

THE FUTURE
OF
BOMBAY CITY

BY

Prof. D. R. GADGIL, M.A. M.Litt. (Cantab)

Price 8 Annas.

SAMYUKTA MAHARASHTRA PUBLICATION

THE FUTURE OF BOMBAY CITY

The Linguistic Provinces Commission has incorporated a question regarding the future political status of the City of Bombay in its questionnaire. That such a question should have been included in the questionnaire is a significant comment on the prevalent confusion regarding the principles on which the Constitution of the Indian Union is to be based. In dealing with this matter beginning must therefore be made with indicating what appear to be the basic principles regarding territorial arrangements and constitutional relations within the Indian Union. The first resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly of India laid emphasis on the federal character of the Union and the large sphere of autonomy to be enjoyed by its constituent units. The third paragraph of the resolution is as follows:

“Wherein the said territories, whether with their present boundaries or with such others as may be determined by the Constituent Assembly and thereafter according to the Law of the Constitution, shall possess and retain the status of autonomous Units, together with residuary powers, and exercise all powers and functions of government and administration, save and except such powers and functions as are vested in or assigned to the Union, or as are inherent or implied in the Union or resulting therefrom.” The Indian Union is a federation formed by the coming together of peoples inhabiting various regions of India. Most of these have had an independent political existence in the historical past and have enjoyed a status comparable to that of the nationalities on the continent of Europe. The division of the country into administrative Units during British rule bore no connection, in a number of areas, with fundamental facts of political tradition and sentiment and were results chiefly of historical accident. From the time, however, that public opinion began to exercise active influence in Indian politics, the redistribution of territories and rearrangement of Provinces has proceeded by reference to

the facts of political and cultural homogeneity. The separation of Bihar and Assam from Bengal, the agitation against the partition of Bengal, the creation of Orissa and Sind as separate Provinces, are all landmarks along this path. The establishment of a sovereign republican Indian Union demands that this long drawn out process be immediately completed.

The autonomous States which are to be named in the first schedule of the Constitution of India must be composed of territories peopled by citizens united with common purposes and fired with a common loyalty to their States. The formation of such States implies the search for a principle in the light of which homogeneity of political sentiment can be determined. By general consensus of opinion this has been found in linguistic affiliation. It is now widely recognised that linguistic affiliation in India, outside the block of speakers of Hindi, denotes not only commonness of language but also, in general, commonness of historical and cultural traditions and a broad unity of political sentiment.

Once this is conceded, the next step is, as in the creation of Sind and Orissa, the determination of the area of the linguistic units through the determination of the extent of contiguous territory inhabited, in the main, by peoples speaking one major language. Such territory is the territory of the peoples speaking that language and forms the area of an autonomous state in the Indian Union. The integrity of this area, however determined, must be taken for granted. If any meaning is to be attached to the term federal union, the territories of the States must be considered inviolable; and once the principle of basing the formation of autonomous States on areas inhabited by the speakers of one language is conceded, the whole of the territory properly included within each such area must belong to the autonomous State of the linguistic group. Any attempt to take away any part of area or region falling within the territory of the speakers of a language constitutes a violation of the federal principle, and of the integrity of the State, actual or potential, and an insult and an indignity offered to that linguistic group.

It may be noted that the process of reformation of State units has been proceeding during the last year among territories of former Indian States. This process has also gone along the path of the quest for political homogeneity; and, wherever the reformation affected areas of states composed of speakers of other languages than Hindi, the principles of attaining linguistic homogeneity and including the largest possible homogeneous linguistic unit within the new unit have been followed. This is exemplified by the procedure adopted in the formation of Sourashtra and in dealing with states in Gujerat, Maharashtra, Karnatak, Orissa, etc.

It has begun to be recently alleged that the demand for linguistic provinces indicates a fissiparous tendency. There can be no grosser misrepresentation of the attitude of those who put forward the demand. The demand is not linked with any particular view of the powers of the Federal Government or the strength of the Union. Those who make the demand only say that, granted the federal character of the Union—and this is the unanimously agreed basis on which the work of the Constituent Assembly is proceeding—the formation of the autonomous States must be brought about on a clear and logical plan. The boundaries of Provinces during the British Period or the influence of vested interests then built up must not be allowed to confuse the issue. The new autonomous units will have the same status as the existing units and can be trusted to be equally loyal to the Union. It is a sufficient reply to this criticism regarding fissiparous tendencies of linguistic claims to point out that most of the units, other than those affected by the demand for the creation of linguistic provinces, are already unilingual. If there is any special virtue in heterogenous population areas and if the co-existence of varied language groups breeds some superior type of nationalism, then efforts should immediately be made to alter suitably the boundaries of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam and the United Provinces. If, however, these provinces are to continue to enjoy the political and administrative advantages flowing from having territories inhabited, in the main, by speakers of one language, other areas must be given an equal

advantage. The truth is, the present demand for linguistic provinces is no more an exhibition of the fissiparous tendency than the demand of the Biharis, Bengalis, Assamese, and Oriyas regarding their Provinces in the past or the aspirations in the direction of Maha-Gujerat of the leaders of Gujerat, and the demand is opposed and calumniated only by vested interests who fear that they might be affected adversely by the redistribution of provinces or by the floating elements in our population who have no roots in any region but who exert, at present, an influence entirely disproportionate to their numbers. Some opposition to the demand has recently emerged also among speakers of Hindi from elements who exhibit signs of an incipient imperialism.

To sum up, the principles basic to the formation of new States in India are that (1) the new units formed should have homogeneity of political sentiment and that commonness of language is an adequate index of such homogeneity, in the non-Hindi speaking areas; (2) as large an area of contiguous territory as possible which is politically homogeneous should be constituted into an autonomous state unit; (3) that, as a necessary concomitant of the status of an autonomous unit in the Federation the integrity of the territory of each autonomous State should be fully respected.

II

A clear understanding of these principles would lead to a realization of how unnecessary it is to ask any question regarding the status of Bombay City. There is no doubt that the Islands of Bombay and Salsette have formed an integral part of the territory of the Konkan inhabited by speakers of Marathi from times going back to the emergence of Marathi as a distinct language. The evidence of epigraphy, of monumental records and other historical data prove conclusively that Konkan upto Daman in the North has always been inhabited by speakers of Marathi and been thus always and indubitably Maratha territory.**

**"Along the Coast, Marathi may be said to begin at the Damanganga river or with Thana District."

Census of Bombay Presidency. J. A. Baines, 1882.

