

THOUGHTS  
ON  
LINGUISTIC STATES

*First Published : 1955*  
*Reprinted from the edition of 1955*



# THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

## PREFACE

The creation of Linguistic States is a burning question of the day. I regret that owing to my illness I was not able to take part in the debate that took place in Parliament much less in the campaign that is carried on in the country by partisans in favour of their views. The question is too important for me to sleep over in silence. Many have accused me for remaining quiet not knowing what the cause was.

I have therefore taken the other alternative i.e. to set out my views in writing.

Readers may find certain inconsistencies in my views as expressed in this brochure and as expressed formerly in certain public statements. Such changes in my view are, I am sure, very few. The former statements were made on the basis of fragmentary data. The whole picture was then not present to the mind. For the first time it met my eye when the report of the S.R.C. came out. This is sufficient justification for any change in my views which a critic may find.

To a critic who is a hostile and malicious person and who wants to make capital out of my inconsistencies my reply is straight. Emerson has said that consistency is the virtue of an ass and I don't wish to make an ass of myself. No thinking human being can be tied down to a view once expressed in the name of consistency. More important than consistency is responsibility. A responsible person must learn to unlearn what he has learned. A responsible person must have the courage to rethink and change his thoughts. Of course there must be good and sufficient reasons for unlearning what he has learned and for recasting his thoughts. There can be no finality in thinking.

The formation of Linguistic States, although essential, cannot be decided by any sort of hooliganism. Nor must it be solved in a manner that will serve party interest. It must be solved by cold blooded reasoning. This is what I have done and this is what I appeal to my readers to do.

23rd December 1955

B. R. AMBEDKAR

Milind Mahavidyalaya

Nagsen Vana, College Road

Aurangabad (Dn.)

PART I

**THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION**

CHAPTER 1

**LINGUISM AND NOTHING ELSE**

The present Constitution of India recognizes the following States which are enumerated in the Schedule :

| PART 'A' STATES   | PART 'B' STATES      | PART 'C' STATES     |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Andhra         | 1. Hyderabad         | 1. Ajmer            |
| 2. Assam          | 2. Jammu and Kashmir | 2. Bhopal           |
| 3. Bihar          | 3. Madhya Bharat     | 3. Coorg            |
| 4. Bombay         | 4. Mysore            | 4. Delhi            |
| 5. Madhya Pradesh | 5. Patiala           | 5. Himachal Pradesh |
| 6. Madras         | 6. Rajasthan         | 6. Kutch            |
| 7. Orissa         | 7. Saurashtra        | 7. Manipur          |
| 8. Punjab         | 8. Travancore-Cochin | 8. Tripura          |
| 9. Uttar Pradesh  |                      | 9. Vindhya Pradesh  |

Article 3 of the Constitution gives power to Parliament to create new States. This was done because there was no time to reorganize the States on linguistic basis for which there was a great demand.

In pursuance of this incessant demand the Prime Minister appointed the States Reorganization Commission to examine the question. In its report the States Reorganization Commission has recommended the creation of the following States :

**Proposed New States**

| Name of the State  | Area<br>(in sq. miles) | Population<br>(in crores) | Language |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| 1. Madras .. ..    | 50,170                 | 3.00                      | Tamil    |
| 2. Kerala .. ..    | 14,980                 | 1.36                      | Malyalam |
| 3. Karnatak .. ..  | 72,730                 | 1.90                      | Kanarese |
| 4. Hyderabad .. .. | 45,300                 | 1.13                      | Telugu   |
| 5. Andhra .. ..    | 64,950                 | 2.09                      | Telugu   |
| 6. Bombay .. ..    | 151,360                | 4.02                      | Mixed    |
| 7. Vidarbha .. ..  | 36,880                 | 0.76                      | Marathi  |

**Proposed New States—contd.**

| Name of the State |                   |    |    | Area<br>(in sq. miles) | Population<br>(in crores) | Language   |
|-------------------|-------------------|----|----|------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 8.                | Madhya Pradesh    | .. | .. | 171,200                | 2.61                      | Hindi      |
| 9.                | Rajasthan         | .. | .. | 132,300                | 1.60                      | Rajasthani |
| 10.               | Punjab            | .. | .. | 58,140                 | 1.72                      | Punjabi    |
| 11.               | Uttar Pradesh     | .. | .. | 113,410                | 6.32                      | Hindi      |
| 12.               | Bihar             | .. | .. | 66,520                 | 3.82                      | Hindi      |
| 13.               | West Bengal       | .. | .. | 34,590                 | 2.65                      | Bengali    |
| 14.               | Assam             | .. | .. | 89,040                 | 0.97                      | Assamese   |
| 15.               | Orissa            | .. | .. | 60,140                 | 1.46                      | Oria       |
| 16.               | Jammu and Kashmir | .. | .. | 92,780                 | 0.14                      | Kashmiri   |

The important thing is to compare the size of the States—

Taking population as the measuring rod the result may be presented as follows :

There are 8 States with a population between 1 and 2 crores each.

There are 4 States with a population between 2 and 4 crores.

There is one State above 4 crores.

There is one State above 6 crores.

The result, to say the least, is fantastic. The Commission evidently thinks that the size of a State is a matter of no consequence and that the equality in the size of the States constituting a Federation is a matter of no moment.

