

Khananjarao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-028218

States Reorganization
Commission
Gupta Samit's Report

श्री. अष्टकर,

महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश काँग्रेस कमिटी, यांस --

सप्रेम नमस्कार.

महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश कां.क.ने राज्यपुनर्गठना समितीला आपली कैफियत सादर करण्याकरिता जी कमिटी नेमली होती, त्या कमिटीने श्री.गुप्ते, श्री. देवगिरीकर व श्री.पाटसकर या तिघांचा गुपसमिती नेमली होती. त्या गुपसमितीने तयार केलेली कैफियत आपणांस सादर करित आहो. आपण ही कैफियत त्या कमिटीकडे व महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश कां क.च्या कार्यकारी मंडळाकडे पाठवावी. आम्हां तिघांपैकी, दोघांच्या सहया या कैफियतीवर आहेत. श्री.पाटसकर यांनी ही कैफियत मान्य केली आहे. पण ते येथे नसल्यामुळे त्यांची सही घेता आली नाही.

बळावे.

आपले,

(सही.) मालचंद्र महेश्वर गुप्ते

(सही.) ज्यं.र.देवगिरीकर.

28218

A MEMORANDUM FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE
STATES' REORGANISATION COMMISSION.

---oOo---

We are submitting this statement on behalf of The -
Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee, to claim that in the
reorganisation of the states of Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and
Hyderabad, the contiguous Marathi speaking areas should be
formed into a separate state, with Bombay as its capital.
This Congress Committee and its executive have on numerous
occasions passed without a single disident vote resolutions
making the demand. Moreover, the prominent members of this
Committee have taken the initiative and the lead in bringing
about what is now well-known as the Nagpur Pact - an agreement
which broadly outlines some of the basic policies to be followed
by the State of United Maharashtra when it is established. (The
extract of the pact is reproduced in the Appendix). Though we
primarily represent Congress opinion in Maharashtra, we have no
hesitation in stating that the claim we are making has the unani-
mous support of The people of Maharashtra in general, belonging
to all shades of political opinion.

2. Evidently the claim mentioned above, is based on the
principle of linguistic homogeneity and a kind of social and
cultural homogeneity that is associated with it, and it will be
our endeavour to prove that that is the right principle for the
solutions of the problems, which the Commission has been set up
to examine.

3. We take it that the Commission will evolve some definite
scheme of reorganisation of the states. Of course, we know, that
the judgment and discretion of the Commission are completely
unfettered by the terms of reference, and it is therefore fully
open to the Commission to recommend that no reorganisation need

be made, or that it may not be made for the present. It has been urged and will be urged before the Commission "This is not the time for undertaking the reorganisation. We have yet to consolidate over newly won freedom. We are living in a troublous period of our history and we are in the midst of the implementation of a Five Year Plan. The question of reorganisation should therefore, be put in cold storage till quieter times arrive". We emphatically disagree with these arguments. With the growing complexity of modern life, and the increasing tempo of activities in the modern world, those old simple, slow moving - almost somnolent times have gone and gone for ever. There will always be some kind of trouble going on in the world. No nation can therefore expect the return of those far off peaceful times and make its programmes dependent on that return. In the light of these remarks, we can say that there is now no emergency in the country. Thanks to the great ability of our leaders and the good sense of the people, we have tided over the political and economic crises that overwhelmed us after the Partition, and the conditions in the country have now assumed a fairly normal aspect. Then the question also arises, "why there should be postponement? Is the process of reorganisation so frightening in its results?" In our recent history, some reorganisation was done. Sind was separated from Bombay and Orissa was carved out of Bengal, Bihar and Central Provinces, and no significant trouble followed. Of course, when any change is made, when an integrated economy is disturbed, there is bound to be some little friction, some temporary dislocation. But it would be wrong to make a bugbear of it and put it in the same category as the disastrous results that followed in the wake of the partition of India. And if the disturbance is insignificant, would it be wise to prefer the continued discontent of a large mass of people to slight temporary dislocation? After all, hopes have been raised, passions have been roused and controversies have raged. Are we to keep the cauldron simmering indefinitely?

3.

To try to avoid trouble in the present, means to store greater trouble for the future.