In recent historical times Shivaji and his successors took part in liberating the territory of the Konkan both to the South and North of Bombay. Today, the nearest boundary of the territory of speakers of a language other than Marathi is to the North of Bombay and this boundary does not come nearer than 80 miles from Bombay. To the South and the East the territory of the speakers of Marathi stretches hundreds of miles from Bombay. The territory of the Island of Bombay and Salsette is thus territory of the speakers of Marathi and there should, therefore, be no doubt regarding the place of Bombay in the new set-up of the Indian Union. Bombay City is obviously a part of the linguistic unit and potential state, Maharashtra, and must remain so.

Bombay and its environs have, further, been always inhabited by a majority or near-majority of the speakers of Marathi. It is highly unlikely that the Islands contained any significant number of speakers of other languages before the intrusion of the Portuguese and the English. Large migrations took place only in the 19th century but even after the English occupation of Bombay and its industrial development the bulk of the population of even Bombay City has always been of speakers of Marathi, as the statistics of the census from 1881 to 1931 make amply clear. The 1941 sample census give the numbers of speakers of Marathi in the sample in Bombay City as just under 50%, which does not show any great deviation from the 1931 figure. Moreover, apart from the majority of the inhabitants of Bombay being speakers of Marathi, the speakers of no other language in it have ever numbered more than 21%. It should, however, be emphasized that considerations regarding the composition by language of the population of a particular locality is completely irrelevant to the determination of the territory of a linguistic state. The fact may be significant only when the locality is on the border between two language areas, in which case the linguistic composition of each locality may influence the drawing of the frontier. The linguistic composition of particular localities which are within the undisputed territory of a uni-lingual State has no importance in this context. There are localities within, for example, Maha-

rashtra, such as Malegaon, in which the majority population is of Muslims and of speakers of Urdu. This would be yet no ground for considering the localities as potentially parts of Pakistan. In a similar manner, large and small colonies of speakers of Marathi are scattered over many parts of India. But, such localities cannot be considered as being either affiliated to Maharashtra or constituting in any way units different from the other parts of the particular linguistic area in which they are placed.

Not only is Bombay a part of the territory of Maharashtra but it is in many ways the centre of the life of the Marathi speaking peoples. It represents the largest urban concentration of the speakers of Marathi. As such, it is the main centre of many cultural activities of Maharashtra, as e.g. the Marathi Press, publications in the Marathi language and the Marathi drama. It should be noted that Bombay City does not stand in this relation to the group of speakers of any other language. The whole of the Railway and Road system of Maharashtra is oriented towards Bombay. A glance at the Road and Railway map will make this clear. It would also be clear that Bombay does not similarly form the focal point of the Road and Railway systems of the linguistic neighbours of Maharashtra, Gujerat on the North and Karnatak on the South. Because it is the focal point of the transport system Bombay is almost the sole outlet for the trade of the whole of the hinterland of Maharashtra and is the centre at which all the major gains from the trading and industrial exploitation of this hinterland are concentrated. In this respect also the relation of Gujerat and Karnatak to Bombay is vastly different. The natural ports for Gujerat have always lain North of Bulsar and with the formation of Saurashtra and its incorporation in the Indian Union port facilities on a very generous scale will be available for the foreign trade of Gujerat. The quest for a port for Karnatak has been rightly undertaken by the Government of India and the new port will prove the natural outlet for the major part of the trade of the autonomous state of Karnatak. Bombay again is not, to anything like the same extent, the centre of trading and industrial activity connected with the

exploitation of the resources of Gujerat or of Karnatak. Gujerat has a vigorous and large centre in Ahmedabad and has many other smaller centres, actual and potential. All of which indicates that not only does Bombay form a part of the territory of Maharashtra formally, but is the largest centre of Maratha cultural, intellectual, urban life and is the focus of the economic life of Maharashtra. It should thus be unthinkable to form a State of Maharashtra which has not Bombay as its capital and it would render impossible the working of a State of Maharashtra, if any, attempt was made to separate the City of Bombay from it.

Before going on to a detailed consideration of the future political status and administration of Bombay remarks may be offered on the proposals to Constitute Bombay City into a free city or a federally administered area. The suggestion that Bombay may be treated as a "free city" ignores the fact that the "free city" is an anachronism. The concept of a "free city" as a distinct political organism was appropriate to medieval or ancient times, i.e., before the emergence of large territorial states. The independent or free cities of these times were either exploiting overlords of the surrounding rural area or were centres of foreign trade with little or no direct dependence on the surrounding area. Free cities which survived into the 20th Century were mere relics of medieval times and the last of these relics have now been incorporated into the appropriate territorial states. The position of Bombay has further been sometimes compared with cities which have been put under an international regime such as Danzig or Trieste. There is no analogy between the position of Bombay and that of either of these cities. An international regime has been found necessary where acute conflicts have arisen between nations due to a port and the coastal strip adjacent to it belonging to a linguistic and national group different from the group of the inhabitants of the hinterland which the port chiefly served. Danzig was a German city which served as the outlet to a Polish hinterland. Bombay is a Maratha City with Maharashtra also as its hinterland. Trieste is a city inhabited, in the main, by Italians who have, in historical times, extended

along the coast upto Trieste and the hinterland of Trieste is chiefly Slavic. The speakers of no other language have, however, crept along the coast upto Bombay outnumbering the speakers of Marathi in any part of the adjacent coastal region and Bombay, as pointed above, does not contain a large number of speakers of any language other than Marathi.

It has also been suggested that the City of Bombay may be made a centrally administered area. It is obvious that the suggestion is made without due attention being paid to the principles basic to the formation of a federation. A federation is formed of units of autonomous states and the total area of the federation is divided completely between the various autonomous states. Only two categories of areas are directly administered by the federal government itself. Firstly, the area designated or reserved for the capital of the federation; and secondly, other areas which are outside the areas of States and are formed of units of colonial and semi-colonial status which cannot for one reason or another be raised to the political level of autonomous States. While a federation has usually powers of acquiring, for specific purposes, sites, lands, plants, etc., within the territory of any constituent unit, it would be considered a grave infringement of the federal principle if government or administration of any part of the territory of a State was sought to be taken away from it by the federation.

