of an under-dog.

Those, who were opposed to this demand, argue that basically the demand was a communal one and cultural and linguistic arguments had been trotted out only to camouflage the real motive.

For assessing the merits of these contending views, it is necessary to take note of certain special features of the linguistic composition of the Punjab. The first point to be remembered is that although Punjabi had been the spoken language of the greater part of the Eastern half of the undivided province of the Punjab, the position in pre-partition days was that Urdu and not Punjabi, was regarded as the official language for purposes other than those for which English was used. It was only under Sachar-Gyani Kartar Singh formula that Punjabi and Hindi were proposed to be introduced as regional languages for official and educational purposes in the two language zones into which Punjab had been divided.

The demand that Punjabi written in Gurumukhi script alone should be recognised as the Punjabi language was of relatively recent

origin. Not only had some of the reputed Punjabi writers like Warris Shah written in a script other than Gurumukhi with which Punjabi was sought to be related, but even the University of Punjab had been giving before partition, an option to the candidates taking various Punjabi examinations to adopt either the Gurumukhi or the Persian script.

The problem of language in the Punjab, was therefore, primarily one of scripts rather than of languages. In this battle of scripts, sentiments were being arrayed against sentiments. The fact could not be denied that no practical difficulties were experienced even when Persian script was used for writing Punjabi. The Hindus as a community seemed to be strongly opposed to the imposition of Gurumukhi script on them in disregard of the past practice as also their own sentiments. In these conditions, if this area was constituted into an unilingual state with only one script namely Gurumukhi, it would create more problems than it could solve.

Even if such a state was created the people claiming Hindi as their mother tongue could demand and be entitled to receive instruction in Hindi. According to the resolution, regarding the interest of linguistic minorities, adopted by the provincial Education Minister's Conference of August 1949 and approved by the Central Advisory Board of Education and the Government of India, the state governments are required to provide facilities for the instruction of children at the primary stage in their mother tongue if it is different from the regional or state language provided that there are at least 40 pupils speaking that language in the whole school or 10 in one class. Facilities must also be provided at the secondary stage, if there is a sufficient number, usually one-third of the total number of the pupils, whose mother tongue is different from the regional or state language.

Looking at the background of the language controversy in this area, it was not unlikely that a large section of Hindus would seek instruction in Hindi if a Punjabi-speaking state was formed. Whatever the legitimacy of such a demand might be, there was no method by which a person could be compelled to adopt a mother tongue other than that for which he himself showed his preference. In these circumstances, if Punjabi Suba was formed, the entire area would still be bilingual, in the sense that instruction in Hindi will have to be arranged on an extensive scale and for official purposes also Hindi probably had to be given special recognition.

That the demand for the due recognition of Hindi as the spoken language of the region stimulated only by the recent controversy, was

clear from the fact that of the total number of candidates who appeared in Hindi and Punjabi examinations of Punjab University from Jullundur division, more than 60% offered Hindi as their Medium of answers and showed that Hindi would not by any means be unimportant in the Punjabi Suba and Punjabi and Hindi will have to be developed side by side.

Sachar-Gyani formula had already given Punjabi its due place. It was being given as honourable a treatment in Hindi-speaking zone as was given to Hindi in Punjabi-speaking zone. If, therefore, in the case of formation of a separate Punjabi Suba the Punjabi language could secure an advantage in one direction, namely, in the enforcement of Gurumukhi script in the Punjabi-speaking zone, it has lost in another direction, by its replacement by Hindi in Hindi-speaking areas.

There was one more important point which should be taken into account while considering a further division of the Punjab on linguistic grounds. According to Grierson the line between Western Hindi spoken in Hindi speaking areas of the Punjab and Punjabi could be taken as the meridian line passing through Sirhind. The territorial claims for proposed Punjabi Suba, however, ignored this line of division. They went so far as to include the whole of Ambala, the district of Karnal minus one tehsil and portions of Hissar. A claim was also made to Ganganagar district of Rajasthan which never formed part of the Punjab. With the vast dispersal of Punjabi-speaking people and with the colonisation of the area under Bhakra Project, the division between two linguistic zones in the Punjab progressively became less and less real. The Akali Dal memorandum, submitted to the S.R.C., itself stated that Punjabi-speaking people carry their culture and language with them wherever they go. Quite clearly, with this wide dispersion of the Punjabi language in recent years and intermingling of Hindi speaking and Punjabi-speaking people, it was impossible to create a compact unilingual state.

One more important and note worthy point was that there were no complaints from the advocates of Punjabi Suba about economic or a political exploitation of Punjabi-speaking areas by the representatives of so called Hindi-speaking region. Such complaints were only heard from hilly areas and Haryana tract.

Undoubtedly in these areas there was internal tension but it followed on communal lines mainly and therefore the S.R.C. did not recommend the separation of Haryana area from Punjab.

The question of the merger of PEPSU had also come before the S.R.C. because the Save Hindi Samiti demanded the formation of a

larger Punjabi unit comprising the territories of Punjab, PEPSU, Himachal Pradesh, some portions of existing Delhi state and two or three districts of Uttar Pradesh. The PEPSU Government wanted that PEPSU should remain as a separate state but the demand was not accepted by the SRC and it was merged in the Punjab.

The language controversy in Punjab was still alive and it gained added momentum when Bombay state was divided into two parts i.e. Maharashtra and Gujarat. Obviously the division was based on the linguistic principle. The argument of the Akalis was that principles should have universal validity and not a limited application depending on the whims and fancies of the powers that be. The bifurcation of Bombay had thus served as a convenient handle for prolonging the demand for the Punjabi Suba.

To decide the long pending case of Punjab a Boundary Commission was appointed on April 23rd, 1966. Mr. Justice J. C. Shah a judge of the Supreme Court was its chairman and Mr. S. Dutta and Mr. M. M. Philip, former secretaries of the Union Government were its two members. The three men Commission was asked to examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the present state of Punjab and to recommend adjustments in the boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed state of Punjab and Haryana. It was also asked to indicate the hill areas of the present state of Punjab contiguous to Himachal Pradesh and having linguistic and cultural affinity with the Union territory. The Commission submitted its report to the Union Home Ministry in 31st May 1966 and was published by the Government on 8th June 1966.

The Report of the Commission traced the history of the linguistic development of Punjab before and since partition and referred to various documents including census reports on the subject. (All these have previously been discussed in the main chapter.)

The Commission recommended that of the 20 districts of the existing bilingual Punjab five should form the State of Haryana, eight the Punjab State and four should merge with the Union territory of Himachal Pradesh. The remaining three districts were to be divided among the three states.

The Commission recommended that the Chandigarh and a ten-mile area around it should go to the state of Haryana. In a dissenting note Mr. S. Dutta favoured the inclusion of Chandigarh in the proposed state of Punjab. The commission member also differed on the question of Kharar tehsil of Ambala. In regard to the other questions the recommendations were unanimous and the Government

accepted all of them.

After a Cabinet meeting on June 9, 1966 the Government of India decided to constitute Chandigarh town into an Union Territory. Chandigarh is a part of Kharar tehsil. The area known as the Chandigarh Project area is administered as Union Territory. The Punjabi speaking part of the tehsil was included in the State of Punjab and the Hindi-speaking part was included in Haryana. Chandigarh was made the Capital of both the states.

The Punjab reorganisation bill was introduced in Lok Sabha on 3rd September 1966 and the new states were created on 1st November 1966.

The new state of Punjab includes the districts of Gurudaspur (excluding Dalhousie, Balun and Bukov) Amritsar, Kapurthala, Jullundur, Ferozepur, Bhatinda, Patiala and Ludhiana with tehsils of Barnala, Malerkotela, Sangrur, Rupar, Dasuya, Hoshiarpur and Gurushankar. It also includes development blocks of Anandpur, Narpurbedi and villages of Kherbagh, Samipur, Bhabhaur, Kalseh and Kosri. Haryana includes the districts of Hissar, Mohindargarh, Gurgaon, Rohtak and Karnal.

Himachal Pradesh

About Himachal Pradesh there had been two demands. According to one, it should be merged with Punjab as a part of newly demanded Maha-Punjab state and according to the other demand, it must remain as a separate unit and should be called Vishal Himachal.

Argument against its merger with a larger unit were put forward before the S.R.C. These arguments were as follows :

Himachal Pradesh was relatively backward and having regard to its small population, and the percentage of literacy in these areas which was much lower than in the case of the Punjab, there was a great need of development of this area. It would form only a part of a larger unit, and would be a neglected area with few opportunities for economic and social development. Himachal Pradesh was also a border state and it should remain as a separate state with the active support of the Central Government. One of the main arguments was also that this area had a cultural individuality and the interests of the relatively backward areas would suffer by its association with the more advanced people of adjoining plains.