4. Then with regard to the implementation of the Five Year Plan. In the first place, the argument would have been valid if we were concerned with one plan only. But that is not the case. Evidently we are in for a series of Five Year Plans, and for many years to come a plan will always be with us. Therefore, implementation of the plan is no argument for the postponement of the solution of the problem. But the more effective reply is that the liquidation of the multi-lingual states itself will promote more enthusiastic cooperation in the implementation of the plan. To-day the atmosphere in these heterogeneous States is hardly congenial to the vigorous execution of the plan. The atmosphere is so vitiated by suspicion and bickering amongst the various linguistic components of these States, that accusations about neglect or favouritism of this region or that are freely made. To the credit of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad it must be noted, that he candidly admitted that Marathwada had not received its due share in the State's Five Year Plan. Anyhow the fact remains that there is widespread dissatisfaction in the multilingual states with regard to the allocations made to the different regions in the Plans of those States. And when people feel frustrated about a matter they cannot be expected to join wholeheartedly in its execution. Therefore, the dissolution of the multilingual states itself will, by eliminating internal distrust and discontent, promote more vigorous participation of the public in the implementation of the Plan.

5. We therefore expect that the Commission will evolve some definite scheme for the reorganisation of states and we believe the Government of India also expect the Commission to do the same. In this connection we desire to invite the attention of the Commission to the resolution passed at the recent --

Kalyani Session of the Indian National Congress which interalia stated "The present constitution of the states in India, as a result of historical growth and the changes brought about after independence, is in many respects unsatisfactory, and their re-organisation has thus become necessary". We underline the word "necessary". It is well-known that generally the resolutions of the Congress are drafted by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and therefore in our opinion the word becomes more significant. But we need not rely merely on this supposition for an indication of his views. In winding up the discussion on the resolution in the subjects Committee and replying to those who demanded the dissolution of the Commission, Pandit Nehru, as President of the Congress described the present map of India as a "Jigsaw puzzle". That clearly shows that he expects the solution of the puzzle and not the postponement of the solution.

6. Technically it may be argued that Pandit Nehru was speaking there as the President of the Congress and not as the Prime Minister of India. But Pandit Nehru cannot have two sets of opinion on the same subject, especially in a matter like this. We can therefore safely assume that, the Government of India also expect the Commission to devise some definite scheme of reorganisation of States.

7. Once reorganisation is decided upon, the question arises, on what principle it should be based? We submit that the most important consideration and the most positive factor to be taken into account is the linguistic homogeneity. The foremost reason why this principle should be adopted is that it promotes the development of true democracy. Increasing association of the people in the governance of their state is the essence of democracy; and this would be impossible if the administration is carried on in a language which the bulk of the people do not understand. Then there is the question of development of the culture also. As stated above, along with the homogeneity of language, goes a kind of homogeneity of culture, and together they represent a pattern of living which

is common in that area. No doubt, we as Indians have a distinctive glorious culture of our own. But in the texture of that culture are woven the multi-coloured threads of various subsidiary culture characteristic of different language groups. Our is the case of unity in diversity and the flowering of the subsidiary cultures enriches the beauty of the composite Indian culture as a whole. Conditions have therefore to be created for the free and harmonious development of the different subcultures and it is clear that linguistic states would be eminently suitable for this purpose. Generally, but in Indian sub-continent at least, language is the strongest bond which binds a group of people, and the determined fight of the East Bengalis against their Urdu speaking coreligionists, for the recognition of Bengali as a state-language, is the most recent and the most powerful illustration of this proposition. The rout of the Muslim league in the recent East Bengal Assembly Elections was in no small measure due to this language question. No wonder therefore that 23 of the 27 units of our federal constitution are unilingual. And it should be remembered that much of this has automatically happened, even though in the British regime, the provinces were formed according to the exigancies of the time and without any deliberate plan. That shows the inherent strength of the principle. And whenever reorganisation has been thought out in theory and carried out in practice, language has been the predominant - almost decisive factor. Indian leaders, in what is known as Nehru Report (1928) and - foreign rulers in the Simon Report have both upheld this principle for the reorganisation of provinces. As to actual practice, it is well-known that the separation of Sind from Bombay and the Constitution of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam as separate provinces were based on linguistic homogeneity. Apart from the past, the present also denotes the same trend. It is extremely significant that all the claims which the Commission will have to scrutinize, are all, without exception, founded on the --

linguistic principle and it is well worth considering why that is so. In our opinion, it bears unmistakable testimony to the great strength and volume of public opinion behind this demand for reorganisation on linguistic lines; and in an adult suffrage democracy, strong and insistent public opinion has to be respected especially when it is reinforced by sound theory and practice. In support of this we may cite the authority of the Nehru Report which says on page 63 "Thus we see that the most important considerations in rearranging provinces are the linguistic principle and the wishes of the majority of people. A third consideration, though not of the same importance, is administrative convenience, which would include, geographical position, the economic resources and the financial stability of the area concerned. But administrative convenience is often a matter of arrangement and must bow to the wishes of the people". There is another important authority, of more recent origin. In December 1948, the Jaipur Session of The Indian National Congress, appointed a Committee, consisting of the late Sardar Patel, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya to consider the question of linguistic provinces. The report of this Committee, popularly known as J.V.P. report states on page 10 - "Notwithstanding what we have said above, if the public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming, the practicability of satisfying public demand, with its implications and consequences must be examined."