We may now turn to a consideration of main grounds on which the separation of Bombay from the rest of the territory of Maharashtra is justified; there are two such grounds. In the first instance, it is urged that while the speakers of Marathi in Bombay are the most numerous they are in the main clerks and labourers and that the bulk of the industrialists, financiers, traders and speculators speak other languages. This is no doubt true; and it is the result of certain forces of economic history which operated during the British period. The results of the operation of these forces are apparent not only in Bombay, but in many other cities of India, notably Calcutta. They have produced even extremer results in countries of South-East Asia outside India and have

created the difficult condition which has been called "plural society". The conditions in Burma have been characterised by a writer in the following manner:

"The Burman became steadily less important industrially in his own country. In the capital, Rangoon, he was nobody. The stigma of poverty beat him down." [Collis: Trials in Burma, p. 216.]

Though this characterisation has some resemblance to the situation in Maharashtra and Bombay, the process in Burma appears to have gone further than in Maharashtra. Nobody yet dared to suggest that Rangoon should be considered as non-Burmese territory. The results in Bombay have perhaps been more extreme than in other places in India. However, it would be a curious commentary on the foundation of what is assumed to be a socialistic republic if in the arrangements of its basic territorial structure attention was paid, not to which people the territory appertained but rather to the hands into which property rights had fallen during British Imperial rule.

It may be said that though the largest element in the population of Bombay is that of the speakers of Marathi the speakers of other languages are also numerous and that it would be unfair to them to retain Bombay in Maharashtra. If accepted, this argument will strike out at the very root of the peaceful formation and functioning of a federal union. The argument would imply that any people who allow the settlement of speakers of other languages within their territory run the danger of losing parts of their territories in course of time. In a federal union peacefully and amicably formed, liberty of intercourse and settlement for citizens of various States is a *sine-qua-non*. The influx of speakers of languages other than the language of the State may be large or small in particular States and localities. But the extent of such influx could surely not be allowed to affect the territorial integrity of a State or the political status of any locality within it. Wherever large number of speakers of languages other than the regional language of the State reside and settle

and form important linguistic minorities such measures relating to their rights will be provided for in the Union Constitution as appear appropriate and the terms and conditions would be the same whether it is the speakers of Marathi who reside and settle in States other than Maharashtra or it is the speakers of other languages than Marathi who reside and settle in Maharashtra. Free intercourse between linguistic communities or nations has been traditional in the history of India. The Nagarshet of Poona during Peshwa times was a Gujerati Bania and the proportion of speakers of other languages than Marathi in the population of Poona was at the end of 18th Century surprisingly large. Nobody could have then argued that the large influx of speakers of other languages made it justifiable to abstract the territory of the city from its proper context. The acceptance of such a principle for Bombay would not only raise immediately claims in relation to other areas of other peoples but also lead to the straining of relations between speakers of languages other than the regional language and the indigenous population in all areas.

In this connection reference may be made to a question which has somehow found its way into the questionnaire of the Linguistic Provinces Commission. This is question No. 19 which reads as follows:

“Do you think the creation of the new Province will lead to a large-scale transference of population and consequent human suffering? If you do, what steps would you suggest for its prevention?”

The question can only be answered by counterquestioning. Do peoples speaking languages other than the language of the Province continue to reside in the provinces of U. P., Bihar, Bengal, Assam, Orissa, etc., or has large-scale transference of population become necessary from those parts? Unless there was reason to believe that the average standard of civilisation and culture, of tolerance and decency, of political reasonableness and administrative competence was distinctly lower in Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra than in the other Indian provinces the question should not have been asked. However carefully, the boundaries are drawn, linguistic

minorities will continue to exist in all States. The creation of linguistic States may bring about a change in the language of administration or of instruction in State institutions in a small number of localities; but in no case will it affect the political status or economic life of any citizen. Fundamentally, the citizenship of the Union is one and the liberties and the rights guaranteed by the Constitution and the law, the same everywhere. All States would also pursue a uniform policy towards their linguistic minorities. The conditions would change only if it was felt that a linguistic minority threatened the existence or proper functioning of the State. For example, if it was seen that the presence of a linguistic minority within a State leads to a loss of territory by the State the very basis of the federal Union would be upset and the resulting situation may be difficult. No state would in the eventuality, be willing to accept new linguistic minorities and the problem of the settlement of refugees may thus take on a serious complexion. Also, the linguistic minorities already settled in different parts of the Union may, perhaps, find the regional population less tolerant than otherwise of their continued existence in the region.

Another ground on which special treatment of Bombay is advocated is that it is a major port and a place of high industrial concentration. Whatever the degree of economic importance of any locality there is no reason why in a Federation it should be put under central administration. The division of subjects in a Federation gives to the Federal Government powers relating to subjects of general economic importance throughout the area of the Federation. When matters such as major ports or air fields or certain basic industries are within the purview of the Union, federal power is equally exercised whether the port, the air field or the industry lies within the area of a State or within an area directly administered by the Federation. The division of powers in a Federation provides for all the subjects necessary for central administration by including them among federal subjects. The direct federal administration of an area increases the powers of the Federation only in the direction of powers ordinarily given to the

State governments and to local authorities. The effects of central administration of an area are chiefly: (1) The denial of integration with the surrounding region to the federally administered area. (2) The denial of participation in State-self-government to it. This is because a centrally administered area is not an authority on the level of autonomous states but enjoys an administration which has the status of a local authority of the Union Government. A third consequence will, of course, be that because of direct administration by the Union the federal language will predominate in the area and the regional language will to that extent be suppressed. This fact will also have repercussions, in related directions on educational, cultural, etc. activity. It is obvious that the importance of the economic activities in a place or of the concentration of the activity in a centre has nothing to do with these consequences which follow from being a centrally administered area. The economic and political interests of the Union Government in such localities are guaranteed by the appropriate provision regarding Union powers. No additional guarantee or safeguard in these respects is introduced by making the area a directly centrally administered area.

However, if this plea for making Bombay a federally administered area is accepted, it must logically hold good in other instances and extend much beyond the single case of Bombay. Not Bombay alone but all other centres of economic importance must be similarly treated. All the major ports such as Calcutta, Madras, Vizagapattam and any other major ports that may be developed later and all centres of industrial concentration such as Ahmedabad, Cawnpore and Jamshedpur must be made centrally administered areas in the same manner. Without such a logical extension of the plea it would be seen to have no other significance than a device to cripple deliberately the economic strength and the political and social life of Maharashtra.