All these arguments were not accepted by the S.R.C. and it reported that the economic and administrative advantages of Himachal Pradesh being integrated with adjoining places were important.

The report said that the catchment areas of Sutlej and Beas were mostly in Himachal Pradesh and from the point of view of Bhakra Project, some areas should be transferred to the Punjab. Soil conservation in the hills was vitally important and, therefore, the transfer of these areas would be to the mutual benefit of the people of plains and hills because then these areas would be irrigated easily.

Another argument which was put forward in favour of Himachal Pradesh's separate existence was that the Government of India had intended at the time of the formation of this unit that it would continue it as a separate Centrally administrative unit. The Commission reported that no firm assurance of this sort was given to that effect. The arrangement made at the time of the merger of the states was only transitional. If it was to be regarded as final, the reorganisation on a rational basis was impossible and there was no need of appointing the States Reorganisation Commission.

The Commission in its decision declared that as a result of its tour of that area it had found that the opposition to the integration of this unit in the Punjab was not so strong as was generally made out. Whatever opposition existed was fostered by vested interests. Accordingly the S.R.C. recommended the merger of Himachal Pradesh with the Punjab and suggested that the Punjab cabinet should include at least one member elected from one of the constituencies of Himachal Pradesh. The Commission also reported that Indo-China border in this region admitted of easy infiltration so that the defence and security requirements of the region must remain a special concern of the Government of India. These security considerations required the establishment of a stronger and more resourceful unit than present Himachal Pradesh. Shri Fazal Ali, one of the three members of the S.R.C., however, added a note of dissent to this recommendation, by which he supported the demand of keeping Himachal Pradesh as a separate unit.

When the report of the Commission was published the demand for a separate unit, called 'Vishal Himachal' was reiterated in several meetings held under the auspices of Congress Committee in the state and it was urged that the hill people of Himachal Pradesh, Kangra, Kandaghat and Tehri Garhwal were so organically intertwined that 'no interest of the hill people would be served unless they were put in one lot together.' Mr. Fazal Ali's note of dissent was welcomed as a silver lining in the clouds. The Government afterwards made Himachal Pradesh a union territory but this could not satisfy the advocates of Vishal Himachal and demand for it still continues. They demanded a separate Vishal Himachal Pradesh comprising Himachal

Kangra, Kandaghat, Simla, Nalagarh and hilly areas of Hoshiarpur and Gurdaspur and they achieved their goal on the formation of Punjabi Suba.

West Bengal

West Bengal claimed the territories of East of the Mahananda river, the whole of Manbhum and the Dhalbhum portion of Singhbhum district and Santhal Pargana. This claim was put before the S.R.C.

West Bengal's claim to these areas rested on the argument that the transfer of these areas to West Bengal would create administrative convenience, geographical contiguity, and linguistic affinity. Bihar also claimed these areas and contended that geographical contiguity need not be attached much importance in view of the fact that the constitution of India contained adequate provisions to facilitate inter-state cooperation.

These disputed areas to which Bihar and West Bengal both put their claim were bilingual areas. Hindi was either the predominant language or at least a very important language in these areas, while quite a large number of Biharis were also found in these parts. The Bihar Government contended that Bengali was unnecessarily being imposed on the people and from language point of view West Bengal could not claim these areas. It was also pointed out that if the rich mineral bearing and industrialised areas of Rajmahal, Manbhum and Dhalbhum were transferred to Bengal, the economy of Bihar would be dislocated.

Unfortunately the linguistic complexion of these disputed areas was not quite clear and only a wide estimate of the relative numerical strength of various linguistic groups in the districts of Purnia, Santhal Pargana and Manbhum and Goalpara seemed possible.

With regard to Purnia district, the main difficulty came in the classification of dialects spoken in this area. Grierson and following him O Malley classified them as north Bengali but the Bihar Government challenged this classification. Anyway, the affinities between Kishangaji or Sirpuria as spoken in the extreme east tip of Purnia district, on the one hand, and Bengali on the other hand, seemed to be close but this dialect was written in the Maithili script which was allied to Hindi and in the Western part this dialect was allied to Maithili and Hindi both. On the basis of this situation the S.R.C. rejected the claims of Bihar and Bengal both.

Another main argument on which West Bengal claimed these areas was the desirability of making the state a geographical unit. It

was on this ground that the S.R.C. recommended the integration of these areas with West Bengal. The Commission recommended that to secure the geographical unity and administrative convenience (1) the portion of Kishanganj sub-division which lay to the east of the river Mahananda and (2) a portion of Gopalpur Revenue Thana contiguous to the above should be transferred to West Bengal.

While making this recommendation the Commission also pointed that in the Eastern Portion of Kishanganj sub-division the Muslims predominated. They were worried that the transfer of these areas to West Bengal would be harmful to their linguistic and cultural rights. These fears, the Commission added, were not without justification. Therefore West Bengal should take effective steps such as the recognition of the special position of Urdu in this area for educational and official purposes.

In Santhal Pargana Bengali influence was very slight. The percentage of Bengali-speaking people was meagre in all sub-divisions except in Rajmahal and Pakur, where they constituted about 16 and 13 percent of the population.

The S.R.C. observed that if the Eastern fringe of this district was detached from Bihar it would not only create administrative complications, it would also lose Rajmahal coal-fields. Moreover, Santhali opinion was not in favour of retransfer to West Bengal. Therefore this area should not be transferred to West Bengal.

Manbhum was also not recommended to be transferred on the basis of administrative inconvenience and last came the case of Dhanbad. Dhanbad was an industrialised area and Hindi was the prominent language there. Hindi-speaking majority was 65%. It being an industrialised area and having coal-fields, there were indications that in future it would attract a mixed population and on this ground the S.R.C. did not recognise the claim of West Bengal to this area.

In Purulia district Bengali-speaking people were in the majority, their percentage being 55 as against 28% of Hindi-speaking people. Apart from this the S.R.C. observed that its transfer would facilitate the implementation of a flood control-cum-irrigation project and the use of the Kangobati (Kasai) river by West Bengal, (which had already utilised it to some extent in its lower parts) and in this way, Purulia, excluding Chasmana, was recommended to be transferred to West Bengal by the S.R.C.

Next we come to Dhalbhum. In Dhalbhum the Bengalis formed the largest language group. Even then the S.R.C. observed that in an important portion of this area round Jamshedpur the population was

so much mixed that West Bengal's claim could not be admitted and thus this area was not transferred to West Bengal by the S.R.C.

Regarding Goalpara it was reported by the S.R.C. that Bengali was not the prominent language of this district. Moreover, this district had long been a part of Assam and could not be transferred to West Bengal.

Bihar

Regarding Bihar's division, the following proposals were put before the S.R.C.

- (1) The formation of Jharkhand state in South.
- (2) Orissa's claim for restoring to it the Seraikella sub Division of the Singhbhum district.
- (3) The border adjustment of Bihar with West Bengal.
- (4) Bihar's claim to Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Malda and West Dinjapur in the North and to Sundargarh, Keonjhar and Mayurbhanj in the South.

The proposal to split up Bihar in such a way that the Chhota Nagpur division and the Santhal Paragana might be formed into a Jharkhand state had an interesting background. Before the commencement of our constitution, the sub-committee of the constituent Assembly on the excluded and partially excluded areas, (other than Assam) which went into the question of drawing up a scheme for the tribal and backward areas, considered very briefly the suggestion that a new province should be created in South Bihar. The sub-committee expressed itself against this proposal although it did not deal with the question in detail as the formation of new states was outside its scope.

After that Jharkhand party fought general elections on this issue and claimed to have secured a substantial verdict in favour of the proposal to form a new state. Thirty three members of the local legislature from Chhota Nagpur division and Santhal Pargana districts presented the case for the division of Bihar to S.R.C. But these people did not represent the majority view and Jharkhand party also did not obtain a clear majority within Chota Nagpur division and Santhal Pargana. Public opinion outside south also did not favour the division. Even in South Bihar parties, other than Jharkhand party opposed the division.

The S.R.C. observed that if Chhota Nagpur division and Santhal Paragana were taken together the tribal population was only a little more than one-third of the total population and that too was divided into several language groups. Even if it was assumed that the

Adivasis were solidly in favour of formation of a Jharkhand State, a major issue of this kind could not be decided on the basis of the view of majority.

Moreover, the Commission also observed that the separation of South Bihar would affect the entire economy of the existing state. The plains were predominantly agricultural and the Chhota Nagpur plateau provided an industrial balance. The sugar factories of the state were situated outside Chhota Nagpur division but coal bearing areas and major industrial zones were in south Bihar. Bihar's biggest Thermal Power station was also located at Bakaro in Jharkhand area and the loss of this area could not be afforded by the rest of the state.