8. But we are told that a multilingual state provides a better sort of organisation for society, and that it promotes a higher type of nationalism. It would therefore be retrograde to disintegrate such states into unilingual ones. Theoretically it may be so, but as far as the practical aspect in India is concerned, it is now too late in the day to preach this to the parties involved in the problem; for, the linguistic principle has so long been sponsored by leaders of political thought in the country, that it is now --

too late in the day to preach this to the parties involved in the problem; for, the linguistic principle has so long been sponsored by leaders of political thought in the country, that it is now impossible to reverse the current. In this state of public opinion, it is evident that one integral condition which is absolutely essential for the successful functioning of the multilingual state is conspicuous by its absence, and that condition is that all the component parts of the multilingual state must appreciate it as a superior form of organisation and must be keen on its preservation. The sense of oneness is the soul of this kind of organisation and once that soul departs, what remains is only a lifeless formality. Take any of the multilingual states -- take Bombay, take Madhya Pradesh or take Hyderabad, and in everyone of them we will find that this sense of oneness is lost and that each component part is clamouring for separation. The situation is similar to one, that is often found in a joint Hindu Family. As long as all the coparceners are willing to remain joint, the form works eminently well. But once there is a rift, once the sense of oneness is lost, it is no use persisting in a forced union, with its perpetual bickerings, perpetual bitterness and perpetual frustration. It is better to separate in good time and with good grace.

9. Thus we come to the conclusion that in the reorganisation of the states, the linguistic homogeneity is the predominant consideration that has to be taken into account. In stating this we are not unmindful of the other factors emphasised in the Government Resolution setting up the Commission and re-emphasised by the Commission itself in its press note of the 24th Feb. 1954. The very adjective "predominant" used by us shows that we are not oblivious to the influence of other factors. But we do submit that linguistic homogeneity is the most important Consideration and the most positive factor that has to be taken into account. It is the positive factor in this sense that we have to take it into

consideration to start with. To begin with, the Commission will have to demarcate a linguistic area and to scrutinize its claim for separate statehood; then other factors like viability and administrative convenience come into operation in a negative way i.e. they operate as tests to determine whether the claim survives after the application of those tests. Thus the conclusion emerges that ordinarily a substantial language group is entitled to a separate state, unless its claim is negated on the grounds that it is not viable or that its formation is not administratively convenient or that it affects the unity of India etc. After having established this general proposition we shall -- endeavour hereafter to prove that the claim of Marathi speaking areas for a separate state with Bombay as its capital survives even after the consideration of all the factors emphasised by Government and reiterated by the Commission.

10. Before we proceed to this task, we shall give in some detail, the relevant information about the United Maharashtra which we seek to establish. A map also is attached.

<u>State & Districts</u>	<u>Area:- Sq.miles.</u>	<u>Population</u>
1. <u>Bombay State</u> : Districts of (1) East Khandesh (2) West Khandesh (3) Nasik (4) Ahmednagar (5) Sholapur (6) Poona (7) North Satara (8) South Satara (9) Kolhapur (10) Ratnagiri (11) Kolaba (12) Thana (13) Dangs and (14) Greater Bombay.	56,543	19343102
2. <u>Madhya Pradesh</u> : Districts of (1) Nagpur, (2) Bhandara (3) Chanda (4) Wardha (5) Amraoti (6) Akola (7) Yeotmal and (8) Buldana.	36,880	7607058
3. Marathwada (Hyderabad): (1) Auranga- bad (2) Parabhani (3) Nander (4) Bhir and Osmanabad.	21061	1773702
	----- 116484	----- 31723842

We must make clear that what is given above is only a broad outline and is not exhaustive of the areas that would comprise the new Maharashtra State. Naturally, on the borders there are bilingual areas about which there are bound to be differences of opinion with the neighbouring states. We suppose that the Commission will not take up the detailed work of demarcating the precise boundaries of the reorganised states. This task will very probably be entrusted later on to one or more Boundary Commissions. But we presume that this Commission will lay down the principles for the guidance of the Boundary Commission. We therefore suggest that the Commission should lay down the following principles in this behalf. A boundary should be so drawn that as far as possible no pockets of different language groups are left on either sides of the boundary and that in deciding this a revenue village should be taken as the unit.