This is the first and the most terrible error which the Commission has committed. If not rectified in time, it will cost India a great deal.

**CHAPTER 2****LINGUISM IN EXCELSIS**

In the first chapter it has been pointed out that one result of the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission is the disparity in the size of the different States the Commission has suggested for creation.

But there is another fault in the recommendations of the Commission which perhaps is hidden but which is nonetheless real.

It lies in not considering the North in relation to the South. This will be clear from the following table :

| Southern States |    |                           | Central States |                           | Northern States* |    |                           |
|-----------------|----|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------|----|---------------------------|
| Name            | .. | Population<br>(in crores) | Name           | Population<br>(in crores) | Name             | .. | Population<br>(in crores) |
| Madras          | .. | 3.00                      | Maharashtra    | 3.31                      | Uttar Pradesh    | .. | 6.32                      |
| Kerala          | .. | 1.36                      | Gujarat        | 1.13                      | Bihar            | .. | 3.85                      |
| Karnataka       | .. | 1.90                      | Saurashtra     | 0.4                       | Madhya Pradesh   | .. | 2.61                      |
| Andhra          | .. | 1.09                      | Kutch          | 0.5                       | Rajasthan        | .. | 1.60                      |
| Hyderabad       | .. | 1.13                      |                |                           | Punjab           | .. | 1.72                      |

\* I have included certain centrally situated States because by language they are affiliated to one another.

This scheme of dividing India in the name of Linguistic States cannot be overlooked. It is not so innocuous as the Commission thinks. It is full of poison. The poison must be emptied right now.

The nature of Union of India expresses only an idea. It does not indicate an achievement. Bryce in his "*American Commonwealth*" relates the following incident which is very instructive. This is what he says :

"A few years ago the American Protestant Episcopal Church was occupied at its annual conference in revising liturgy. It was thought desirable to introduce among the short sentence prayers a prayer for the whole people ; and an eminent New England Divine proposed the words 'O Lord, bless our Nation'. Accepted one afternoon on the spur of the moment, the sentence was brought up next day for reconsideration, when so many objections were raised by the laity to the word, 'Nation', as importing too definite recognition of national unity, that it was dropped, and instead there were adopted the words, 'O Lord, bless these United States.' "

India is not even mentally and morally fit to call itself the United States of India. We have to go a long way to become the United States of India. The Union of India is far, far away, from the United States of India. But this consolidation of the North and balkanisation of the South is not the way to reach it.

## PART II

### THE LIMITATIONS OF LINGUISM

#### CHAPTER 3

#### THE PROS AND CONS OF A LINGUISTIC STATE

"One State, one language" is a universal feature of almost every State. Examine the constitution of Germany, examine the constitution of France, examine the constitution of Italy, examine the constitution of England, and examine the constitution of the U.S.A. "One State, one language" is the rule.

Wherever there has been a departure from this rule there has been a danger to the State. The illustration of the mixed States are to be found in the old Austrian Empire and the old Turkish Empire. They were blown up because they were multi-lingual States with all that a multi-lingual State means. India cannot escape this fate if it continues to be a congeries of mixed States.

The reasons why a unilingual State is stable and a multi-lingual State unstable are quite obvious. A State is built on fellow-feeling. What is this fellow-feeling ? To state briefly it is a feeling of a corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This feeling is a double-edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of

fellowship for one's own kith and kin and anti-fellowship for those who are not one's own kith and kin. It is a feeling of "consciousness of kind" which on the one hand, binds together those who have it so strongly that it overrides all differences arising out of economic conflicts or social gradations and, on the other, severs them from those who are not of their kind. It is a longing not to belong to any other group.

The existence of this fellow-feeling is the foundation of a stable and democratic State.

This is one reason why a linguistic State is so essential. But there are other reasons why a State should be unilingual. There are two other reasons why the rule "one State, one language" is necessary.

One reason is that democracy cannot work without friction unless there is fellow-feeling among those who constitute the State. Faction fights for leadership and discrimination in administration are factors ever present in a mixed State and are incompatible with democracy.

The present State of Bombay is the best illustration of the failure of democracy in a mixed State. I am amazed at the suggestion made by the States Reorganization Commission that the present Bombay State should be continued as it is to enable us to gain experience of how a mixed State flourishes. With Bombay as a mixed State for the last 20 years, with the intense enmity between the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis, only a thoughtless or an absent-minded person could put forth such a senseless proposal. The former State of Madras is another illustration of the failure of democracy in a mixed State. The formation of a mixed State of United India and the compulsory division of India into India and Pakistan are other illustrations of the impossibility of having democracy in a mixed State.

Another reason why it is necessary to adopt the rule of "one State, one language" is that it is the only solvent to racial and cultural conflicts.

Why do Tamils hate Andhras and Andhras hate Tamils ? Why do Andhras in Hyderabad hate Maharashtrians and Maharashtrians hate Andhras ? Why do Gujaratis hate Maharashtrians and Maharashtrians hate Gujaratis ? The answer is very simple. It is not because there is any natural antipathy between the two. The hatred is due to the fact that they are put in juxtaposition and forced to take part in a common cycle of participation, such as Government. There is no other answer.

So long as this enforced juxtaposition remains, there will be no peace between the two.