The Commission also observed that the separation of Chhota Nagpur would upset the balance between agriculture and industry in the residual state which would be a poorer area with fewer opportunities and resources for development. At the same time the centres of higher education like Patna and Bihar universities would be outside the Jharkhand area. Obviously it would be very inconvenient from this point of view also.

It was also suggested before the Commission that Chhota Nagpur division had been neglected by Bihar Government but this argument was not found valid by the Commission and was put aside. The Commission did not recommend the division but it recommended that adequate measure should be taken for the advancement of Adivasis.

Orissa

Just connected with the question of Bihar came the question of the re-organisation of Orissa. The province of Orissa was created in 1936 in terms of Government of India (constitution of Orissa) order but an elaborate enquiry, covering in particular the question of its boundaries preceded this order and was spread over a period of about 30 years that is to say from 1903, when the circular which dealt with the regrouping of provinces was first addressed to the provincial Government.

The question was also considered by three important committees in very considerable detail (1) the Philip-Duff Committee which reported in 1924. (2) The Attlee Committee which was constituted by the Simon commission. (3) O'Donnell Committee which reported in 1932. These committees considered the matter in detail and the province of Orissa was carved out of neighbouring areas, after a consideration of its proper boundaries,

When in 1953 the S.R.C. was appointed the question of its re-organisation came before it. On the one hand Orissa claimed some districts of Bihar and on the other hand the Andhra state made claims on some of its territories.

The major claims made on Orissa were as follows :—

(1) The three Northern districts of Mayurbhanj, Sundargarh and Keonjhar were claimed by Bihar on the ground that the people of these areas desired to be associated with Chhota Nagpur.

(2) The Andhra state claimed the whole of Koraput district, the Parlakimedi estate and the Parlakimedi Maliahs of the Ganjam district, and a portion of the Chatarpur and Berhampur talukas of Ganjam constituting a coastal belt in this district extending from the then existing Andhra state boundary upto the Rushikulya river.

The claim of Bihar government has already been dealt with, in connection with the re-distribution of Bihar so we will examine the claim of Andhra only.

Andhra's claim to Koraput rested on a number of arguments, the most important and relevant being that the trade affiliations of the district with Parvati-puram and the rest of Srikulam district as well as with Vishakhapatnam districts were fairly close. The basis of the demand for other territories which had been claimed was mainly linguistic, Parlakimedi estate and Berhampur town in particular being claimed as outlying Telugu Pockets in Orissa.

But the Commission observed that Koraput was a district in which Oriya-speaking majority was absolute and since Kondh and Paruja was spoken by a little less than one quarter of the population therefore it could not be regarded as an Andhra area. The trade affiliations of these districts which have been mentioned were not also such as might justify the disturbance of the then existing position and they did not recommend the transfer of Koraput to Andhra.

At the time of creation of Orissa Parlakimedi was transferred to Orissa mainly on linguistic ground. Same was the case with Berhampur and the S.R.C. did not see any reason for disturbing this arrangement.

In Ganjam, Oriya was the predominant language and Telugu was spoken only by about 15% of the people and here also the Commission did not find it necessary to detach an important coastal belt from the rest of the district.

The claims made on behalf of Orissa were as follows :—

(1) A coastal belt and agency tracts consisting of predominantly Oriya and aboriginal areas in Srikakulam district right up to

Vamsadhara river.

Regarding this claim the Commission observed that in Srikulam district Telugu Majority was as high as 89%. This majority was like-wise pronounced even in Ichapuram, Sompeta and Tekkaly taluks and therefore it could not be transferred to Orissa.

(2) The Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawagarh (ex-Zamindari areas of Raipur districts), a portion of ex-Zamindari areas of Chandpur in Bilaspur district and portion of the Bastar district.

In the case of Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawagarh areas of the Raipur district, the O'Donnel Committee found overwhelming Public support for their retention in Madhya Pradesh. In these areas Hindi was the predominant language and even Chattisgarhi was more important than Oriya. Oriya-speaking population was not in majority even in Mahasamund and apart from this no other convincing argument was put in favour of this claim and, therefore, the S.R.C. agreed with the decision of O'Donnel Committee and did not disturb the existing arrangement.

(3) The Singhbhum district of Bihar, particularly Seraikalla and Kharsawan, had been claimed.

Orissa's claim to these areas rested mainly on the ground that Oriya was the largest single language group in this area. These two areas had formed part of the Singhbhum district since May, 1948. The S.R.C. observed in this connection that Oriya's percentage in rural portions was only about 26 and those speaking this language did not seem to be concentrated anywhere in the sub-division to such an extent that linguistic affinities could be regarded as clear and unmistakable. Moreover, when Manbhum district was to go to the West Bengal (this was recommended by the S.R.C.) the transfer of the Seraikalla sub-division or any part, thereof, to the state of Orissa would convert the Dhalbhum sub-division in the east into an enclave which could not be physically contiguous to the rest of Bihar.

The Commission observed that this could be advantageous only if the whole of Singhbhum was transferred to Orissa but that would not be justified on administrative or on other grounds. In 1932 the O'Donnel Committee had considered the question of transferring the entire district to Oriya-speaking state but declined to recommend the transfer on the ground that its geographical position and lines of communication favoured its retention in Chhota Nagpur. The S.R.C. also agreed with this view and did not recommend the transfer.

Bastar was claimed by Orissa on an alleged affinity between Halbi and Parjhion languages on the one hand and Oriya on the other, which in the opinion of the S.R.C. was not adequately proved

and therefore the claim was not admitted.

(4) A portion in south-west Midnapore district of West Bengal was also claimed by Orissa.

This area belonged to West Bengal and had been considerably under Bengali influence. Oriya-speaking people in this area were negligible and, therefore, the S.R.C. rejected this claim too.

Vidharbha

The demand for the creation of Vidharbha can be traced back to 1905. The advocates of this demand want the separation of Marathi-speaking districts of the ex-Madhya Pradesh in a separate unit. The demand was put before the S.R.C. and rested on the usual arguments put forward in the favour of linguistic states. The statement put up before S.R.C. by the M. P. Government showed that no discriminatory treatment was accorded to the Marathi-speaking people as alleged by them. Even then the Commission pointed out that the demand for the separation of the Marathi-speaking areas from Hindi-speaking areas could not be ignored. The ignoring of this demand would involve an increasingly severe strain on political life and the administrative machinery of the state.

Now, we shall examine the arguments in favour of the separate state of Vidharbha which are historical, cultural, administrative and financial.

First we can examine the case of four districts of Berar namely Akola, Amaravati, Buldana and Yeotmal. The Marathi-speaking districts of ex-Madhya Pradesh have intimate links with Berar district since long, therefore, geographically, economically and culturally, the Marathi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh can not be distinguished from Berar itself.

The advocates also said that financially Vidharbha would be a surplus area, having a surplus of one crore and a half as a rough estimate. If these areas were joined with Bombay they will not get the full advantage of their money in connection with development schemes and projects.

It was also claimed before the S.R.C. that Nagpur would be completely overshadowed by Bombay city, which would be the capital of Maharashtra state. Communalism would begin to play a leading part in the political life of this area. Land and tenancy laws in this area would have to be modelled on those of Bombay state.

After considering all these factors S.R.C. also pointed out that there was a deep rooted regional consciousness in Vidharbha and an important section of public opinion wanted separation, even though

leaders of Samyukta Maharashtra had given full assurance to guarantee their rights. Therefore S.R.C. recommended the creation of Vidharbha state consisting of Buldana, Akola, Amaravati Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda. The area and population of this state was to be 36,880 square miles and 7.6 millions respectively. The S.R.C. did not, however, recommend the break-up of the districts of Nimar, Betul, Chhindwara and Balaghat to the North and Bastar to the East in order to recognise the claims made on behalf of Vidharbha.

Thus recommended Vidharbha was to be the most important cotton growing area in the country but this recommendation of the S.R.C. was not approved and Vidharbha was not created although the demand still continues.

Kerala

The present Kerala state was created by the S.R.C. consisting of Travancore-Cochin minus the five taluks of Thovala, Agastheeswararam, Kaekulam, Vilavancode and Shakota plus Malabar district (including the port Cochin area) the Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district and the Amindive island. It was a linguistically homogeneous area, about 94% of its population being Malayalam-speaking.

With regard to Kerala a proposal was put before the S.R.C. that the whole of the Kerala should be merged in Madras to form a South Indian state, otherwise Travancore-Cochin, deprived of its Tamil Taluks and yoked with economically backward areas would not constitute a viable unit. But this proposal was not welcomed by Malayalam-speaking people nor by the Tamil. The latter did not like to be associated with 13 million Malayalam-speaking people who had never been united with them before. Opinion in Travancore-Cochin was also against the merger.