11. Now we shall take up, one by one the negative factors referred to above and the first to be so taken up would be the the unity security of India. As far as unity of India is concerned we regret to say we cannot understand how the question arises at all in the matter of reorganisation of the internal units of our Federal Constitution. To our knowledge, not even a single . advocate of reorganisation on linguistic basis has claimed for organised states the right of secession from the Union of India. Not only that, none of them has even asked for enlarged powers for the units as against the centre. They are all asking for the establishment of their respective linguistic States within the framework of our present Constitution. We yield to none in our love for Mother India and we are proud to be her children. We are Indians first and Maharashtrais afterwards. But we emphatically deny that patriotic devotion to the Country is incompatible with attachment and pride for the smaller units like the State and the province. We do not at all

subscribe to the absurd idea that one can grow only at the cost of the other. In the circumstances we are unable to see how the reorganisation of States can in any way affect the unity of India.

12. As far as security of India is concerned, the question can directly arise, only in the case of a border state like East Punjab. The proposed Maharashtra State has no foreign state on its borders. Therefore the question of security of India does not arise at all, in the formation of the United Maharashtra. But at the same time we admit that the reorganisation of States has an indirect bearing on the security of India. It is rightly said that the strength of the weakest link is the strength of the Chain. If some of the units are weak and divided against themselves they are bound to spread their weakness to the Union; on the other hand, homogeneous and stable States are bound to contribute materially to the strength and stability of the Federation. Therefore, linguistic states, eliminating as they do, the sources of distrust and discord in multilingual units, must substantially strengthen the solidarity of India as a whole.

13. As forcefully pointed out by the quotation from the Nehru Report (quoted in para 7) it would not be proper to make viability an indispensable condition for the Constitution of a separate State; nor is it easy to lay down absolute criteria for the determination of viability. Nevertheless it may generally be agreed that as far as possible no new states which are likely to entail heavy financial burden on the centre be created. The proposed new state of United Maharashtra can stand this test. No accurate assessment of the annual revenue of the new state can be made to-day. But from the study of the recent budgets of the States of Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad, a rough but safe estimate has been made and that estimate amounts to 50 to 55 crores of rupees. Thus the per capita revenue would be about Rs.15/-. The Finance Commission Report of 1952 gives figures of per capita revenue of all the Part A, B States and from them we find that this compares

very favourably with the per capita revenue of much bigger states like Bihar (Rs.7.2) and Uttar Pradesh (Rs.3.2). At any rate, the per capita revenue would be higher than the all-India average of Rs.11.6 and thus the United Maharashtra State would be in a position to sustain a fairly high level of administrative efficiency and developmental expenditure without requiring any special recurring or non-recurring assistance from the Centre. As the State would have two ready made capital cities in Bombay and Nagpur, no assistance from the Centre for that purpose also would be necessary as in the case of Andhra.

14. Apart from the financial aspect, the United Maharashtra would be well qualified for separate stathood from other points of view also; for after all the real strength and stability of a state depends on the variety and the richness of its resources. Ordinarily this would not be possible unless the area is fairly large from the points of view, both of population and area. United Maharashtra would be big state - but moderately big. In the latest Census Report, India is divided into 3 sub-regions with regard to density of population namely, high, low and medium density. It is noteworthy that most of the area of the new state is placed in the midium catagory. Just as homogeneity is desirable in the population of a State, diversity is desirable in its resources. The new Maharashtra State would have a variety of soils, crops and climates. Most probably it would be self-sufficient in food grains and it has good commercial crops in Sugarcane, cotton, oil seeds and Tobacco. Bombay Maharashtra claims the highest sugarcane and sugar yield per acre in the country. Mahavidarbha is rich in Cotton and Marathwada in oil-seeds. The State has great industrial centres in Bombay, Sholapur and Nagpur. It has immense potentialities for irrigation and power development. In that connection, the Koyna, Khadakwasla, Nira, Mula, Kukadi and Girna projects are already well-known.

15. The test of administrative convenience also would present no impediment. In para 10 the area mentioned is 116984 sq. miles. To this will have to be added the area that will fall to the share of this state after the determination of the precise boundaries in the outlying bilingual regions. This may be of the order of 14 to 15 thousand square miles. Then the total area will be about 126 thousand square miles. In the first place, this is not extraordinarily large to cause administrative inconvenience. Comparing this with the areas of some other states, we find that Uttar Pradesh has 127 thousand Sq.Miles and the present Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan 130 each. Secondly the new State would be far better served with all sorts of communications - rail, road, air and sea. The last is not available at all to the three bigger states mentioned above; but even in the case of air, Bombay and Nagpur being junctions of important national and international air services would give the new state a definite superiority. Thirdly, the Nagpur Pact has, in addition, improved the situation in this respect. Besides the chief capital at Bombay, there would be a subsidiary capital at Nagpur. So also there would be a bench of the High Court at Nagpur. No part of the state would therefore feel that the seat of administration or the seat of justice was far distant from it.