It is sometimes argued that the whole question might be determined by a plebiscite. Presumably, the plebiscite would be taken on the issue as to whether Bombay should be retained

in Maharashtra or whether it should become an autonomous unit or a centrally administered area. The proposal for a plebiscite raises two issues. In the first instance it raises the question of the attributes required of an area or a region before the demand for a plebiscite in relation to it is justified. It would obviously not be open to the inhabitants of any area or locality to demand a plebiscite for being constituted separate autonomous or centrally administered area. A plebiscite in relation to the formation of an independent territorial unit and to autonomous status in a federal union can be demanded only by the inhabitants of a region which has the size and resources required for becoming an autonomous State. In a federal union such regions as can claim to be autonomous states within the federation on a parity of status with other existing states can alone put forward such plea. The demand for a plebiscite can, therefore, be conceded only in respect of an area which is large enough, whose resources are diverse enough and whose interests are distinct enough from the neighbouring areas.

Autonomy of status which can be claimed by a politically homogenous and internally integrated region can in no case be attributed or conceded to a city. A city is the result of the growth of the specialization of economic activity within a region. Not the city by itself but the city with its surrounding area constitutes an integrated whole. The fact is, no doubt, often ignored by dwellers in the city. This specially happens when the exploiting classes in the city are different from and anti-pathetic to the population of the rural regions which the city exploits and prospers on. But the notion that the city concentration can or should be politically and economically separated from the area on which it depends and which is dependent on it, is entirely foreign to modern political, economic or social theory. There is on the contrary an insistence at present, on the integration of and a proper balance between interests and development of a city and the rural area and recent students of sociological problems of the City have insisted that the only way of correcting the complex evils of metropolitan agglomeration is by proceeding in the direction

of decentralization and regional unification. To claim the right to separate, for a city, runs counter to these ideas and derives from European medieval concepts. It should be remembered that with the revival of medieval concepts there would come about a revival also of medieval conflicts.

The suggestion for a plebiscite is inept. It is also no more than a palpable ruse. Those who put forward proposals such as that of a plebiscite proceed on the expectation that the large new and old floating population of Bombay which consists largely of speakers of languages other than Marathi would vote against the non-incorporation of Bombay in Maharashtra.

The composition of the population of the city of Bombay in 1939 was described in the following terms:

“The city has a sub-stratum of original inhabitants; but it is largely a city of immigrants. A portion of them has made Bombay a permanent place of its residence; to another portion it is only a place of work to be left when it becomes unsuitable.” (Report of the Rent Enquiry Committee, 1939. Vol. I, p. 5).

Since this was written an enormous addition has been made to the floating population of the City and it is unthinkable that decisions regarding permanent territorial arrangements should depend on the vote of such a population. The vote of such a population would have no political significance of moral weight. A vote in which the speakers of languages other than Marathi decide the fate of the Maratha territory of Bombay places the non-Marathi elements in the position of eating their cake and having it too. The integrity of linguistic territories of these other elements is not threatened by their vote. The centres of the economic life of their States are not to be cut off and formed into autonomous units or to become federally administered areas. The vote might have been conceded to have had significance had it been a vote not only about cutting off Bombay from the territory of Maharashtra but also if it could have at the same time meant a similar treatment of Ahmedabad, Madras, Vizagapattam, Calcutta, Jamshedpur, Cawnpore, etc.

To sum up, there is no valid ground on which the separation of Bombay City from Maharashtra can be justified. The City is a part of Maratha territory and is the focal point of the economic life of Maharashtra and the largest centre of the intellectual and cultural activities of the speakers of Marathi. Any control that it is necessary for the Union Government to exercise over it because of its economic importance may be exercised through the same powers and in the same manner as for other similar centres. The need for such control could not justify separating the City from its hinterland. No claim to autonomous political status can be sustained by a City and it is absurd to suggest that the vote of its floating population can decide territorial arrangements regarding the new States in India. Bombay City is an integral part, economically and politically of the whole of the region of Maharashtra and must be treated as such in the constitutional set-up of the future.

III

We may now turn to a consideration of the future of Bombay and of the manner in which the many difficult problems of Bombay and its life could be tackled on the political and administrative plane. In the current controversy regarding the status of Bombay little appreciation is shown about the real position. This is itself the result of the unnatural divorce, in thought and policy, of Bombay from its surrounding region. There is always an attempt, conscious or unconscious, to increase the importance of Bombay, to concentrate wealth and power within it and to treat it as a unit apart. As a result, the problems of Bombay are made more and more difficult and the people of the surrounding regions made more impoverished and all their resources ill-used or neglected.

A first approach towards understanding the problem of Bombay may be made by comparing it with the problem presented by London. The Royal Commission (Barlow Commission) on the Distribution of Industrial Population of Great Britain includes in its general discussion, of City problems, an extract from an American report in which the following

sentences occur: "The concentration of so large a proportion of the urban population in extremely limited areas is wasteful of resources, time and energy Provided the urban community possesses a fundamentally sound economic basis and has a site the disadvantages of which are not too costly to overcome, the Committee is of opinion that the realistic answer to the question of a desirable urban environment lies not in wholesale dispersion but in the judicious reshaping of the urban community and region by systematic development and re-development in accordance with forward looking and intelligent plans" (Report p. 154-5). In discussing how these general principles are to be interpreted in relation to particular cities the Commission points out that what is important is not to determine an absolute figure as to population or area but to express size always as a function of the social relationships to be served. While not recognising any necessary limit to the size of the urban unit the Commission emphasizes that "all towns including the largest units, shall be properly planned, or if not so planned shall be re-developed so as to secure better provision than usually exists at present against the evils of overcrowding, lack of sunlight and facilities for recreation, fatigue and waste due to congested traffic, and so on." (Report p. 156). It maintains that it is not so much concentration as congestion that must be sought to be abolished. Though it suggests no simple formula for determining where congestion of population and industry exist it points to indexes of population per acre, congestion in relation to housing as determined by certain tests laid down by Housing Acts, and also to such other factors as the acreages occupied by houses, factories, permanent open space, transport difficulties, cost of sites, etc. It considers traffic congestion as a good practical indication of the presence of congestion of industry.

In analysing the problem of London, in particular, the Commission found that two overriding causative factors emerged, namely (i) the increasing population and the industrial development of Greater London; (ii) the increasing degree to which the place of residence of the members of the industrial population became separated from the place of their

work and the general absence of co-ordination in the location of housing and industry. Regarding the latter the Commission remarks that obviously the distance between home and work place cannot continue to increase indefinitely. "Sooner or later the burdens of both cost and time must bring the process to an end. Even now cost is a serious burden". (p. 173). In illustrating the existing (1940) difficulties in London the Commission give certain statistics which show the distances from which large numbers of people daily travelled by mechanical transport to work. Similar figures are not available for Bombay. There is little doubt, however, that conditions in Bombay regarding the problem of separation of work, place and residence and the cost of travel to work are very acute.