On behalf of Kerala the district of South Kanara and Nilgiris, Coorg and Amindive and Laccadive islands were also claimed. But the claim was not accepted by the S.R.C. which observed that in South Kanara and Nilgiris the Malayalam-speaking population was 72% and it was not good to break up this area on linguistic grounds.

Hyderabad

Hyderabad is a state with a population speaking different languages. 47.8% speak Telgu, 24.3% speak Urdu and 10.5% speak other languages.

On this linguistic basis the demand for the disintegration of this state was put before the S.R.C. It was also contended that the state had long been an artificial political unit and therefore, the progress of the state had suffered unnecessarily.

Curiously enough, on the opposite side, it was contended that for more than 600 years, from the times of Bahmani Kings, the area had been an integrated unit with common geo-political features and the state represented in miniature a real cultural synthesis and intermingling of Indian people and should, therefore, be preserved as a model for other areas to imitate.

One important fact to be remembered is that three areas of Hyderabad known as Telangana, Karnataka and Marathawada were substantially unified only under the authority of Asaf Jahi dynasty. Thus the unity of Hyderabad was not based on a free association of the people but rested on the weak foundation of personal rule, therefore, much can not be said about its cultural unity or synthesis.

Geographically Hyderabad is divided into two distinct regions—the Deccan region and the remaining region. Out of these the Deccan region more or less corresponds with Marathawada. The demographic features are also so different that even a casual observer proceeding from Aurangabad to Warangal may notice the differences between the people not merely in their languages but also in their clothing, special customs, and manners etc. Thus geo-political arguments and claims of cultural unity were not very substantial.

After considering both the views i.e. the disintegration of the state or maintaining the status quo, the S.R.C. reported that plea for the continuation of Hyderabad rested on weak arguments. It reported as follows :

“Continuance of the existing state will keep a number of important reorganisation problems unsolved and thereby impede the stabilization of proposed units in the South.

The S.R.C. report further observed that the position of Urdu-speaking people in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, who constitute 45% of the population, should be made secure. These people feared that if Hyderabad was made the capital of either Telangana or Vishal Andhra, they would suffer culturally and economically. To reassure these people, Urdu should be given a special position in educational institutions.

On the bases of this report Hyderabad was merged in Andhra and the name of Andhra was changed into Andhra Pradesh.

Karnataka

People speaking Kannada language demanded the creation of a

separate Karnataka state or Maha-Karnataka as early as 1927.

It has been generally recognised that in provincial distribution under the British, Kannadigas had suffered most, with their area split up into four units. The all-India Congress Committee in 1927 and the Indian Statutory Commission of 1930, all recommended and recognised the legitimacy of the claim of Kannadigas to the unification. The Dar Commission also expressed the view that the Kannadigas would prosper and be able to manage their affairs much better under their own government. When S.R.C. was appointed the proposal of merging Mysore with Karnataka was put before it but Mysore was not prepared to be merged in Karnataka mainly on religious grounds i.e. dominance of Veerasaivism at the cost of other religions.

But even then the creation of a new Karnataka state was recommended by the S.R.C. The new Karnataka was to be self-sufficient financially because it was to have Tungabhadra Project. The other difficulties which might come in transitional period were to be settled by and by.

The proposed state was to have :

(1) Mysore state excluding Siruguppa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and a small area of Mallapuram sub-taluk in which the dam and headworks of the Tungabhadra Project were situated.

(2) The four Kannada-speaking districts of the Southern division of Bombay namely Belgaum except Chandgud taluk, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara.

(3) The districts of Raichur and Gulbarga.

(4) The South Kanara districts except Kasaragod taluk.

(5) The Kollegal taluk of the Coimbatore district of Madras.

(6) Coorg.

The territorial limits of Karnataka thus broadly covered the Kannad-speaking areas but in case of one two small units linguistic considerations were subordinated to other considerations.

This recommendation of the S.R.C. was not accepted by the Government because of administrative difficulties and this province was not created.

Uttar Pradesh

The demand for the reorganisation of U.P. had also been put forward before the S.R.C. It was not a new demand. On the basis of linguistic division of U.P. and its past history this demand had been

voiced from time to time in several conferences between 1928 and 1933 and was also placed before Simon Commission, before the Allahabad Unity Conference of 1931, the Round Table Conferences and British Parliamentary Delegation in 1945. Big conferences consisting of the representatives of the entire area were held in 1946 and 1947 which passed resolutions in favour of its decision. The demand was again put forward before the S.R.C. and the following arguments were given in its favour :—

The language map of the U.P. shows that there are to be found four dialects.

(1) Pahari in the North.

(2) Western Hindi or Brij Bhasa in that part of Western U.P. which consists of Meerut, Agra, Rohilkhand and Jhansi divisions and part of Allahabad division.

(3) Eastern Hindi or Oudhi, which is the prevailing dialect of that part of U.P. which is situated between Pilibhit, Hardoi, Shahjehanpur, Kanpur and Hamirpur districts on one side and Basti, Azamgarh Ghazipur and parts of Benaras and Mirzapur districts on the other.

(4) Bihari or Bhojpuri in the East.

On this basis the proposal for the reorganisation of Uttar Pradesh was made. The newly proposed state was to include 16 Western districts of U.P. Hindi-speaking areas of Bharatpur, Punjab and PEPSU, Delhi, the districts of Alwar, Bharatpur and Dholpur from Rajasthan and such contiguous areas of Madhya-Bharat as were desirous of joining the new state.

Apart from this linguistic argument it was also urged that historically the basin of Ganga and Jamuna had since times immemorial, formed a separate political unit and passed into the hands of the Afghans as one suba. In the days of the Mughals, the present Haryana Prant of the Punjab and the present Meerut division, part of Rohilkhand and Kumaon divisions constituted one suba and afterwards passed under the control of the Marathas. After the defeat of Marathas in 1803, it passed again as one whole into the hands of the British and was added to Bengal Presidency. It was only in 1858, after the so called 'Mutiny', that the area beyond the Jamuna was made over to the Punjab. Oudh was annexed by the British in 1856 and Mathura and Ayodha were brought together for the first time in 1877. It was pointed out that Uttar Pradesh in its present form had a continuous history of less than a hundred years, nor could the claim that it was a well-knit area with natural boundaries proved by facts. Therefore it was only after reorganisation

that a homogeneous unit could be created and satisfy the aspirations of the people.

The case for the reorganisation was presented before the S.R.C. by an ad hoc committee described as the Western U.P. M.L.A.'s Central Committee for reorganisation of U.P. A memorandum urging the division was originally signed by 97 members of Local Legislative Assembly, representing 16 Western districts. But about 70 members subsequently dissociated themselves from this memorandum.

The arguments in favour of division, apart from those mentioned above were as follows :—

(1) Physically and geographically, the hill and plateau regions of Uttar Pradesh had little in common with the Gangetic valley.

(2) The present size of the state was unwieldy and therefore the administration had not been very efficient.

(3) The Western areas of U.P. had been neglected and the financial surplus which accrued to the state from this region had been mostly spent on Eastern areas.

(4) The states of the union should be roughly of equal size and importance, so that no one unit might be in a position to exercise a dominant influence in all India affairs.

The demand for reorganisation was rejected on the recommendation of two out of the three members. Mr. Fazal Ali and Shri Hirdayanath Kunzru did not favour the demand while the third member Sardar K.M. Pannikar recommended that a new state should be created consisting of the Meerut, Agra, Rohilkhand and Jhansi divisions of U.P. (minus the Dehra Dun district of Meerut division, the Pilibhit district of Rohilkhand division), the districts of Datia from Vindhya Pradesh and the four districts of Bhind, Morena, Gird Gwalior and Shivpuri from Madhya Bharat. Sardar Pannikar supported the division mainly on the grounds that the U.P. was a very big unit and this was against the federal principle which provides for the more or less equal size of its units.

The other two members rejected the demand on the following grounds :—

(1) The existing state had been able to avoid a great deal of expenditure which might otherwise become necessary if two or more states were created.

(2) Partition of the state would create financial difficulties for one or more of the units.

(3) The head works of all the three or four major projects would be situated in the West but they would also have to serve the Eastern areas.

(4) The distribution of expenditure had been more or less in ratio of the population and the allegation that the Meerut, Agra and Rohilkhand divisions had been neglected was baseless.

(5) In the state itself there was no demand on any large scale for its being broken up.

(6) Much importance could not be attached to the view that either the present size of U.P. or its representation to the Upper House, by itself, secured for this state any dominant influence in the Union Parliament or in the executive. The complaint that most of the representatives of the Hindi-speaking areas voted on the same side could not be substantiated.

The recommendations of the S.R.C. were widely objected to by the supporters of the newly proposed state and it was said that the Commission did not properly consider the question. Anyway U.P. was not amputated.