There will be people who would cite the cases of Canada, Switzerland and South Africa. It is true that these cases of bilingual States exist. But it must not be forgotten that the genius of India is quite different from the genius of Canada, Switzerland and South Africa. The genius of India is to divide—the genius of Switzerland, South Africa and Canada is to unite.

The fact that they have been held together uptil now is not in the natural course of things. It is due to the fact that both of them are bound by the Congress discipline. But how long is the Congress going to last ? The Congress is Pandit Nehru and Pandit Nehru is Congress. But is Pandit Nehru immortal ? Any one who applies his mind to these questions will realize that the Congress will not last till the sun and the moon. It must one day come to an end. It might come to an end even before the next election. When this happens the State of Bombay will find itself engaged in civil war and not in carrying on administration.

We therefore want linguistic States for two reasons. To make easy the way to democracy and to remove racial and cultural tension.

In seeking to create linguistic States India is treading the right road. It is the road which all States have followed. In the case of other linguistic States they have been so, from the very beginning. In the case of India she has to put herself in the reverse gear to reach the goal. But the road she proposes to travel is well-tried road. It is a road which is followed by other States.

Having stated the advantages of a linguistic State I must also set out the dangers of a linguistic State.

A linguistic State with its regional language as its official language may easily develop into an independent nationality. The road between an independent nationality and an independent State is very narrow. If this happens, India will cease to be Modern India we have and will become the medieval India consisting of a variety of States indulging in rivalry and warfare.

This danger is of course inherent in the creation of linguistic States. There is equal danger in not having linguistic States. The former danger a wise and firm statesman can avert. But the dangers of a mixed State are greater and beyond the control of a statesman however eminent.

How can this danger be met ? The only way I can think of meeting the danger is to provide in the Constitution that the regional language shall not be the official language of the State. The official language of the State shall be Hindi and until India becomes fit for this purpose English. Will Indians accept this ? If they do not, linguistic States may easily become a peril.

One language can unite people. Two languages are sure to divide people. This is an inexorable law. Culture is conserved by language. Since Indians wish to unite and develop a common culture it is the bounden duty of all Indians to own up Hindi as their language.

Any Indian who does not accept this proposal as part and parcel of a linguistic State has no right to be an Indian. He may be a hundred per cent Maharashtrian, a hundred per cent Tamil or a hundred per cent Gujarathi,

but he cannot be an Indian in the real sense of the word except in a geographical sense. If my suggestion is not accepted India will then cease to be India. It will be a collection of different nationalities engaged in rivalries and wars against one another.

God seems to have laid a heavy curse on India and Indians, saying 'Ye Indians shall always remain divided and ye shall always be slaves !'

I was glad that India was separated from Pakistan. I was the philosopher, so to say, of Pakistan. I advocated partition because I felt that it was only by partition that Hindus would not only be independent but free. If India and Pakistan had remained united in one State Hindus though independent would have been at the mercy of the Muslims. A merely independent India would not have been a free India from the point of view of the Hindus. It would have been a Government of one country by two nations and of these two the Muslims without question would have been the ruling race notwithstanding Hindu Mahasabha and Jana Sangh. When the partition took place I felt that God was willing to lift his curse and let India be one, great and prosperous. But I fear that the curse may fall again. For I find that those who are advocating linguistic States have at heart the ideal of making the regional language their official language.

This will be a death knell to the idea of a United India. With regional languages as official languages the ideal to make India one United country and to make Indians, Indians first and Indians last, will vanish. I can do no more than to suggest a way out. It is for Indians to consider it.

#### CHAPTER 4

### MUST THERE BE ONE STATE FOR ONE LANGUAGE ?

#### What does a linguistic State mean ?

It can mean one of two things. It can mean that all people speaking one language must be brought under the jurisdiction of one State. It can also mean that people speaking one language may be grouped under many States provided each State has under its jurisdiction people who are speaking one language. Which is the correct interpretation ?

The Commission took the view that the creation of one single State for all people speaking one and the same language was the only rule to be observed.

Let the reader have a look at map No. 1. He will at once note the disparity between the Northern and Southern States. This disparity is tremendous. It will be impossible for the small States to bear the weight of the big States.

How dangerous this disparity is, the Commission has not realized. Such disparity no doubt exists in the United States. But the mischief it might

cause has been prevented by the provisions in the Constitution of the United States.

One such safeguard in the Constitution of the United States has been referred to by Mr. Pannikar in his dissenting minute to the Report (See Table No. 2).

I give below the following extract from his minute :

“I consider it essential for the successful working of a federation that the units should be fairly evenly balanced. Too great a disparity is likely to create not only suspicion and resentment but generate forces likely to undermine the federal structure itself and thereby be a danger to the unity of the country. This is clearly recognised everywhere. In most federal constitutions, though wide variation exists in respect of the population and resources of the unit, care is taken to limit the influence and authority of the larger States. Thus in the United States of America, for example, though the States are of varying population and resources and the State of New York has many times the population, say of Nevada, the constitution provides for equal representation of every State in the Senate.”