16. After having established our case in general, we shall now deal with the three particular questions that have arisen in connection with the formation of this new state. They relate to (1) Mahavidarbha (2) Marathwada and (3) The Bombay City. We must make clear at the outset that we deal with those questions only to demonstrate that the differences of opinion expressed about them have no validity. This does not in the least affect our view which we hold strongly, that these areas must be automatically included in the State of United Maharashtra. This view is based on the principle that once a broadly defined contiguous linguistic region is found suitable for the establishment of a separate state, there should be no question about the inclusion of the whole area

in the state. A question can later on arise and that too only with regard to outlying bilingual areas when a precise boundary line is to be drawn. Luckily in the enunciation of this principle we are fortified by an excellent recent precedent. It was well-known that substantial opinion in Rayala seema was strongly opposed to the formation of separate Andhra or to joining Andhra. And yet Rayalseema was automatically included in Andhra. Our case is far better for no where in our area opposition is so strong as it was in Rayalseema in relation to Andhra.

17. We shall first take up Mahavidarbha. It must be remembered that the demand for a separate state of Mahavidarbha rests on the same foundation on which the case of United Maharashtra rests -- namely the principle of re-organisation on linguistic basis, and once this principle is accepted, between the two solutions United Maharashtra would have undoubted superiority over Mahavidarbha; for, there is no reason why two smaller separate Marathi States should be formed instead of one. Both states would be generally weak, the smaller Mahavidarbha especially so. On the other hand, one United Maharashtra State would be of the optimal size -- neither too large nor too small, and as we have already seen, eminently well fitted in all respects to constitute a separate state, strong and stable.

18. We are totally opposed to creation of small units. Not only they become a financial dead weight on the centre, but in general they constitute a source of weakness to the Union. Because of their territorial smallness they do not lend themselves properly to sound economic planning and thus prevent efficient exploitation of resources. This is itself is detrimental to the interests of the Country at large. Even if the interests of Mahavidarbha alone were considered; it stands to gain more by joining the United Maharashtra than by remaining aloof. Mahavidarbha's annual revenue is expected to be 8 to 9 crores. Its per capita revenue would thus become much smaller than the per capita

revenue of the United Maharashtra as a whole. It is obvious, which course is more beneficial to it.

19. It is true that prior to the conclusion of the Nagpur Pact, the demand for a separate state of Mahavidarbha has got considerable support, because it mainly arose out of the desire to avoid the domination of the Hindi region, in Madhya Pradesh State and consequent injustice to the Marathi area. At that time the former precisely states had not merged and disintegration of Hyderabad was not within the range of practical politics. Mahavidarbha on the other hand was in need of early relief from the injustice referred to above. Therefore, the advocates of United Maharashtra also supported the demand for a separate Mahavidarbha State. But things have changed with unexpected rapidity. Disintegration of Hyderabad has not only come within the range of practical politics, but has become the most crucial issue before the Commission. In the meanwhile some of the propogandists of Mahavidarbha began to raise the alarm of the domination of Bombay Maharashtra in the State of United Maharashtra. They argued that by joining the United Maharashtra they would be merely substituting one dominant partner for another and the same injustice to Mahavidarbha would continue. But the conclusion of the Nagpur Pact has knocked the bottom out of this argument that Pact, providing as it does, adequate safeguards and liberal guarantees for Mahavidarbha and Marathwada areas, has allayed all fears and suspicions. There is therefore now no case for a separate state of Mahavidarbha.

20. In a sense the case of Marathwada is simpler. Representative bodies and persons have accorded almost unanimous support to United Maharashtra and opposition is scarcely audible. They have also made it unmistakably clear that they are not at all in favour of joining Mahavidarbha, even if it were decided to set up a separate state for that area. Even to-day owing to economic and commercial ties, the people of Marathwada are in more frequent and more intimate contact with Bombay than with Nagpur. Their cultural contacts are also

with Bombay and Poona. It is not therefore surprising that they feel greater affinity towards United Maharashtra than towards Mahavidarbha.

21. But there is the problem of the disintegration of Hyderabad. It is to be expected that the proposed elimination of the state would provoke some emotional opposition. But facts have to be faced and the foremost of them is that all the three component parts of it - namely Telangana Marathwada and Karnatak have repeatedly expressed their complete dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs and have asked for separation. All the arguments for the liquidation of multi-lingual states, already set out in the preceding paragraphs of course apply here also, in their full force. But there is an additional and a more compelling reason why the dissolution of Hyderabad must be effected. States like Bombay, Madras and Madhya Pradesh, though heterogeneous in character have achieved a measure of progress and acquired considerable experience of the working of the democratic form of Government. But that is not the case with Hyderabad. A long rule of communal oligarchy has impoverished the people and kept them backward in all respects. No doubt the power of the oligarchy is now broken and a democratic set up put in its place, but the entire state being backward, the progress of the people cannot be accelerated unless its component parts are attached to more advanced and experienced units. Moreover, the leeway in progress can be made up only if there is enthusiastic cooperation of the masses. But that has now become impossible in the State as it is. The differences amongst the linguistic regions having already become acute, there is no unity of purpose or unity of outlook. Inclusion in more homogeneous States alone, will now evoke a vigorous upsurge of emotional response from the people.