Madhya Pradesh

As early as in 1938 the demand was raised for the separation of eight Marathi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh and for forming a large Hindi speaking state, consisting of the Hindi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh and Hindi-speaking units of Central India i.e. Vindhya Pradesh, Bhopal, and Madhya Bharat. This demand was also raised before the S.R.C.

The proposals made to the S.R.C. about these areas ranged from the consolidation of all of them into one state on one hand, and to the maintenance of the status quo on the other hand. Public opinion in Hindi-speaking areas seemed to assume that the formation of a large Hindi-speaking unit followed as a necessary corollary from the disintegration of Madhya Pradesh. The Mahakoshal Pradeshik Committee suggested the formation of a state consisting of Hindi-speaking areas of Madhya Pradesh, the Malwa portion of Madhya Bharat and the whole of Vindhya Pradesh and Bhopal.

Bhopal's merger in Madhya Pradesh was proposed on the ground that it would make its economic development possible. Vindhya Pradesh was also to be benefitted by the utilisation of Narmada waters after the merger. As regards Madhya Bharat it was concluded by the S.R.C. that it would gain by joining a large and resourceful unit. One clear advantage was envisaged from administrative and political point of view i.e. the controversies regarding the distribution of development expenditure between the North and South which were linked to some extent with the traditional rivalries between Gwalior and Indore, would lose their edge, if a bigger unit

having its capital at some central place was formed.

The suggestions made to the S.R.C. regarding the extent of this state were various and conflicting. In particular the following claims and counter claims were made :

(1) It was argued on behalf of Maha Vidharbha that the boundaries of Mahakoshal should be so drawn as to exclude the following areas i.e. the Marathi-speaking portions of Nimar, Betul, Chhindwara, Balaghat and Bastar districts.

(2) It was suggested that four Northern districts of the existing state of Madhya Bharat i.e. Bhind, Morena, Gird Gwalior and Shivpuri should not be included in the proposed state.

(3) The districts of Mandsaur, (which was surrounded by Rajasthan for the most part), portions of Rajgarh and Guna districts of Madhya Bharat were claimed by Rajasthan.

(4) The Sironj sub-division of Kotah district, being an enclave in Madhya Bharat was proposed to be merged in the new state.

(5) The Andhra state claimed the Southern half of Bastar district below the river Indravati. A portion of this district was claimed by Utkal Sammelan of Orissa for Orissa.

The S.R.C. did not recommend the breaking up of five districts claimed by Vidharbha.

As for the four Northern districts of Madhya Bharat, they were to be merged in Madhya Pradesh as they had close economic and administrative links with Mahakoshal area.

Rajasthan's claim to Mandsaur district and Madhya Bharat's claim to Kotah and Jhalawar were made on the ground that they would ensure greater geographical compactness. It was also said that barring the Sunel and Sironj enclaves, however, the disputed areas had been administered as part of these states for a long time. Public opinion did not express itself in favour of status quo. Under these circumstances, the S.R.C. recommended the transfer of Sunel town to Rajasthan and of Sironj to the proposed Madhya Pradesh.

The portions of Rajgarh and Guna districts were claimed by Rajasthan but the claim was not admitted by the S.R.C. and they remained in M.P.

Andhra claimed the southern half of Bastar on the ground that Telugu was the prevailing language of this area. Andhra also pointed out that the economic development of this area was linked with Vishalandhra.

While pondering over this claim the S.R.C. observed that this area was a multi-lingual one. Telugu was only one of the languages while Halbi, Bharti, Parjhi and Gondi were the real indigenous

languages. Though Andhra state did not agree with this view still S.R.C. did not recognise the claim of Andhra and Bastar remained in Madhya Pradesh. The Utkal Sammelan of Orissa claimed Bastar on an alleged affinity between Halbi and Parjhi on one hand and Oriya on the other but this claim was also rejected by the S.R.C. and Bastar was given to M.P.

In this way the M.P. came to have :

- (1) 14 districts of residuary Madhya Pradesh.
- (2) The whole of Bhopal.
- (3) The whole of Vindhya Pradesh.
- (4) Madhya Bharat except the Sunel enclave of Mandsaur district.
- (5) The Sironj sub-division of the Kotah district of Rajasthan.

Maha Delhi or Haryana Prant

The demand for Maha Delhi is not a new one. The move for Greater Delhi was initiated as far back as 1926 and received active support from leaders like Shri Asaf Ali and Lala Desh Bandhu Gupta.

The present Delhi state came into being with the enforcement of part 'C' state act 1951, on 17th April, 1952. Previous to this, Delhi state was known as Delhi Province. This province was constituted in 1912. Before 1912 Delhi was the Head quarter of a division which comprised the following districts :

- (1) Simla, (2) Ambala, (3) Hissar, (4) Karnal, (5) Rohtak, (6) Gurgaon and (7) Delhi.

Delhi division was constituted after Delhi was annexed by the British. Before 1858 the areas now contained in the Meerut and Agra divisions of the U.P. and Ambala division of Punjab, (that is up to the river Sutlej), were in the then North-Western provinces. The separation of the present Ambala division and separation of Delhi from Meerut and Agra divisions and their merger with the Punjab and U.P. respectively was effected in 1858 not because the population of these areas had anything common in the way of language, customs or traditions with the Punjab beyond the Sutlej or with U.P. but was perhaps intended as a punishment against the people of these areas who had taken a prominent part in the so-called 'Mutiny'. The British thought that this separation would be able to break down their moral and resistance to their rule. Whatever might be the genesis of separation, the demand for unification of these areas in Maha Delhi was put forward before the S.R.C. and a memorandum was submitted to that effect. The following facts and arguments in sup-

port of its demand were put forward :

The memorandum said that even after the division of the province by the British the people residing in Ambala division of the Punjab and in Western Districts of U.P. had retained their distinct culture and had kept in close association with each other.

The administrative partnership of Ambala division with the districts of Central and Western Punjab, extending over a century and similarly of Western districts of U.P. with its Eastern districts had not brought any cultural fusion of these people. As a proof, it was cited in the memorandum that even now the residents of Gurgaon and Rohtak districts are looked upon by the people of Jullundur division as Hindustanis. They are Punjabis only to the extent that the place of their origin is administratively linked up with the Punjab state. In every other respect including customs, laws of succession, marriage rites and so on, they are non-Punjabis. Like-wise the residents of Western districts of U.P. do not find themselves at home in Eastern districts where the dialect, known as Purabia, as well as the customs and mode of living of the people, are altogether different from theirs.

Delhi province was constituted in 1912 by dissolving Delhi District and transferring Sonapat Tehsil, which formerly was part of it, to Rohtak district and 28 square miles out of Balabgarh Tehsil to Gurgoan district. Later on it was enlarged by the addition of 46 square miles from Meerut district and its total area became 593 square miles. It was all done on account of the capital of India having been transferred from Calcutta to Delhi. Post-partition era witnessed migration of about five lakhs of displaced persons into this city and the population of the city thus became mixed in character and origin. The rural population however remained comparatively unchanged and has retained its affinity and kinship with the rural population of Ambala division on one side and the Western districts of U.P. on the other.

With the formation of Delhi province in 1912, Delhi lost its representation in provincial legislature. In 1919 one seat was allocated to it in the Legislative Assembly but this could not satisfy the aspirations of the people and they represented their grievances to the Indian National Congress and Congress apparently on the ground of self-determination, allowed Muzaffarnagar, Mathura, Meerut and Delhi to form a separate 'Congress province'. In 1926 Pirzada Mohd-Hussain, Chairman of the All-India Muslim League recommended the extension of territorial limits of Delhi province by the amalgamation of Agra, Meerut and Ambala divisions. The represen-

tatives of Delhi Provincial Congress Committee urged the same demand before the All Parties Conference in 1928. In several conferences held in 1928-33 the same demand was reiterated. This question was also raised in the second Round Table Conference by Sir Geoffrey Corbett. An extract of the memorandum presented by him to this conference was as follows :

“Historically, Ambala division is a part of Hindusthan. Its inclusion in the province of Punjab was an incident of British Rule. Its language is Hindustani not Punjabi and its people are akin to the people of adjoining Meerut and Agra divisions of the United Provinces rather than to the people of the Punjab

“Economically, the most important factor in the life of an agricultural people is irrigation and it is administratively desirable that an irrigation system should be controlled by a single provincial government. Otherwise there will be inevitable disputes. The Ambala division is not irrigated from the five rivers but from Jumna system on which the adjoining districts of U. P. also depend but the North-west corners of Ambala district, which are watered by Sutlej and contain the headworks of Sirhind Canal should remain in the Punjab.

“It is fair to assume, therefore, that in any rational re-distribution of provinces, the Ambala division, minus the Simla district and North-west corner of Ambala district should be separated from the Punjab.”