On this point Mr. Pannikar also refers to the Soviet Union and old Germany. This is what he says:

“In the Soviet Union also, in which great Russia has a larger population than most other units of the Federation taken together, representation in the House of Nationalities is weighed against her so that the other units of the Federation may not be dominated by the larger unit. In the Bismarckian Reich again, though Prussia had a dominant position from the point of view of population, she was given less representation in the *Reichsrat* or the house representing the states than she was entitled to (less than one-third) and the permanent presidency of that body was vested in Bavaria, clearly demonstrating that even here—where there was concentration of political, military and economic power in one State—it was considered necessary, in the interest of the union, to give weightage to the smaller units and also to reduce Prussia to the position of minority in the *Reichsrat*, States Council, which enjoyed greater powers than the *Reichstag* or the House of the People.”

Mr. Pannikar has however not mentioned one other safeguard in the Constitution of the United States against the evils of disparity. In our Constitution the two Houses are not co-equal in authority. But the position in the Constitution of the United States is quite different. In the U.S.A. the two Houses are co-equal in authority. Even for money bills the consent of the Senate is necessary. This is not so in India. This makes a great difference to the disparity in the population.

This disparity in the population and power between the States is sure to plague the country. To provide a remedy against it is most essential.

## CHAPTER 5

**THE NORTH VERSUS THE SOUTH**

What the Commission has created is not a mere disparity between the States by leaving U.P. and Bihar as they are, by adding to them a new and a bigger Madhya Pradesh with Rajasthan it creates a new problem of North *versus* South.

The North is Hindi speaking. The South is non-Hindi speaking. Most people do not know what is the size of the Hindi-speaking population. It is as much as 48 per cent of the total population of India. Fixing one's eye on this fact one cannot fail to say that the Commission's effort will result in the consolidation of the North and the balkanization of the South.

Can the South tolerate the dominance of the North?

It may now not be a breach of a secret if I revealed to the public what happened in the Congress Party meeting when the Draft Constitution of India was being considered, on the issue of adopting Hindi as the national language. There was no article which proved more controversial than Article 115 which deals with the question. No article produced more opposition. No article, more heat. After a prolonged discussion when the question was put, the vote was 78 against 78. The tie could not be resolved. After a long time when the question was put to the Party meeting the result was 77 against 78 for Hindi. Hindi won its place as a national language by one vote. I am stating these facts from my personal knowledge. As Chairman of the Drafting Committee I had naturally entry to the Congress Party enclosure.

These facts reveal how much the South dislikes the North. This dislike may grow into hatred if the North remains consolidated and the South becomes disintegrated and if the North continues to exercise a disproportionate influence on the politics of India (*See Map 1*).

To allow one State to have such preponderating influence in the Centre is a dangerous thing.

Mr. Pannikar has referred to this aspect of the case. In his dissenting minute he says :

“The consequence of the present imbalance, caused by the denial of the federal principal of equality of units, has been to create feelings of distrust and resentment in all the States outside Uttar Pradesh. Not only in the Southern States but also in the Punjab, Bengal and elsewhere the view was generally expressed before the Commission that the present structure of government led to the dominance of Uttar Pradesh in all-India matters. The existence of this feeling will hardly be denied by anyone. That it will be a danger to our unity, if such feelings are allowed to exist and remedies are not sought and found now, will also not be denied.”

There is a vast difference between the North and the South. The North is conservative. The South is progressive. The North is superstitious, the South is rational. The South is educationally forward, the North is educationally backward. The culture of the South is modern. The culture of the North is ancient.

Did not Prime Minister Nehru on the 15th of August 1947 sit at the Yajna performed by the Brahmins of Benares to celebrate the event of a Brahmin becoming the first Prime Minister of free and independent India and wear the Raja Danda given to him by these Brahmins and drink the water of the Ganges brought by them ?

How many women have been forced to go Sati in recent days and immolate themselves on the funeral pyre of their dead husbands. Did not the President recently go to Benares and worship the Brahmins, washed their toes and drank the water ?

The North still has its Satis, its Nanga Sadhus. What havoc the Nanga Sadhus made at the last Hardwar Fair ! Did anyone in U.P. protest against it ?

How can the rule of the North be tolerated by the South ? Already there signs of the South wanting to break away from the North.

Mr. Rajagopalachari has made a statement on the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission which has appeared in the *Times of India* of the 27th November, 1955. This is what he says :

“If it is impossible to put the States Reorganization Schemes in cold storage for the next 15 years, the only alternative is for the Centre to govern India as a unitary state and deal with district officers and district boards directly, with regional commissioners’ supervision.

“It would be utterly wrong to fritter away national energy in dispute over boundaries and divisions conceived in the drawing room and not on the background of conditions that have resulted historically.

“Apart from the general convictions of mine, I feel that a large southern State is absolutely essential for preserving the political significance of that part of the country. To cut the South up into Tamil, Malayalam and other small States will result only in complete insignificance of everybody and, in the net result, India as a whole will be the poorer.”

Mr. Rajagopalachari has not expressed himself fully. He did do so fully and openly to me when he was the Head of the State and I was the Law Minister in charge of drafting the constitution. I went to Mr. Rajagopalachari for my usual interview which was the practice of the day. At one such interview Mr. Rajagopalachari, referring to the sort of constitution which the Constituent Assembly was making, said to me, “You are committing a great mistake. One federation for the whole of India with equal

representation for all areas will not work. In such a federation the Prime Minister and President of India will always be from the Hindi speaking area. You should have two Federations, one Federation of the North and one Federation of the South and a Confederation of the North and the South with three subjects for the Confederation to legislate upon and equal representation for both the federations.”