The examination by the Royal Commission of the problem of London led it to the conclusion that the drift of industrial population to London constituted a social, economic and strategical problem which demanded immediate attention and the Commission recommended that the National Industrial Board, which it recommended be set up, should be vested from the outset with powers to regulate establishment within the London area of additional industrial undertakings. The Royal Commission reported in 1940. The considerable amount of planning activity in relation to London that has since been in evidence has all accepted the basic analysis of the problem of London made by the Barlow Commission. The Greater London plan prepared by Sir Peter Abercrombie proceeds on assumptions among which the main are (1) the recommendation contained in the Barlow report that no new industry shall be admitted to London and the Home Counties except in special cases; (2) the decentralization of industry from the congested centre; (3) that the total population of the area of London and Home Counties will as a result of the Barlow recommendation not increase but on the contrary will be somewhat reduced; (4) that new powers for planning will be available including powers for the control of land values.

In relation to industrial location, which after all is the chief factor in causing concentration or congestion of population the proposals of the Abercrombie Report make further

detailed assumptions some of which are instructive. These are (1) that the Greater London area will be normally banned to new industry and to any but minor extensions of existing enterprises; (2) that the maintenance of a prosperous agricultural industry is intended, which will give stability of employment and good wages to the residents of market town and villages, coupled with a radical improvement in living conditions there, thus at least preventing a further drift of population to the bigger towns. The memorandum (1947) of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning on the Greater London Plan also proceeds on the assumption that the population of the Greater London Region should not increase above the 1938 figure. Mr. Lewis Mumford criticises the Greater London Plan on the ground that even the 1938 figure is much too large.

Statistical information relating to Bombay City in respect of the various factors mentioned by the Barlow Commission are not, at present, available. But it is obvious that regarding most of these factors, existing conditions in Bombay City are bad, perhaps, immensely worse than those in London. Physical lack of housing even of no standard, traffic congestion of a degree, perhaps, unparalleled elsewhere, enormous distances from which people are known to travel to work, the cost of such travel, the heights to which cost of sites and housing have risen, all these point to the problem of Bombay being one of the worst in the world. One aspect of the situation, housing in Bombay, was examined by an Official Committee ten years ago. The description by the Committee of Conditions at the time (Report of the Rent Enquiry Committee. Vol. I, Chapter II) makes unpleasant reading. Even in 1939, conditions in Bombay compared unfavourably with those in London and in the opinion of the Committee the prosperity of the City meant "the prosperity of a few, leaving the vast majority of the people to rot in abject conditions." (P. 12).

The main responsibility for this problem of Bombay is of its original site whose disadvantages are so large that it is almost impossible to overcome them at any cost. Attempts which have been made, in the past, to overcome the disadvant-

ages of the original site have made little impression on the fundamental problem. They added, at great cost, a small area to the accommodation in the commercial centre and for the residences of the wealthy. They could not, however, expand the area significantly nor solve, even partially, the transport problem created by the location of the commercial and financial centre at the end of a narrow island. The addition of Salsette island to Bombay island and the incorporation of the two in a Greater Bombay cannot change the fundamentals of the problem of Bombay. The two islands together yet form a comparatively narrow block of land with the nucleus placed at its narrower end. The land available for expansion of the City is many times less in extent than if the centre of the City had been in a landblock which extended in all directions radially from the centre. It is a great deal less than if a semi-circular expansion from the centre were, at least, possible. In positions such as that of Bombay the lines of transport are reduced to a very small number and the length of the transport arms is lengthened enormously from the centre for given numbers of population. The original site is thus extremely unsuitable for the location of a large industrial population. The problem of housing and transporting the population of the size reached in 1938, at even low standards, was already insoluble at that date. Large numbers which have been since added to the population make it completely intractable.

Bombay City and its environs, though containing a much smaller population than Greater London, present a problem which is more acute than that of Greater London. The only approach which holds out a hope for an eventual solution is that adopted by the Greater London Plan. In the case of Bombay the prescription will have to be more drastic and the time factor is more pressing; the steps required appear, however, to be similar. They are (1) placing an immediate ban on the opening of new or expansion of old industrial establishments within Greater Bombay and beyond (2) the preparation of a plan which will provide for a large movement of industry and a transfer of population from Greater Bombay so as to bring down the population of the total area to, at

least, the 1941 figure and a similar movement between Bombay City and the outer Bombay region so as to relieve the congestion in the most crowded areas in the City to some extent. The surplus that will have to be transferred in such a plan, is today so large that the ban on new establishments must apply not only to what is usually termed Greater Bombay, but also to such areas as the Kalyan-Ambarnath area.

It does not appear that this root problem of Bombay is receiving any attention. Government seems to be encouraging the location of further factories in the Bombay area and adding to the problem of population within that area. As long as there is an unwillingness to examine the problem of Bombay along lines indicated above the problem will continue to be intensified. Such intensification is evidently proceeding apace. It has, for example, been reported that the Valley of the Ulhas river which is as yet, in the main, an agricultural area and which because of assured water supply has great potentialities in the direction of increased production of rice and protective foods has already been pledged to industrial concerns of such order of national importance as rayon factories. So that, instead of doing all that government can do, at least, not to spread the blight of Bombay in the vicinity and to maintain the existing green and agricultural belts, an exactly opposite course is being followed. Government is also planning to spend and is spending crores of Rupees in trying in vain, to alleviate in some degree problems such as those of the milk supply and housing in Bombay. The amounts spent are entirely disproportionate to the resources of the country, the numbers involved, or the results expected. These crores if spent in, say, major irrigation or other productive works are capable of immediately increasing production within the country and bringing about some betterment of living conditions in villages. Their expenditure in Bombay, at a time when the further drift to the city is not stopped and no plan regarding industrial location is under contemplation, is a sheer waste of money. The chief explanation of this attitude on the part of Government seems to lie in the current approach which derives from British times

and which looks at the problem of Bombay as distinct from that of its hinterland.

It is no doubt true that the accentuation of the problem of Bombay during war time and owing to the influx of refugees was not of Government's seeking; but it is also true that Government appears to be following a wrong policy relating to the location of new industrial establishments in Bombay and the settlement of refugee and other new immigrants within the already crowded area of Greater Bombay. As the Barlow Commission pointed out nothing succeeds like success and natural forces attract industry, labour and immigrants to a conurbation like Bombay.