This scheme of separation of Ambala division from Punjab had the support of Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah too. Lala Desh Bandhu Gupta also supported this demand in a press statement which appeared in the ‘Hindustan Times’ of 9th December, 1932. He stated ‘The Ambala division, excluding Simla district has never been a part of the Punjab throughout Indian History and is in all respects distinct from the Punjab. Tagged to the Punjab it has been a misfit and owing to the wide differences of language, culture, history, tradition and mode of life, no less than ethnical distinction, the population of Ambala has remained as an unassimilable constituent of the province and has suffered in a variety of ways. As an outlying part of the province, it has been subject to the exploitation by the more advanced section of the population and has failed to receive the attention from the provincial government and its development has been neglected. Further more, the agricultural population of Haryana or roughly speaking of the Ambala division has closer affinity with the population of the other side of the Jumna with whom, besides having ties of blood, language, social and eco-

conomic life, they share common agrarian and industrial interests. Due to these reasons they desire re-union with their brethern across the Jumna and have been clamouring for a re-distribution of Ambala, Agra, Meerut, and the Rohilkhand divisions along with the Delhi Province." The statement also stated that a homogeneous population of nearly two crores of Hindus, Jats, Tagas, Ahirs, Gujars, Lalkhoris, Pathans, Musalmans, Rajputs and Rohillas, who in the past were used to have common Government and had close affinities and a common culture and language were now scattered in three Provinces. Their re-union would secure them the benefit of common government, which being fully autonomous would enable them to rebuild a prosperous Province.

The western districts of U.P. also wanted separation from the eastern parts of their state and submitted a memorandum to the S.R.C. to this effect, which was supported by a large majority of M.L.A.s of these districts and this showed the urgency of demand.

The boundaries of the proposed new state would extend to the following areas :—

- (1) Agra Division : (Comprising Aligarh, Mathura, Agra, Manpuri, & Etah districts).
- (2) Meerut Division : (comprising Dehradun, Saharanpur, Muzafarnagar, Meerut and Bullundshahar districts).
- (3) Rohilkhand Division : (comprising Bareilly, Bijnor, Badaun, Muradabad, Shahjehanpur, Pilibhit and Rampur districts excluding such parts of this division as might be necessary to make the rest of U.P. compact).
- (4) Ambala division : (minus Simla districts and Rugar and Kharar tehsils and parts of Hissar).
- (5) The Delhi state.
- (6) PEPSU : (minus Simla district, Jind and Narwana tehsils).
- (7) Alwar and Bharatpur districts from Rajasthan.

The total area of this state was to be approximately 53,472 square miles.

The people of this area had a common language which was known as Western Hindi or Hindustani. In common parlance, this

tract was called 'Hindustani'.

The formation of this state was advocated on the following grounds. It was said that the state would be so administratively convenient as it would neither be so large as the U.P. so as to be unwieldy nor so small as to be uneconomic. The state would have adequate potentials for future development. The Western districts of U.P. whose progress at present is retarded by their being yoked to the backward Eastern Districts would have adequate opportunities for advancement. The grievance of the people of these districts was that they were being comparatively neglected as far as future development plans were concerned and to their problems sufficient attention was not being paid.

It was also said that the new state of Maha Delhi would be important from the point of view of trade and industry. They said that it was already functioning as an inland 'enter pot' for the areas proposed to be included in the new state which had close business relations with it. The advocates argued that the formation of new state with Delhi as its capital would be beneficial not only from the cultural but also from economic point of view, both to Delhi state and to its other constituents. It would remove the barrier in the way of inter-state trade. A number of industries were already established in this area and there is scope for further development and with Delhi as its pivot, it would make rapid advancement. The supporters also said that the area was well connected by rail and road and would be self-sufficient in respect of foodgrains also because the Western Districts of U.P. were surplus in foodgrains and Ambala was atleast self-sufficient in this respect.

The new state could stand on its own feet in financial matters also. It was estimated that revenue of the proposed state would be approximately Rs. 30 crores. No substantial amount was to be spent on the building of new Capital or the Secretariat. This state was to have the Universities of Agra, Delhi, and Aligarh. Thus, it was argued, that the formation of this state would involve no heavy expenditure and that it would be a viable unit.

Further, it was also emphasised that the formation of the new state would give an opportunity to the people of Delhi state to secure adequate representation in the services. All the time it had been their grievance that although they were supposed to have common cadre of services with the Punjab, the number of people recruited from Delhi state in various departments was negligible.

It was also made clear by the supporters of this scheme that

even after some of the districts had been separated from the U.P., it would remain one of the biggest states in India and its status would in no way be affected. In case of the Punjab, it was admitted, that the exclusion of Ambala division would undoubtedly reduce its size but if the remaining districts of Pepsu and the state of Himachal Pradesh and Bilaspur were merged with the Punjab the loss caused by the separation of the Ambala Division would be made up. The completion of Bhakra Nangal Project would also improve its economic position.

It was also argued that the formation of this state would be in the interest of the country as a whole, as it would bring within the orbit of one state, people with strong martial traditions and long military connections, who were scattered in four different states. This state would thus act as a strong second line of defence in case of aggression from the West. A contented and united population residing in this area, which was as important as the Punjab from the point of view of national defence would greatly add to the security of the country. The formation of the new state would pent up energies of the people and create new hopes and enthusiasm among them and would inspire them to work for their cultural and material progress. The advocates added that this would be the realisation of a long cherished wish and consummation of a hope long deferred.

A memorandum on the aforesaid lines was submitted to the SRC. At that time Delhi enjoyed the status of part 'C' states. The above mentioned memorandum stated 'Delhi as a part' 'C' state and it is difficult to see any future for such states'. Along with these favourable arguments same objections were also put forward against the creation of this new state, which may be studied as follows :—

(1) It was urged that Delhi being the seat of the Union Government could not be made the capital of a full-fledged state and if it was done, administrative complications would arise.

In this connection examples of Washington, Ottawa and Canberra were quoted, which were administered directly by the federal government for similar reasons. But this argument was contradicted by the supporters of the demand by saying that Delhi now covered a vast area and New Delhi could be the capital of the Union Government while old Delhi could be made the capital of the New state. As these two cities had joint civic amenities, such as city transport, electricity and water supply, they would not present any insurmountable difficulty and satisfactory arrangement

for continuing the same on proportionate cost basis could always be arrived at.

(2) Another objection was that the demand for the new state aimed at the predominance of the Jat community, but population figures belied this by proving that Jat Community formed only 10% of the total population and was not able to establish its hegemony in the new state.

The S.R.C. had already decided to abolish the Part 'C' states as these states did not have any substantial powers. In considering the case of Delhi, particularly two special factors were taken into consideration by the Commission (1) Delhi was the seat of Union Government and (2) it was basically a city unit, 82% of its total population being resident in urban areas.

The commission observed that if Delhi was to continue as the union capital it could not be made part of a full fledged constituent unit of the Indian Union. Even under a unitary system of government national capitals were kept under special dispensation. In France for example there was a greater degree of central control over Paris than over other parts of the country. In England the Police administration of metropolitan area was directly under the control of the Home Secretary, who did not possess similar powers in respect of other municipal areas. Apart from these examples it was also clear that in general, capital cities possessed or came to possess some degree of political and social predominance. They were seats of National Government with considerable property belonging to these governments. Foreign diplomatic missions and international agencies were located in these capitals and they became centres of National Culture and art. Thus administrative facilities, practices in other countries, and the desirability of avoiding conflicting jurisdiction all pointed to the need for effective control over federal capital by the National Government.

It might be recalled that the desirability of excluding the seat of the Central Government from the jurisdiction of a provincial Government was one of the main considerations which led to the transfer of the imperial capital from Calcutta in 1912. "It is generally recognised" observed the Government of India in their despatch to the Secretary of State dated August 25th, 1911, "the capital of a great Central government should be separate and independent and effect had been given to this principle in United States, Canada, and Australia." The Secretary of State also supported this idea and subsequently the capital was changed.

In the opinion of the Commission these considerations carried

more weight in independent India because now there was a greater need for avoiding the blurring of responsibility under a democratic form of government, based on federal principle than under a bureaucratic government, which allowed each higher unit to exercise over-riding authority over the lower units. Thus it was decided that Delhi, as the capital of Union Government should remain under the direct control of that Government. Another thing which remained for consideration was whether a line of demarcation could be drawn between old and New Delhi. With regard to this issue, the Commission concluded that from the point of view of rapid growth of population and their intermingling, law and order, social life of the people, trade and commerce and common public utility service Old and New Delhi now constituted one integrated unit and it was difficult to draw a line of demarcation between these two. Moreover, Delhi was essentially urban in character. It had rural belt, it was true, but that served only to meet its food requirements as the seat of Imperial Government. The S.R.C. also observed that in devising a system of government for Delhi the requirements and aspirations of a cosmopolitan urban population should be taken into consideration. Urban problems such as slum clearance, reconstruction, city planning, recreation, transportation, primary and secondary education all fell within the domain of municipal finance and enterprise.