22. Another equally important but more compelling fact to be faced is that the dissolution of Hyderabad is the crucial

issue before the Commission.

We humbly submit that the disintegration of Hyderabad is the only foundation on which the edifice of the reorganization of the South can be built up; and the reorganisation of South is the main - task of the Commission Reorganisation of the States of Bombay. Madhya Pradesh, Mysore and Andhra, in fact the reorganisation of the entire South excepting the problem of Keral, is wholly dependent on the liquidation of Hyderabad. Therefore, non-acceptance of this solution will not only add to the accumulating discontent and bitterness of a very large mass of people, but will stultify the work of the Commission itself.

23. The problem of the Raj Pramukh naturally arises in this connection. We are in favour of the abolition of the office which is in congruous with our republican and democratic form of Government. Whether there is to be a general abolition of the office or not, at any rate, the question of the position of the Raj Pramukh of Hyderabad should not be allowed to prejudice the proper solution of the problem. After all the privilege and prestige of one man should not hold up the progress and welfare of millions.

24. And finally we come to the problem of the Bombay City - the Greater Bombay.

Geographically, historically and linguistically Bombay city belongs to Maharashtra. Verdict of history may not be unanimously accepted, but the verdict of Geography is incontestable; and the verdict of Geography in this case is that Bombay City cannot be a part of Maharashtra. Even a glance at the map of India would convince any one of the fact, Bombay City is a tiny spot on the western - coast. To the north of Bombay there is Thana District and to the South is the Kolaba district and Ratnagiri beyond that. The sea to the West is common to all the four. To the East again there is the Kolaba District and beyond that other adjacent parts of Maharashtra. Now all the three districts are indisputably Marathi speaking. Surrounded on all the three sides by Marathi area how can there be

any doubt on the point that geographically Bombay City forms part of Maharashtra? The very fact that the land required for the relief of congestion from Bombay or for expansion of Bombay, has come and can come only from Maharashtra territory, conclusively proves the point.

25. Historically, the original inhabitants of the island namely the Kolis and the early colonisers were speakers of Marathi. Bhimdeva or Bimbadeva the second son of Ramdeva the King of Devgiri is the founder of Bombay. After the defeat of his father by Allauddin Khilji in 1294, Bhimdeva established his rule in North Konkan and made Mahi-Mahim (Bombay-Mahim) as his capital. With him and following him came to Bombay many Marathi speaking families like --- Pathare Prabhus, Palshikar Brahmins, Bhandaris, Panch Kalashis, Bhois, Thakurs etc. The island was then very scarcely populated and therefore these early colonisers easily formed the predominant part of the population and were responsible for its initial development. This predominance of speakers of Marathi in the population of Bombay, continued right upto recent times, and even according to 1941 Census, the percentage was 50. Thereafter the peculiar war conditions encouraged large influxes of people from other parts of India and later on there was the influx of refugees from Pakistan. This has tilted the balance against speakers of Marathi, but yet they form the largest group. According to the latest 1957 Census, Marathi accounts for 44% Bombay's population, with Gujerathi following as a poor second with its 18%. Maharashtrians in Bombay also represent the largest single concentration of Marathi speakers in one place. No other city in the United Maharashtra territory can claim a larger Marathi speaking population than the 1236874 of Bombay.

26. A point is sought to be made that the Bombay was never under Maratha rule, but this is not strictly correct. The island of Salsette which now forms part of Greater Bombay was admittedly a part of Maratha Kingdom. Bombay is in Konkan and the whole of Konkan

including the island of Salsette but excluding only the island of Bombay proper, was under Maratha rule at one time or another. And Bombay island escaped being subjugated mainly because its governors followed a policy of applasement of Marathas when they were at the height of their power. If Shivaji could attack Surat he could certainly have attacked Bombay also; but at the time Bombay had not grown big enough or rich enough to attract attention. In 1739, when Chimaji Appa captured Bassain, Salsette island came under his sway and Maratha rule extended right up to the gates of Bombay. Frightened by this, the English at Bombay sent Captain Gordon to Shahu's Durbar and Captain Inchward to Chimaji to solicit friendship and peace. Partly due to these ouertures and partly because of the fact the Marathas were then engaged in dealing with more powerful adversaries in the north, the tiny island of Bombay was allowed to remain undisturbed.