"The obvious attractions which Greater London possesses as market, a centre of potential labour, a distributing centre, and as an area in which electrical power is universally available, inevitably tend to attract many consumers' industries to locate themselves in or near to it. The extra employment provided by the new factories further adds to the importance of the area as a market. Thus higher industrial activity and purchasing power are induced. The magnetic pull on industry is strengthened; and, as respects the industrial population, wide opportunities of employment add to the attractive power which London naturally exerts through the advantages which it possesses as a Capital City." (Report p. 170).

This explains why unchecked private activity keeps on adding to problems of congestion in metropolitan areas. It cannot, however, explain why Government has shown no awareness of the problem of Bombay and has acted as if it did not fear its continued worsening. The neglect by Government of this problem or rather the non-awareness on the part of Government that such a problem exists, is evident even in the recent reports of the Provincial Industrial Committee and its Location Sub-Committee which contemplate with equanimity a further large addition to the industrial complement of the Bombay area. Any suggestion that industry could now move with great advantage to valleys and other areas distant from the overgrown city, where electric power and water are available cannot be appreciated until vested interests and public

leaders insist on looking upon all suggestions regarding moving industry away from Bombay as being contrary to the interests of the City.

A Government which looks at Bombay in isolation would, of course, act in the way in which the Government acts at present. It would not discourage the growth of the City as it would look upon the increasing size as adding to the importance of the city. It would not count the cost in terms of physical and moral degeneration of the population because this would bear fruit chiefly, not in the city itself but, in the outer areas which feed it. It would be unaware, when dealing with the city of the problem of impoverishment of the rural areas and smaller towns from which the city draws away men and economic activity. It would not count the comparative cost of the efforts at tinkering with the problem of the city as it would have the resources of the whole province to draw upon. With increased size the surplus wealth concentrated in the city grows and makes fine showing, the glitter of which distracts attention from the appalling squalor and degradation of the conditions in which the vast bulk of the city dwellers live. The conditions of life in the city have the greatest demoralising effect on the people of Maharashtra. They form the bulk of the poor who migrate to it with their womenfolk. Other elements who may be permanent residents, are proportionately smaller in number and are, on an average, better off than the Marathas; and the other groups of temporary immigrants consist mostly of adult males of working age. The incidence of the high infant mortality which is the cumulative effect of conditions in the City is borne chiefly by its Maratha population.

The only remedy for the existing condition is compulsory decentralization of industry according to a plan which integrates the economic life of the City of Bombay with the development of the whole of its hinterland. The chief problem in this context is that of industrial location. The main factors determining industrial location in the entire region are transport facilities, availability of water and electric power and availability of labour. The advantages of a major port are

obvious and concentration near it is no doubt natural; but granted good transport facilities industry may find that, the distance from the port and the transport costs flowing from it are amply compensated by other advantages, especially the availability of land and its lower cost. Electric power and water are immediately available on a fairly large scale, and potentially available even to a greater extent on both sides of the range of Ghats stretching south of Bombay right upto Kolhapur and beyond. The whole of this area lies within Maharashtra. The reserves of industrial labour near Bombay are also all from within or not far distant from the area where electric power and water are available. Labour from Gujerat, Rajputana, Kathiawar etc. has many nearer centres of industry to which it is attracted and it does not usually migrate so far South as Bombay. The centres from which labour is attracted to Bombay, outside Maharashtra, are all more than at least 500 miles distant from Bombay. In many cases the distances are much larger. It is extremely wasteful, from the national point of view, to encourage the migration of labour from such distances, with its attendant economic and social costs and attempts must be made to find employment for the population of these distant areas in centres nearer to their Home regions. The problem of the location of industries to be transferred from Bombay and around is a problem that must, therefore, be considered directly in relation to the available sites in either the Konkan or on the Desh districts of Maharashtra.

The future of Bombay City is, in the long run, bound up almost exclusively with Maharashtra. The wide extent of its area of influence today is merely the result of arrested developments in other parts of the country. In due course much greater facilities for maritime trade will be available, than at present, South of Goa and between Surat and Cutch. This will relieve the heavy concentration of this trade in Bombay. Similarly, industrial development will soon take place in many of the provinces which are at present backward in this respect. This will reduce the industrial importance of Bombay for those parts and also stop the flow of industrial labour from distant regions. Bombay's all-India importance

for certain specialised activities may remain; but it will exist chiefly as the port and economic centre of Maharashtra, which is the role indicated by its geographical location.

This examination of the problem of population and industrial location, which is the problem of all big cities, will show how artificial it is to try and separate the political and economic government of Bombay from that of Maharashtra. As pointed out above, if such a step is forced on the people of Maharashtra conflicts will arise, conflicts which may give rise to most serious problems both for Bombay city and Maharashtra. Any proposal for the separation of Bombay from Maharashtra will immediately give rise to bitter disputes regarding boundaries and there would be no objective tests by which these could be settled. The boundary will be purely artificial. Also, in this event, the scheme for a Greater Bombay will be looked upon only as a means by which as large an area of the territory of speakers of Marathi as possible is sought to be detached from Maharashtra. The Greater Bombay Scheme then becomes a step towards making feasible the proposal for the separation of Bombay from Maharashtra and will naturally meet with determined opposition from the people of Maharashtra. But even a Greater Bombay will not solve all problems; for the water and electric power of Bombay may have to come from distances which are outside the region of Greater Bombay.

A move towards a Greater Bombay, is, however, a move in the right direction if it leads to no more than a system of graded authorities devised to tackle properly the great problems created by a metropolitan area. The problem of administration and of regulation of economic activity in relation to a large concentration of urban population has a number of aspects. In the first instance, there is the problem of the administration of the nucleus of concentrated population. This may be defined as the area of Bombay City. Secondly, there is the problem of administration of the Suburban areas and part of the rural area which it is found necessary to include within

the boundaries of the Greater City. There are many disadvantages arising from an attempt at combining the administration of Suburban areas, especially if they consist of a number of distinct and separate nuclei, with the administration of the city. The way out may be found by setting up a number of separate Municipal authorities, where localities possess distinct individuality and are large enough, and a general Local Board which administers the more dispersed areas. The City Corporation and the local authorities of the Suburban etc. areas will be embraced within a single Greater Bombay authority. There is, however, always the problem of co-ordinating the activities of even the neighbouring areas of the Greater City with those of the authority of the Greater City. Among the subjects which such an overall co-ordinating authority or advisory body for a large area should control, are especially transport and town planning. Such an overall body if set up, would also be the general planning authority or advisory body for the whole area. At the same time the master plan regarding the development of transport and electric power or the location of industries would be derived from the plan for the whole of the region, in which the plan for the Greater City would be fitted up.