These are the real thoughts of Mr. Rajagopalachari. They came to me as a revelation coming as they did from the innermost heart of a Congressman. I now regard Mr. Rajagopalachari as a prophet predicting the break-up of India into the North and the South. We must do everything to falsify Mr. Rajagopalachari’s prophecy.

It must not be forgotten that there was a civil war in the U.S.A. between the North and the South. There may also be a civil war between the North and the South in India. Time will supply many grounds for such a conflict. It must not be forgotten that there is a vast cultural difference between the North and the South and cultural differences are very combustible.

In creating this consolidation of the North and balkanization of the South the Commission did not realize that they were dealing with a political and not a merely linguistic problem.

It would be most unstatesmanlike not to take steps right now to prevent such a thing happening. What is the remedy ?

### PART III

## SOLUTION

### CHAPTER 6

## THE DIVISION OF THE NORTH

The problem having been realized we must now search for a solution.

The solution lies obviously in adopting some standard for determining the size of a State. It is not easy to fix such a standard. If two crores of population be adopted as a standard measure most of the Southern States will become mixed States. The enlargement of the Southern States to meet the menace of the Northern States is therefore impossible. The only remedy is to break up the Northern States of U.P., Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

How did this solution not strike the Congress Working Committee I am unable to understand. It is so obvious.

### Division of the Northern States

As I have said the Commission in designing linguistic States has created a consolidation of the North and balkanization of the South. The Commission has not I am sure done this intentionally. But intentionally or unintentionally the fact is there. Its evil consequences are also clear.

It is therefore necessary that this situation must be rectified. The only way to do this is to divide the three States of (1) Uttar Pradesh, (2) Bihar and (3) Madhya Pradesh into smaller units.

In this behalf I make bold to offer certain tentative proposals.

This division does not conflict with the underlying principles of a linguistic State. For, if these States are divided in the way suggested, each resulting State will be a linguistic State.

I am happy to find Mr. Pant saying in the recent debate in Parliament on the subject that he has no objection to the cutting up of the U.P. What he said for U.P. may well be taken as applicable to Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

*Division of Uttar Pradesh.*—My proposal with regard to the Uttar Pradesh is to divide it into three States (See Map 2). Each of these three States should have a population of approximately two crores which should be regarded as the standard size of population for a State to administer effectively. Where the boundary lines of these three States should be drawn I have shown in the accompanying Map No. 2.

The three States of the Uttar Pradesh could have as their capitals (1) Meerut (2) Cawnpore and (3) Allahabad. They are situated quite in the centre of each of these three States.

*Division of Bihar*—My proposal with regard to Bihar is to divide it into two States (See Map 3). Each of these two States will have a population of a little over one and half crores. It is not a small population for one Government to administer.

Where the boundary lines should be drawn I have shown in the accompanying Map No. 3.

The two States of Bihar could have as their capitals (1) Patna and (2) Ranchi. They are situated quite in the centre of the two States.

*Division of Madhya Pradesh.*—Madhya Pradesh stands before us in two forms. The old Madhya Pradesh and the new Madhya Pradesh.

The old Madhya Pradesh consisted of :

- (1) the Province at one time known as C. P. and Berar, and
- (2) some Indian States out of the States known as the Eastern States.

This old State of Madhya Pradesh had a population of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  crores. It consisted of 22 districts. Its legislature had 223 members.

The new Madhya Pradesh as planned by the Commission will consist of:

- (1) the 14 districts of the old Madhya Pradesh,
- (2) the whole of Bhopal,
- (3) the whole of Vindhya Pradesh,
- (4) Madhya Bharat except : Sunel enclave of Mandasaur district, and
- (5) the Sironj sub-division of Kota district of Rajasthan.

The total population of this new Madhya Pradesh will be 26.1 million and its area will be about 171.200 square miles.

I suggest that it should be divided into two States : (1) Northern Madhya Pradesh, (2) Southern Madhya Pradesh (*See Map 4*).

The State of New Madhya Pradesh should consist of the following areas :

- (1) The whole of Vindhya Pradesh.
- (2) The whole State of Bhopal.

The State of Southern Madhya Pradesh should consist of—

- (1) the whole State of Indore, and
- (2) the 14 districts of Mahakosal.

The population of this Indore State will be about 2 crores and the population of this Vindhya Pradesh will be about 1.30 crores. (*See Map No. 4*).

Why the Commission created this monster State it is no way to know. Even Prime Minister Nehru was surprised at its creation.

All that one can think of is that the Commission has been under the impression that one language, one State is a categorical imperative from which there is no escape. As I have shown one language, one State can never be categorical imperative. In fact one State, one language should be the rule. And therefore people forming one language can divide themselves into many States.

## CHAPTER 7

### THE PROBLEMS OF MAHARASHTRA

#### 1

#### THE PROPOSALS TO DEAL WITH MAHARASHTRA

Maharashtra is another area which is a subject of controversy.

There are four proposals in the field :

- (1) To retain the Bombay State as it is i.e. to retain it as a mixed State consisting of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay.
- (2) To disrupt the existing State and to separate Maharashtra and Gujarat and make them into two separate States.
- (3) To make united Maharashtra with Bombay as one State.
- (4) To separate Bombay from Maharashtra and make it a separate City State.

I would like to state what my proposals are. They are as follows :

Bombay as a mixed State should be done away with.