Guided by these considerations the Commission did not approve the creation of Maha Delhi State, the S.R.C. recommended the establishment of a Municipal corporation in the city so that the people could enjoy the advantages of a popular government and of internal autonomy. The corporation was established afterwards but the demand for Maha Delhi still continues.

Vishal Andhra

After the creation of Andhra, the agitation for the creation of Vishalandhra gained momentum. The advocates of this demand wanted that the Telugu speaking areas of Andhra and Telangana should be included in Andhra and it should be called Vishalandhra.

They argued that the creation of this state would not only unite all Telugu speaking areas but there would be other advantages also i.e. the development of Krishna and Godavari rivers would be possible in a better way under a unified control. Moreover, the Telangana had suffered a deficit in food supplies often, while Andhra had normally a surplus which Telangana might be able to use. On the other hand Andhra had no coal and would

be able to get its supplies from Singareni. Telangana would also be able to save a great deal of expenditure on general administration, in case it was not established as a separate unit. Finally, the supporters urged that there was a strong public opinion in the favour of this which should not be put aside unless there were strong reasons against it.

There were arguments against the merger of Telangana with Andhra also which were that Telangana was progressive and from an administrative point of view, unification would not confer any benefit on that area. Telangana did not wish to lose its independent rights in relation to the utilisation of the waters of Krishna and Godavari.

Moreover, it was felt that educationally backward people of Telangana would be swamped and exploited by the more advanced people of coastal area. Education being backward in Telangana lower qualifications were accepted for public services there. If Telangana was merged in Andhra, its inhabitants would be equally placed in partnership with the people of Andhra and the people of Andhra would derive all the advantages immediately and Telangana would be converted into a colony by the enterprising coastal Andhra.

It was urged that Telangana could be a viable unit in itself because of river projects in that area.

The S.R.C. reported in favour of the creation of Vishalandhra on the basis of the advantages of bringing the Krishna and Godavari river basin under one unified control and because of the trade affiliations between Telangana and Andhra and the suitability of Hyderabad as the capital for the entire region. The commission also reported that a guarantee should be given about opportunities for employment to Telangana people in the Public Services to the extent of one-third and other necessary safeguards.

After considering all these factors, the Commission concluded that it would be in the interests of Andhra as well as of Telangana if this area, which then formed part of the separate Hyderabad state, consented to be merged in Andhra after the general elections of 1960 and became Vishalandhra.

As regards the residue of Hyderabad, the Commission reported that it should consist of the following districts namely Mahboobnagar, Nalgonda, Warrangal including Khammam, Karemngal, Adilabad, Nizamabad, Hyderabad, Medal and Bidar and the Mungala enclave in Nalgonda district belonging to the Krishna district.

The entire district of Bidar was included in Hyderabad. It

was a multilingual district in which Marathi, Kannada, Urdu and Telugu were spoken respectively by 39, 28, 16 & 15 per cent of the population. The Railway system linked Marathi speaking taluks of the districts very easily with Hyderabad and the national highways provided a direct connection between the Kannada speaking taluks and this state. Kannada areas were far off from Bangalore and Mysore. They could not be merged in them. Likewise, Marathi speaking areas were far remote from Bombay. Therefore, the S.R.C. reported that Bidar should not be disintegrated and should be merged in Hyderabad.

But these recommendations of the S.R.C. were not accepted by the Government and Telangana along with Hyderabad was included in Andhra though it was not called Vishalandhra.

Madras

The separation of Andhra from the composite Madras state left that state as a linguistically homogenous state except mainly for two districts i.e. Malabar and South Kanara in a distant and outlying corner which were not Tamil speaking.

Madras claimed Tamil speaking areas of Travancore-Cochin and put its claim before the S.R.C. The claim was made mainly on linguistic considerations and on the grounds of geographical contiguity and related to nine Taluks, Thovala, Agastheeswaram, Kalkulam, Vilvancode and Neyyattikara in Trivandarum district, Devikulam and Peermede in Kottayam district, Shenkotta in Quilon district and Chittur in Trichur district.

The language figures in these areas show that in the Southern Taluks namely Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilvancode, situated in what is known as Nanjil-Nad, the percentage of Tamil speaking people is above 79.

The Shenkotta Taluk was partly an enclave in Tirunelveli district of Madras state and the percentage of Tamil speaking people in this Taluk was about 93. Physically and geographically, it belonged to Tirunelveli district and it was recommended by the S.R.C. to be merged in this district.

The Devikulam and Peermede taluks stood on a somewhat different footing. These were hilly areas which for various economic and other reasons were of great importance to Travancore-Cochin. The percentage of Tamil speaking people in Devikulam and Peermede taluks was 72 and 44 respectively.

Considering their area, which was about 12% of the whole area of Travancore-Cochin state, Devikulam and Peermede taluks

had comparatively a meagre population. Although much of this population was originally migrant, it now constituted a majority. These were of great importance to Travancore-Cochin because hydro-electric works were situated here and they produced rubber. Even Tamil Nad Congress, which demanded a separate Tamil Nad, recognised the importance of these areas to Travancore-Cochin Government. While considering this claim, the S.R.C. observed that it did not regard linguistic principle as the only factor for reorganisation of any area. In these areas the majority of Tamil speaking people was only marginal. The Dar Commission had also reported that unless the majority of one language spoken in any area was at least 70% that area should be considered as bilingual. The S.R.C. agreeing with this opinion, did not recommend the creation of a Tamil Nad or the separation of these areas from Madras.

Neyyattinkare was predominantly a Malayalam speaking Taluk, its percentage being 86. In Chittur the Malayalam percentage was 59·8. These areas were also attached to Madras according to the recommendation of the S.R.C.

N.B. :—The report of the S.R.C. has been mainly referred for this chapter (PP. 80 to 202) along with daily Newspapers mainly for Assam & Punjab.

REFERENCE BOOKS

1. ✓ Problems of Linguistic States ... Shri P. Chenchiah, M.L.
in India.
2. Report of the SRC (1955) ... Government Publication.
3. ✓ Linguistic Regionalism in ... Mr. Marshall Windmiller.
India.
4. Report of the Finance ... Government Publication.
Commission (1952).
5. -do- (1957) ... Government Publication.
6. Reorganisation of States in ... Samyukta Maharashtra.
India with particular reference ... Parishad Publication.
to the formation of Maharashtra.
7. The Constitution of India. ... Central Law Agency
(as amended up-to-date). ... Publication.
8. Maharashtra as a Linguistic ... Dr. B.R. Ambedkar,
Province. ... M.A., Ph. D. D.Sc.
Bar-At-Law,
Minister of Law, Govt.
of India
9. Some Aspects of Hyderabad. ... Department of Information
and Public Relations,
Govt. of Hyderabad Publi-
cation.
10. Maha Delhi Memorandum ... Delhi Govt. Publication.
to the S.R.C.
11. Akhand Karanatak Rajya ... Parishad's own Publication.
Nirman Parishad's
Resolution, Oct. 6th 1955.
12. ✓ All India League of Linguistic ... All India League of
Provinces, Bezwada—Presi-
dential address and proceed-
ings—12th and 13th May 1947. ... Linguistic Provinces work-
ing committee's Publication.
13. ✓ Linguistic Provinces and the ... Brahmshree G. D. V. Subba
Dar Commission Report. ... Rao.
14. White Paper on Indian ... Govt. of India Publication.
States (1950).
15. ✓ Report of the Linguistic ... Govt. of India Publication.
Provinces Commission
1948 (The Dar Commission)
16. ✓ Languages and the Linguistic ... Shri Suniti Kumar
Problem. ... Chatterji.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|---|
| 17. | Languages of India 1901. | ... | Shri G.A. Grierson. |
| 18. | Report of the Linguistic
Provinces Committee (1948)
(JVP Report)* | ... | An Indian National
Congress Publication. |
| 19. | Indian Statutory Commission
Report. (The Simon Commission
(Report) 1928. Vol. I & II. | ... | Govt. of India
Publication. |
| 20. | Report of the Committee of
Parliament on Official
Language. (1958). | ... | Govt. of India
Publication. |
| 20. | Report of the Commissioner
for Linguistic Minorities.
(First Report). | ... | —do— |
| 22. | Powers and Functions of a
Sub-Province. | ... | Prof. D.R. Gadgil, M.A.
M. Litt. (Cantab). |
| 23. | History Warns.
(Decentralise or Balkanise). | ... | Shri I. M. Muthanna. |
| 24. | Linguistic States in a
Regional Plan. | ... | Shri A.S.N Murti. |
| 25. | Linguistic Provinces. | ... | Shri M.K. Gandhi.
Edited by Bharatan
Kumarappa. |
| 26. | The Formation of New
Provinces. | ... | Prof. D.R. Gadgil, M.A.
M. Litt. (Cantab). |
| 27. | Hindus and the Punjabi State. | ... | Prof. Om Prakash Kahal.
M. Sc. B.T. |
| 28. | Some Fundamentals of Indian
Problem. | ... | Shri B. Pattabhi Sitaram-
ayya. |
| 29. | Greater East Punjab. | ... | Shri Kulwant Singh
Virk, M.A. |
| 30. | The Future of Bombay City. | ... | Prof. D.R. Gadgil, M.A.
M. Litt. (Cantab). |
| 31. | Punjab Language Problem
and Arya Samaj. | ... | Shri Ghanshyam Singh
Gupta. |
| 32. | The Causes and Solution of
India's Communal Problem. | ... | By Britindian. |
| 33. | The Idea of Sikh State. | ... | Shri Gurbachan Singh
M.A. & Lal Singh M.A. |
| 34. | All-India Linguistic States
Conference—Presidential
addresses of I, II & III
Session. | ... | Dr. Lanka Sundaram
M.P. M.A. Ph.D. |