The main stages by which the problem of Bombay has to be tackled appear, therefore, to be as follows: (1) a ban on the establishment of new or expansion of old industrial undertakings within a distance by road or rail of, say, 50 miles of the Fort area (2) the preparation of a plan of industrial location for Bombay and the whole of its hinterland (3) a detailed programme which will indicate the steps by which the transfer of population and industry from Greater Bombay and the movement of dispersal from the most congested parts of Bombay city will take place; (4) the setting up an authority for a large area which will have overall powers regarding planning and also regarding major transport and housing. If these steps are taken and if the agricultural potentialities of the region within say 80 to 100 miles of Bombay are actively developed the problem of Bombay may be on the way to its solution.

This will not happen if Bombay is separated from Maharashtra. Because in that event an overgrown congested city where vested interests rule and whose population feels itself distinct from and superior to the people of Maharashtra will look across and face a sullen, impoverished and resentful countryside which will refuse to co-operate with any settlement of the city's problem and will attempt at the same time to build up, with little hope of success, another central nucleus of its own.

IV

Finally, it is necessary to give thought to the reasons which lead some elements and interests in Bombay to demand the separation of Bombay from Maharashtra. The demand appears to be partly based on apprehensions which it may be possible to allay in some measure. Partly, it is also based on hopes and fears of particular interests. The demand for separation comes from sources which are all non-Maratha. The Marathi-speaking peoples are united in their insistence on the retention of Bombay in its proper place in the political and economic set-up of Maharashtra; barring a few eccentrics whom Maharashtra always produces, the demand from Maharashtra may be said to be unanimous. The active support to the demand for retention of Bombay in Maharashtra given by the Maharashtra Chamber of Commerce further indicates that not only the Marathi-speaking capitalists and traders in Bombay but also the large body of non-Marathi vested interests in Maharashtra outside Bombay, support the demand for the retention of Bombay in Maharashtra. The Maharashtra Chamber of Commerce has a large membership of industrialists, traders etc. who though settled in or operating in Maharashtra are, by origin, speakers of languages other than Marathi.

It is difficult to analyse carefully the grounds on which the demand for separation is being justified, because it has not been yet put forward in a cogent form by any responsible person or body. The Non-Maratha vested interests in Bombay appears to be the most important among those who demand

separation. It seems to be claimed by representatives of these interests that the major part in the development of Bombay city has been taken by non-Maratha Communities. In consequence, they assert that even though Bombay may be Maratha territory, it is right to separate it from Maharashtra. It is difficult to interpret what is precisely meant by the term 'development'. In the mouths of the representatives of vested interests, it must be taken to mean investment of capital with a view to obtaining profit from the investment. In a general way, the development of the island of Bombay was primarily the work of the English. A number of other communities, chiefly Indian, no doubt helped the English; but they brought in neither new technique nor equipment and the capital they invested was also the fruit of exploitation of local resources. They were, almost wholly, the assistants or the imitators of the English. It may be that among these assistants and imitators the non-Maratha communities were more prominent than the Maratha communities. But whatever the historical facts regarding comparative shares in this aspect of development, they have nothing to do with political rule over a locality or its inclusion in or separation from its native territory. The English developed, in the main, not only many localities but large regions in India and the European powers have developed many regions and countries in South East Asia. In neither case, has the perpetual political rule of these lands or regions by those who developed them or the claim to separate particular localities such as the ports or industrial areas, from their native regions as having been intensively developed by the European powers, have been sustained. The contention that because in the "development" of Bombay city some non-Marathas took a special share, the city should be cut off from its native region following the wishes of these communities, is of a type which even European capitalists no longer dare to put forward in relation to their more genuine work of development of resources in the Asiatic countries.

The non-Maratha vested interests, no doubt, feel that if Bombay is separated from Maharashtra, it will remain effectively in their hands. The permanent residents in it form

a comparatively small proportion of the total population and are largely dependent on these vested interests who are large employers of intellectual and manual labour. The enormous floating population has no roots, is constantly changing in its composition and is easy to influence in a variety of ways. The desire for separation on the part of vested interests, perhaps, also springs from the belief that the large resources which are the results of the concentration of economic activity of the whole region in the city will be available for the development of the city alone. Thus they would be able not only to drain into the City all the resources of the countryside but also prevent any measure of benefit that might accrue to the countryside from the expenditure of a portion of tax revenues raised from the City. It is probable that the vested interests are also actuated by some fears. They may fear that Maharashtra with its fundamentally democratic traditions may formulate a more strict regulatory regime in economic affairs and follow a more liberal social policy than would suit their inclinations or interests. There is little that can be said regarding these arguments, hopes or fears of the vested interests except that if they prevail, it would be clear that the political status of the Marathas in the Indian Union is not on a par with that of the other linguistic groups.

The proposal of the vested interests, supported by some non-Maratha intellectuals who talk vaguely of "cosmopolitanism" to separate Bombay city from Maharashtra has close resemblance to the demand for treaty ports, presented to China by the European powers. There was unanimity amongst European powers that treaty ports ought to be demanded from China and the demand was, no doubt, made by all of them in the interests of universal progress and peace and for the promotion of "cosmopolitanism". Such agreement as may exist among the non-Marathas drawn from various regions regarding the reasonableness of separating Bombay city from Maharashtra is on the same plane of disinterestedness. It appears, curious, to the Maratha that it is only in Bombay that this experiment of "cosmopolitanism" is proposed to be made. The economic centres and political capitals of

the other linguistic regions evidently do not require an equal dose of it. The Maratha may, in the circumstances, be excused if he refuses to be flattered by the compliment implied in the proposal to make an experiment in "cosmopolitanism" on his territory.

Apart from the non-Maratha vested interests, there may be elements in Bombay city who may support its separation from Maharashtra because of certain apprehensions. They may be characterised, I hope without offence, as coming from the intellectual proletariat from outside Maharashtra. These, perhaps, fear that their chances of employment in Bombay may be jeopardized, if Bombay forms a part of Maharashtra. This fear has no foundation whatsoever. It must be emphasized that the political and economic rights of citizens of Bombay would in no way change because of the retention of Bombay in Maharashtra. The right to settle, the right to practise any profession or enter any employment, the right to own property and to dispose of it, all these rights will be enjoyed by any Indian citizen coming to Bombay in the same manner as by the indigenous Bombay and Marathi speaking population when Bombay forms part of the State of Maharashtra. In the sphere of private industry and commerce, for example, the conditions of employment offered would, in no respect, change with the creation of the new State. There would neither be prohibition of migration, settlement, or of following any occupation nor any differentiation between Marathas and non-Marathas within the territory of Maharashtra. The guarantee depends not only on the liberal traditions of the Marathas but also on the constitutional safeguards that would be embodied in the Union Constitution.