I would divide Maharashtra into four States (*See Map 5*) : (1) Maharashtra City State (Bombay), (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra and (4) Eastern Maharashtra.

*Maharashtra City State.*—The City of Bombay *plus* such area of Maharashtra as would enable it to be a good and strong City State.

*Western Maharashtra.*—(1) Thana, (2) Kolaba, (3) Ratnagiri, (4) Poona, (5) North Satara, (6) South Satara, (7) Kolhapur and (8) the Marathi-speaking territories given over to Karnataka.

*Central Maharashtra.*—(1) Dang, (2) East Khandesh, (3) West Khandesh, (4) Nasik, (5) Ahmednagar, (6) Aurangabad, (7) Nanded, (8) Parbhani, (9) Beed, (10) Usmanabad, (11) Sholapur City and the Marathi-speaking area of Sholapur District and (12) the Marathi-speaking territories given over to Telangana.

*Eastern Maharashtra.*—(1) Buldhana, (2) Yeotmal, (3) Akola, (4) Amraoti, (5) Wardha, (6) Chanda, (7) Nagpur, (8) Bhandara and (9) the Marathi-speaking territories given to Hindi States.

I will next proceed to examine the merits of these proposals.

## II

### MAHARASHTRIANS UNDER THE MIXED STATE

Should Bombay remain a mixed State ? It is a most unusual procedure. The City of Calcutta is not a separate City State. Madras is not a separate City State. Why Bombay alone be made the exception ?

Secondly, it is already a mixed State. What is the experience of the Maharashtrians under this mixed State ? The Maharashtrians have suffered terribly under this mixed State.

What is the position of the Maharashtrians in the Bombay Cabinet ?

Let us consider the distribution of Ministership :

|                     |     |       |     |          |
|---------------------|-----|-------|-----|----------|
| Gujarathi Ministers | ... | ...   | ... | 4        |
| Marathi Ministers   | ... | ...   | ... | 4        |
| Kannada Ministers   | ... | ...   | ... | 1        |
|                     |     | Total | ... | <u>9</u> |

Gujarathi members in the Assembly are only 106, Marathi members are 149 and yet the number of Gujarathi Ministers is equal to that of Maharashtrian Ministers.

Let us come to Deputy Ministers :

|                    |     |       |     |          |
|--------------------|-----|-------|-----|----------|
| Marathi speaking   | ... | ...   | ... | 5        |
| Gujarathi speaking | ... | ...   | ... | 2        |
| Kannada speaking   | ... | ...   | ... | 2        |
|                    |     | Total | ... | <u>9</u> |

Only among Deputy Ministers do the Maharashtrians have a majority of one.

But how the power and subjects are distributed among the Ministers and Deputy Ministers is the most important matter. It shows what power and authority the Maharashtrian Ministers possess in this mixed Cabinet of the Bombay State.

*Allocation of Subjects among Ministers*

| Gujarathi Ministers |                 |    |            | Maharashtrian Ministers |    |           |       |
|---------------------|-----------------|----|------------|-------------------------|----|-----------|-------|
| 1.                  | Morarji Desai   | .. | 105 Subs.  | Hirey                   | .. | 49        | Subs. |
| 2.                  | Dinkerrao Desai | .. | 26 Subs.   | Nimbalkar               | .. | 20        | Subs. |
| 3.                  | Jivaraj Mehta   | .. | 43 Subs.   | Tapase                  | .. | 15        | Subs. |
| 4.                  | Shantilal Shah  | .. | 28 Subs.   | Chavan                  | .. | 4         | Subs. |
| Total               |                 | .. | <u>202</u> |                         |    | <u>88</u> |       |

The allocation of subjects among Deputy Ministers is also done on the same pattern.

*Allocation of Subjects among Deputy Ministers*

| Gujarathi Deputy Ministers |                   |    |           | Maharashtrian Deputy Ministers |           |           |          |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| 1.                         | Indumati Sheth    | .. | 12 Subs.  | 1.                             | Wandrekar | ..        | 12 Subs. |
| 2.                         | Babubhai J. Patel |    | 3 Subs.   | 2.                             | Deshmukh  | ..        | 4 Subs.  |
|                            |                   |    |           | 3.                             | Naravane  | ..        | 5 Subs.  |
|                            |                   |    |           | 4.                             | Sathe     | ..        | 5 Subs.  |
|                            |                   |    |           | 5.                             | Faki      | ..        | 3 Subs.  |
| Total                      |                   | .. | <u>15</u> |                                |           | <u>29</u> |          |

Let us now consider how much money is spent on development in Maharashtra and in Gujarath. The following figures will give an idea of the Per Capita Expenditure for the three years on Maharashtra and Gujarath :

*Per Capita Expenditure on Development in Rupees*

|            |             |    |             | Years   |         |         |
|------------|-------------|----|-------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Population |             |    |             | 1950-51 | 1951-52 | 1952-53 |
| 1.         | Maharashtra | .. | 2,17,20,091 | 1.7     | 2.3     | 1.8     |
| 2.         | Gujarath    | .. | 1,18,96,789 | 2.9     | 3.1     | 3.2     |

What a differential treatment ? What a discrimination ? What an injustice ? Can anybody blame the Maharashtrians if they felt disgusted with the mixed State of Bombay ?