27. Thus geographically, historically, linguistically Bombay is an integral part of Maharashtra. They are indissolubly linked together. Bombay is the nerve centre of all economic activity of Maharashtra. It is also a very important centre of cultural and social activities of Maharashtra. Bombay on its part is dependent on Maharashtra for its supplies of water and electricity. Notwithstanding all this, its severence from Maharashtra and its constitution as a centrally administered separate unit is vehemently advocated. Prejudice rather than reason is responsible for this demand. We are very sorry to note that J.V.P. report made a recommendation in this connection which is absolutely unfair to -- Maharashtra. The report says, " ----- (Bombay City) is essentially a cosmopolitan multilingual city; the nerve centre of our trade and commerce etc. It is impossible for us to entertain any idea or any proposal which might injure the many sided life and activity of the great city which has been built up by the labour of all kinds of people and communities. We cannot consider it as belonging to any linguistic group, and attach it to a purely linguistic province.

That would undoubtedly mean its rapid deterioration from its present commanding position". With due deference we must say that the last sentence is a mere assertion and no reasons are given in support of it. In the absence of such reasoning we cannot understand how the dire result can follow the inclusion of Bombay in the United Maharashtra State. We cannot conceive how any Government of Maharashtra can ever think of pursuing policies detrimental to the prosperity and pre-eminence of Bombay. If Maharashtrians were so indifferent to the importance of Bombay, they would not have insisted, with such determination as they have displayed, on the retention of Bombay for the United Maharashtra. They would have long ago accepted the offer contained in the J.V.P. report to form a separate state without Bombay. It is true that Bombay has been built up by the labours of many peoples and communities. Nevertheless, it is also true, that Maharashtra with its resources in men and materials has made no small contribution to this achievement. Maharashtra has therefore a legitimate claim over, and vital interest in the prosperity and the commanding position of Bombay. The future rulers of Maharashtra must be presumed to have common sense enough to protect the welfare of Bombay, on the maintenance of which the welfare of their state largely depends. And even supposing for the sake of argument that these rulers are evil minded or perverse enough to do the mischief, have they the power under the Constitution, to carry out their designs? All powers regulating industry trade and commerce or powers in respects of - subjects such as finance, Banking, Transport Communications, Ports are concentrated in the hands of the Centre. What can a state do with regard to these? Not only this, there are - Fundamental Rights in the Constitution prohibiting discrimination and assuring freedoms of trade commerce, occupation, movement etc. It is therefore evident that the fears that a separate Maharashtra State will injure Bombay are absolutely groundless.

28. But there is also another aspect of this matter. Is there any reason why apprehensions should be entertained in relation to Maharashtra alone? Is there any reason why Bombay should be singled out for differential treatment? There are many cosmopolitan cities in India - or many other large centres of trade industry and commerce. At least the case of Calcutta is on all fours with Bombay. But nobody has ever thought of disintegrating Calcutta from West Bengal. If a separate Bengali State has not caused injury to Calcutta, why a separate Marathi State should cause injury to Bombay? We would not have minded, though we would not have agreed with the solution, if Bombay and Calcutta were uniformly treated, disrupted from their hinterland and entrusted to the care of the Centre. But if Bombay alone is meted out such treatment, Maharashtrians will naturally regard it as an affront to their good sense.

29. The question of discrimination apart, it is necessary to consider whether it is desirable to detach Bombay city from its immediate surroundings and make it a separate unit. We shall first take up the Constitutional aspect of the matter. If the present provisions are to be maintained, Greater Bombay can become only a Part C State, governed by a Chief Commissioner. Article 170 would preclude it from being constituted as a Part A State. According to the calculations of that Article a Part A State must have at least 45 lakhs as its population. But Bombay has only 28 lakhs. In this way the political status of Bombay's citizens would be materially lowered and their powers of self-Government substantially reduced. This is obviously a retrograde and reactionary step unfair to the people of Bombay who to-day belong to one of the most progressive and best governed states of Indian democracy. This is particularly hard on the Maharashtrians in the city, who form a very large part of the population and who but for the peculiar reactionary arrangement would continue to be the citizens of a Part A State.

We know that this difficulty can be surmounted by an amendment of the Constitution, but such an amendment merely for the purpose of disrupting Bombay from Maharashtra would not be very easy.

30. Irrespective of the Constitutional difficulties surrounding the separation of Bombay from Maharashtra there are serious objections on economic and political grounds against that proposal. The economies of both are so closely intergrated that their severance is bound to cause damage to either of them. It is desirable that in every state there should be a balance between the development of the Cities and the development of the rural area - a balance, between the industrial development and the agricultural development lopsided growth of one of the cost of the other will be ultimately detrimental not only to the interest of the state but also to the interest of the Country as a whole. If Bombay is constituted into a separate state, this balance would be available neither to it nor to Maharashtra.