35. A case for the formation of a ... Samyukta Maharashtra
New Province of United ...
Maharashtra. Publication.
36. Memorandum to the S.R.C. by ...
Manipur State Congress
Committee.
37. Re-organisation of U.P. ... Memorandum to the
S.R.C. by A.H. Khwaja.
38. A supplementary Memorandum ... The Nag Vidharbha
to the S.R.C. Samiti.
39. A supplementary Memorandum ... Marathwada Regional
to the S.R.C. Committee.
40. Bombay Legislative Assembly ... Bombay Govt. Publica-
debates on S.R. Bill—37 Vol. tion.
40. Mysore Legislative Assembly ... Mysore Govt. Publica-
debates on S.R. Bill—3 Vol. tion
42. M.P. Vidhan Sabha Speeches ... M.P. Govt. Publication
on S.R. Bill—3 Vol.
43. Hyderabad Legislative ... Hyderabad Govt. Pub-
Assembly Debate—65 Vol. lication
44. Himachal Pradesh Vidhan ... Himachal Pradesh
Sabha—Debates on S.R.C. Govt. Publication.
Report.
45. Delhi Vidhan Sabha Debates. ... Delhi Govt. Publication
46. PEPSU Vidhan Sabha Debates. ... PEPSU Vidhan Sabha
Secretariat Publication.
47. U.P. Assembly debates on ... Published by Informa-
S.R.C. Report. tion Directorate-U.P.
48. Bhopal Legislative Assembly ... State Press Bhopal
Debates. Publication.
49. Saurashtra Legislative ... Legislative Secretariat
Assembly Debates. Publication, Rajkot.
50. Coorg Legislative Assembly ... Coorg Govt. Publication.
Debates on S.R.C. Report.
50. Bihar Vidhan Sabha Debates. ... Bihar Legislature
3 Volumes. Secretariat Publication.
52. Case for Greater Delhi. ... Delhi Govt. Publication
(Memorandum to the SRC).
53. Memorandum to the S.R.C. ... Refugee Settlers of
Andaman Islands.
54. Concerning Marxism in ... Shri J.V. Stalin.
Linguistics.

55. Report of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Wanchoo on the formation of Andhra State. ... Govt. of India Publication.
56. A Summary of evidence given before the linguistic provinces commission. ... The Rt. Hon'ble Dr. M.R. Jayakar M.A. LL.B. (Allahabad), Bar-At-Law, B.C.L. (Oxon) P.C., Vice Chancellor of the University of Poona.
57. Modern Review—August 1959. ...
58. The Vikram. ... (Journal of Vikram University) Vol. 1st Nov. 1957.
59. Belgium. ... by Else-Vier.
60. Use of Tamil language—Tamil language (Special Provisions Act No. 28 of 1958.) ... Ceylon Govt. Publication.
61. (i) The language of Switzerland ... Supplied by the Courtesy of the Embassy of Switzerland in India.
 (ii) Management of three different languages in Switzerland.
 (iii) The influence of language on National Conscience.
 (iv) Schwyzer Dutsch & High German.

N.B. :—The Hindustan Times & the Times of India chiefly referred for daily reports on the problem since 1954.

INDEX

- ALL PARTY CONGRESS
 (Aug. 1928); 8.
 All India League ; 9, 10, 22.
 All India Manufacturers ;
 Association ; 15, 39.
 All India Exporters'
 Association ; 15.
 All Parties Report ; 18.
 America ; 67,
 Andhra ; 4,12,57,106.
 Andhra Conference (Ist.) ; 4.
 Andhra Conference (IInd.) ; 4.
 Anthony Frank ; 77.
 Assam ; 26,73,82,90.
 A.P.C.C. ; 86,87.
 BELGIUM ; 67,—68.
 Bihar ; 102,104,105.
 Bombay ; 90—92.
 CANADA ; 61—62.
 Cabinet Mission ; 12.
 Ceylon ; 65—66.
 Citizens' Committee ; 40.
 Chatterji (Suniti Kumar) ; 36.
 Chatterji N.C. ; 41.
 Chaliha ; 86—87.
 Congress Provinces
 (Linguistic) ; 4—5.
 Commission(Linguistic) (1928) ; 8.
 Congress ; 4,8,71—72.
 Commission(Finance)
 (1952—57) ; 25.
 Constitutional Sections
 (About Language):—
 Sec. 2 ; 45.
 Special Directives ; 49-50
 CPI. ; 14.
 DAS C.R. ; 5
 Dar Commission; 10,11,17,18,19.
 Dialects; 1-2,17
 GANDHI; 4,41-42,79,80
 Ghosh Dev Prasad; 41.
 Grierson; 102.
 Golwalkar M.S. ; 39.
 HARYANA PRANT, 99,116-123
 Hill State; 83.
 Himachal Pradesh 100-102.
 Hindi; 2
 Hindu Mahasabha; 15,72.
 Hobson; 19.
 Hyderabad; 100,124-125.
 JANASANGH; 15,18,19,41
 Jvp Committee; 11-12,34,91.
 KARNATAKA; 55,110
 Kerala; 109.
 LINGUISTIC FAMILIES; 2.
 Linguistic Problem; 3-4.
 Linguistic Province
 Commission; 91.
 MADRAS (Leg. Assem.) ; 38.
 Madras; 125-126.
 Madhya Pradesh; 114-116.
 Maha Delhi; 116-123.
 Manipur; 89-90.
 Mehta Ashok 40
 Medhi Bishnu Ram; 86.
 Mehata Jivraj; 39.
 Memorandum AIE & AIIA 39-40
 Menon K.B. ; 40,

- Sec. 3 ; 45.
 Sec. 4 ; 46.
 Constitutional Provisions
 (About Language) :—
 Language of the Union ; 46—47.
 Language of the Union ; 59—51.
 Regional Language ; 48
 Language of the courts ; 48.
 ORRISA ; 26,105-106.
 PATEL DAYA BHAI ; 39.
 Phizo ; 84-85.
 Punjab ; 92-160.
 Punjabi Suba ; 95-97.
 PSP ; 15.
 Purbachal ; 83-84.
 Races & Dialects:—
 Aryans ; 2.
 Austrics ; 1.
 Dravidians ; 1-2.
 Negroids ; 1.
 Sino-Tibetans ; 2.
 Proto-Australoids ; 1.
 RAJASTHAN ; 26.
 Rajagopalachari C. 40,77.
 Resolutions ; 5.
 Roy B.C. ; 41,71.
 Menon V.P. ; 13.
 Mont Ford Report ; 18.
 Mukerji Radha Kumud ; 22-23,31.
 Munshi K.M. ; 77-78.
 Murthy A.S.N. ; 19.
 NAGA HILL AREAS ; 84-89.
 Nehru (Jawaharlal) ; 38-39,79.
 Nehru Report (1928) ; 7-8.
 R.S.S. ; 39.
 Russian Example ; 68-69.
 SACHAR FORMULA ; 94-95,98-99
 Sanskrit ; 2.
 Sardar Patel ; 12-13.
 Simon Commission ; 5-6,7,8,9.
 Sinha S.K. ; 41.
 Soviet Union ; 61,61-69.
 S.R.C. ; 55,58-59,60,74,76,82-126.
 S.S. Iyengar ; 5.
 Suhrawardy Committee ; 6-7.
 Switzerland ; 62-63.
 UTTAR PRADESH ; 111-114.
 VIDHARBHA ; 108.
 Vishal Andhra ; 123-125.
 Vishal Himachal ; 101-102.
 WEST BENGAL ; 102-104.