Such a position of subordination no Maharashtrian can tolerate. The idea of a mixed State must be blown off once for all.

## III

## THE POSITION OF THE CITY OF BOMBAY

The Bombay City is an area which is a subject matter of controversy. The controversy has become very acute.

Maharashtrians want the City to be part of Maharashtra, Gujarathis want the City to be a separate State. Heads have been broken over the controversy. But there has been no agreement. It is therefore necessary to go to the root of the matter.

The Gujarathis do not claim Bombay City as their own. But will not let go their hold on it. They claim a sort of easement over it by reason of the fact that they control the trade and industry of the City. The issue is : should it become part of Maharashtra or should it be constituted into a separate State ? The Gujarathis and Maharashtrians are sharply divided on the issue. The Maharashtrians want that Bombay should become exclusively a part of the new Maharashtra State. The Gujarathis are stoutly opposed to it. They have presented two alternatives. One alternative is not to break up the existing bi-lingual State of Bombay into two linguistic units of Gujarath and Maharashtra. The Congress Working Committee's decision is to make the city of Bombay into a separate State.

The Gujarathis are happy. The Maharashtrians are naturally angry.

The resentment of the Maharashtrians is well justified. The arguments urged against the claim of the Maharashtrians have no force at all.

The first argument that is urged is that the Marathi-speaking population of Bombay City does not form a majority of the total population of the City. The total population of Bombay City is very large (*See Statistical Appendix*). Marathi-speaking population is 48 per cent.

Those who use this kind of argument do not seem to realize the weakness of it

The total Marathi population of Bombay City is no doubt less than 50 per cent but it has to be valued against two factors. One is that geographically no one can deny that Bombay is part of Maharashtra even if the Maharashtrians are in a minority in the City. Even Mr. Morarji Desai admitted in the course of his speech in the meeting of the Gujarath Pradesh Congress Committee that Bombay is part of Maharashtra.

The second point to be taken into consideration in valuing the population factor is the continued influx of population from the rest of India who come to Bombay either for making profits or for earning their bread. None of them regard Bombay as their home ; they should not therefore be counted as permanent residents of Bombay City. Many come for a few months and go back.

Bombay is a home only to the Maharashtrians and none else. It is not therefore logical or fair to count the non-Maharashtrians for the purpose of coming to the conclusion as to who form the majority of population in the Bombay City.

Again it is not realized that the increase in the non-Marathi-speaking people in the Bombay City is due to the absence of a local law restricting citizenship. If Bombay State had such a law all this influx into Bombay from all parts of India could have been shut out and the Maharashtrian majority retained.

It is also not realized that the influx of the non-Maharashtrians in Bombay is due to the fact that Bombay is a port, and it is a port on the Western Coast. The route from Europe to Bombay is much shorter than the route from Europe to Calcutta or Europe to Madras. That is why large number of poor people from other parts of India leave their homes and come to Bombay as temporary residents. It is easier to find a job in Bombay than elsewhere.

Really speaking the matter has to be looked at from a different point of view. People have been coming to Bombay for the last two hundred years or so. Yet this influx has not reduced the Maharashtrian population in the city below 48 per cent. After two hundred years, the bedrock of its population remains Maharashtrian in its composition. This is due to the migratory character of City (See Appendix 3). The Gujarathis are migratory population.

There are also other arguments which could be urged in favour of allowing Bombay to remain as part of Maharashtra.

Bombay is not the only composite city in India. Calcutta and Madras are also composite cities. If Calcutta can be part of Western Bengal and Madras can be part of Madras State what objection can there be to Bombay being made part of Maharashtra ? This is the question that every Maharashtrian will ask. I see no answer to this question. The only answer that comes to one's mind is that the Congress High Command thinks that Maharashtrians are unfit to rule others. This is a slur on the Maharashtrian character and they will not tolerate it.

It is said that Bombay has been built up by the capital belonging to non-Maharashtrians. That may be so. But has Madras been built by the capital of Madrasees ? Has Calcutta been built by the capital of Bengalees ? Without the capital of Europeans Madras and Calcutta would have been villages. Then why urge this point against the Maharashtrians when they claim Bombay to themselves ? Maharashtrians have at least contributed labour without which Bombay could not have been what it is. It must always be remembered that the life lines of Bombay lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its electricity lie in Maharashtra. Sources of its water supply lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its labour lie in Maharashtra. Maharashtra can at any time make the city of Bombay '*Mohenjodaro*' a City of the Dead.

The Gujarathi population is filled with fear that Maharashtrians will practise discrimination against them. But under our Constitution discrimination is not possible for the reason that the Constitution contains a list of fundamental rights and remedies by way of writs from the High Court and the Supreme Court which can immediately provide redress for a wrong. For every wrong of a discriminative character there is a remedy provided by the Constitution. Why should the Gujarathis have any fear ?

Let us now consider what benefit the Gujarathis are going to get from Bombay being made a separate City State. Their population in the Bombay State is only ten per cent. How many seats can they get in the Bombay City State Legislature ? Not even ten per cent. How can ten per cent protect their clients against 90 per cent ?