31. There is another objection also. We have already expressed our strong opposition to the creation of small units. But we more strenuously opposed to the creation of city-states especially industrial city-states. These States may be rich enough to stand the test of viability, but without the steadying influence of the surrounding country-side, they are susceptible to a kind of political instability, which make them peculiarly vulnerable in times of emergencies. Therefore, establishment of such a state for an area of high strategic importance as Bombay is fraught with possible danger to the security of India.

32. Moreover Bombay's peculiar position must be taken into consideration. Bombay is in urgent need of considerable additional space, if not for expansion, at least for relief from congestion which has already assumed the proportions of a grave and acute problem. A step towards solution has been taken by the organisation of Greater Bombay and the occupied has grown from 26 sq.

miles to 111 sq.miles, all the additional space having been supplied by Maharashtra. But this is scarcely sufficient. A master plan has been drawn requiring an area of 225 sq.miles. The additional 114 sq.miles can come only from Maharashtra. But if Bombay is constituted into a separate state, what right it will have to encroach on the territory of another state?

33. It is unfortunate that advocates of separate Bombay State have not taken all these aspects into consideration. If they reconsider the whole matter in a calm and dispassionate manner, they would realise that there is hardly likely to be any serious change, to be panicky about, by the incorporation of Bombay in the Marathi linguistic State. The language of the High Court is regulated by Article 248 of the Constitution and is within the jurisdiction of the centre and not of the State. Marathi speakers having in Poona University a field for the development of Marathi, Bombay University will be free to decide its own media of instruction and examination. Similarly Bombay Corporation has the autonomy to decide its language policy. And above all the languages now used in the vast field of private business would remain unaffected. The rights of linguistic minorities are well safeguarded by Fundamental Rights in the Constitution. Whenever a language minority is sufficiently large, literal facilities would be provided for the education of its children. In fact, every attempt would be made to allay fears and win contentment of the minorities. We therefore humbly submit that there is no valid case for the separation of Bombay City from the State of United Maharashtra.

34. While on the subject of minorities we may also refer to the Case of the most important minority namely the Harijans, not only in relation to Bombay, but to Maharashtra State in general. Speaking on the Andhra Bill in the Council of States Dr. Ambedkar complained that the plight of scheduled caste would become worse under the regime of linguistic States and he suggested that the Governors should be invested with special powers to protect the

minorities. We have no doubt, his fears are unfounded and his remedy misconceived. We give below figures to prove that the combination of Harijans in one State of United Maharashtra, does not change the situation to their detriment. Roughly and in round figures, Harijans number 30 lakhs in the total population of 359 lakhs of the Bombay State, 28 lakhs in 186 lakhs of Hyderabad and 29 lakhs in 212 lakhs of Madhya Pradesh. In the United Maharashtra, their strength will increase to 38 lakhs in a total population of 317 lakhs. There are already adequate Constitutional safeguards for the protection of their interests and the spirit of the times is in their favour. No Government whatever its Communal Complexion can afford to tolerate or - ignore any harassment of the minority within its jurisdiction. In any event we have no doubt that the welfare of Harijans will receive utmost consideration from the Governments of the future Maharashtra State.

In conclusion we hope that the long cherished aspirations of Maharashtrians will be fulfilled as a result of the labours of the Commission. They richly deserve that consumation. They have a proud past and a bright future. Though spread over in different regions they have complete linguistic, political, social and cultural homogeneity. They have common history, traditions and literature. Their dress, food, customs and manners are all alike. They celebrate the same festivals, adore the same heroes, revere the same Saints and worship the same Gods. The name of Shivaji is a name to conjure with throughout Maharashtra. The Saint poets like Dyneshwar, Namdeo, Tukaram, Eknath, - Ramdas, Janabai, Chokhamela and others have carried the philosophy of vedant and the cult of Bhakti, down to the vast illiterate masses of people and thus moulded their spiritual outlook in one homogeneous pattern. Pandharpur is a great centre of - pilgrimage. Every year, lakhs of devotees from all over the

territory of United Maharashtra gather to gather on the sands of the Chandrabhaga for the purpose of offering worship in the famous temple of Shri Vithoba. Though thus unified in many respects Maharashtrais have been labouring under a great handicap -- they have been divided in three different administrative areas. If that handicap is removed, if they are brought together in one state, the United Maharashtra will be one of the most progressive units of Indian Democracy and one of the strongest bulwarks of the integrity, stability and the prosperity of the Motherland.