It must be remembered that the feelings between the Maharashtrians and the Gujarathis would hereafter be running high as never before. A Maharashtrian will not vote for a Gujarathi candidate and a Gujarathi voter will not vote for a Maharashtrian candidate. Hitherto the Gujarathis have been able to plough the sands of Maharashtra with their money. But money may not succeed once self-respect is aroused. The Gujarathis must consider whether goodwill is not a better protection than a paltry share in the Government of the City.

While the case of Maharashtra is as strong as steel there are some points on the other side which they must not fail to consider in their anger.

They want Bombay to be within Maharashtra. But the question which they must consider is : What do they want ? Do they want prosperous Bombay or do they want decadent Bombay ? Can Bombay be prosperous under Maharashtra ? This in other words means : can Maharashtra provide the capital necessary for the growing trade and industry of the City ? No Maharashtrian can answer this question in the affirmative. The Maharashtrians may be able to supply the need for capital after a course of years. But certainly not now.

The second point is : what would be the effect on the standard of living of Maharashtrians living in Bombay if the City's prosperity declines either by flight of capital or removal of business houses. The Maharashtrians must not forget, however it may hurt their pride, that they are a nation of clerks and coolies. What employment can they get in a declining city ?

The Maharashtrian should consider the question of Bombay from this point of view. There is a saying which says :

सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्धं त्यजति पंडितः ।

There is also another reason why Bombay City should be made a separate state. The minorities and the Scheduled Castes who are living in the villages are constantly subjected to tyranny, oppression, and even murders by the members of the majority communities. The minorities need an asylum,

a place of refuge where they can be free from the tyranny of the majority. If there was a United Maharashtra with Bombay included in it where they can go to for safety ? The same tyranny was practised over the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis living in the villages when Godse killed Mr. Gandhi. All the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis who were once living in villages ran away and are now living in towns and forgetting their experiences are shouting for United Maharashtra, after having reached a safe harbour.

It seems to me that Maharashtrians will do well to accept the decision of the Congress High Command for the time being.

The Maharashtrians need have no fear of losing Bombay. Nobody can dispossess Maharashtrians of Bombay. Much less can there be any custer of them by anybody.

The real objection to the creation of Bombay as a separate State arises from the fact that the name Bombay does not carry within it the sense that it is part of Maharashtra. It is to remove this objection that I propose that the new State of Bombay should be renamed by another name which will carry on its face the word Maharashtra.

Supposing in terms of this suggestion instead of saying that Bombay be made a separate State it is said that Maharashtra be divided into four States, (1) Maharashtra City State (which is Bombay City), (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra, (4) Eastern Maharashtra; what objection can there be to the creation of a separate State of Bombay ?

This also involves the separation of Bombay. With this change in the name of the City I like to know which Maharashtrian can raise objection to the creation of Bombay as a separate City State on the ground that this scheme separates Bombay from Maharashtra ? To say that Bombay be made a separate State is merely stating that Maharashtra be divided into four States. If there is no objection to Maharashtra being divided into *two* or *three* States what objection can there be to Maharashtra being divided into four? I can see none. For the sake of similarity in language I propose that Calcutta be called Bengal City State and Madras be called Tamil City State.

This is one proposal which I make to ease the tension between Maharashtrians and Gujarathis.

The Maharashtra City State will be a surplus State. Those who are wanting United Maharashtra with Bombay are hoping to get the benefit of this surplus for Maharashtra.

The surplus revenue of the City State arises because of (1) The Property Tax and (2) The Electricity Tax. Can the revenue from these two sources be appropriated by Maharashtra if Bombay becomes a separate City State ?

Nothing can be done to take away the yield of the Property Tax from the Bombay City State Property Tax. It is a local tax, on local situated

property. The State within which the property is situated is entitled to the yield of the Tax.

With regard to the Electricity Tax the situation is different.

When Gujarath and Maharashtra are separated—and they must be—Gujarath will claim the revenue derived from electricity produced and consumed within Gujarath. Maharashtra will claim the revenue derived from electricity produced and consumed within Maharashtra. Bombay City as a State will do the same. Can Bombay be allowed to do so and appropriate the revenue to itself ? Is it just ? Bombay City does not produce electricity. It is produced outside Bombay City in Maharashtra. Therefore the new Bombay City State has no right to appropriate to itself the whole revenue derived from electricity. The proper thing to do is to apply the principle of the segregation of the sources and division of the yield well known to all students of State Finance.

To put it in concrete shape let the Centre take over the taxation of Electricity and divide the yield among the four States of Maharashtra—(1) Bombay, (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra, (4) Eastern Maharashtra according to their needs.

It will also ease the financial strain that the three Maharashtras are likely to suffer on account of the separation of Bombay.

#### IV

#### UNITED OR DIVIDED ?

I have said that Bombay be given a new area and made into a separate City State.

There now remains the question of how to deal with the rest of the Maharashtra. I have suggested that the rest of the Maharashtra should be divided into three States.

From very ancient times Maharashtra has been divided into three States.

Maharashtra first comes to be known in history during the time of Ashok. It is mentioned in *Mahavansa* in connection with reference to the missionaries sent by Ashok to different parts of India for the purpose of propagating Buddhism. But thereafter the Pali literature speaks of *Trai Maharashtra* or three Maharashtras. It means that from very ancient times there have been three Maharashtras. My proposal is not therefore new.

The distribution of population, area and revenue would be as shown in Table (on page 160).

The accompanying map No. 5 will show the area and boundaries of each of the three divisions.