Not only would the political status and economic rights of individuals not undergo any change because of the incorporation of Bombay in the new autonomous State of Maharashtra but also the present system of governance of the local affairs of Bombay would not be changed in any way. The Bombay City Corporation would not only not suffer any loss of powers but would, because of the general trend towards decentralization in Maharashtra, get an accession of powers in many

directions. As indicated in the earlier section, a large planning authority may also have to be set up for an area larger than even Greater Bombay. In all these authorities the residents of Bombay, whether Marathi-speaking or not, will play the major part. Local Self-Government, in the most liberal sense, would be guaranteed to the people of Greater Bombay and within the frame-work of the larger plan of regional development, the detailed development plan of Bombay would be entirely in the hands of the Bombay population.

There is one direction in which, no doubt, certain transitional difficulties will have to be faced by immigrants in all States. This is due to a transformation which is not local in Bombay or in Maharashtra but will be common throughout India in the near future. With the reduction in the importance of English in Indian administration, one of the factors which made for ease of movement of the intellectual proletariat will vanish and migrants from one linguistic State to another will not, in future, be able to neglect the regional language as they used to formerly. The regional language will more and more predominate in State administration and a knowledge of it will become essential to most who want to follow any employment within the region. This must be considered to be, on the whole, a beneficial movement. Hitherto, in spite of large movements of intellectuals from one region to another, there has arisen no effective understanding between various parts because, with the prevalence of English, the migrants did not feel called upon to familiarise themselves with the language, habits and ideas of the people of the regions to which they had migrated. The new requirement, however beneficial in the long run, may, no doubt, create some difficulties in the transitional period. It may also create hardships wherever large linguistic minorities are permanently settled, unless a liberal linguistic policy is followed by all the new States.

In this connection, attention may be drawn to a Resolution recently issued by the Government of Bombay. This is a resolution on Government policy regarding instruction in languages other than the regional languages in the Province. It lays down that the medium of instruction in Primary

Schools maintained by the State within the Province should be the language of the region concerned and that all Primary and Secondary Schools privately run should make provision for teaching the regional language compulsorily so as to be eligible for grants-in-aid from the State. It is presumed that all members of the Bombay Cabinet belonging to the three linguistic regions within the Province subscribe to this statement of policy.* The Government Resolution makes clear how the linguistic problem cannot be postponed even if the linguistic States do not immediately come into existence. As a matter of fact, it is likely that in the absence of a careful demarcation of linguistic boundaries the operation of the Resolution will create not only hardships but genuine grievances in districts with mixed populations. The Resolution frames a policy that can properly operate only in a State created on the linguistic basis and presumably anticipates the event. All States in India will no doubt follow a policy regarding the language of instruction in schools similar to the one laid down in the Bombay Government Resolution.

This Government Resolution which so emphatically enunciates a relation between the region, the language and the educational system itself, however, reveals the influence of existing circumstances by making a very peculiar statement regarding Bombay. The Resolution cites Bombay City as an instance of area "with more than one regional language." The expression "areas with more than one regional language" makes non-sense, except perhaps, in localities on the border of two linguistic areas whose boundaries have not yet been drawn. The regional language of a locality in the midst of a linguistic region cannot be doubted. The regional language of Bombay city is Marathi and no other just as much as it is the language of, say, the Malegaon region. The statement regarding Bombay in the Government Resolution is evidence of a lack of clear thinking which is unfortunately very common in relation to

*It may be noted parenthetically that if Marathas had been able to follow such a policy in the past, the problem of the non-Maratha claim in Bombay would not have arisen in the manner in which it has now arisen. Their present plight in relation to Bombay is, therefore, another result of British rule during which regional interests were naturally completely ignored.

this question; it also makes clear the dangers involved in a separation from Maharashtra of the area of the City. The proposition regarding the regional language made today regarding Bombay city will be made to apply tomorrow to Greater Bombay and to any other extension of the sphere of Bombay. Once the claim of separation is conceded it will amount with every extension of the city to a consent to lopping of the contiguous area and consequently a constant automatic reduction of the territory of Maharashtra.

While it is necessary to protest against the statement that the Bombay city has more than one regional language, it is equally necessary to take account of the fact that large numbers of speakers of languages other than Marathi have settled in that city. It will, therefore, be necessary to add to the policy laid down in the Government Resolution an exception in relation to certain circumstances in which the policy would have to be partially modified. In considering the general problem of linguistic minorities, it will have to be laid down that whenever a substantial linguistic minority is settled in a locality and forms, say, more than 20 per cent. of its population, certain special privileges regarding the study of the language of that minority will be afforded in private schools and even in the State system of education. The rules under the Primary Education Act today provide for the opening of Primary Schools for all significant linguistic elements within the population. Present policy in this regard need not be changed except to make provision for compulsory teaching of the regional language. When the linguistic minorities become large, the principle accepted for primary education can and should be extended to higher stages of education. The language of significant linguistic minorities should receive special consideration in the educational system provided that the primary requirement of a minimum knowledge of the regional language is satisfied. In case of the larger linguistic minorities, the language of the linguistic minority may also be given some place as an additional language for use in local affairs and local administration of the locality where the linguistic minority is specially concentrated. The genuine

apprehensions regarding unnecessary inconvenience and hardship of the bulk of, say, the speakers of Gujarati in Bombay because of the incorporation of Bombay city in Maharashtra may and should be met on these lines. There is no reason why even when Bombay city becomes the capital of Maharashtra, the large elements of Gujarati and other settlers in Bombay should suffer any inconvenience or hardship. It is upto the Marathas to recognise the contribution which they have made not only in Bombay city but also in other regions of Maharashtra and to allay their apprehensions with a liberal policy in relation to language in education and administration in localities where they have a concentrated population. A liberal policy in these respects is an essential requirement for the peaceful functioning of the federation.

Before concluding this statement it may be proper to refer to certain charges such as that of parochialism or even of aggressive intent made against the people of Maharashtra because of their stand regarding Bombay. It must be confessed that the Maratha is perplexed and bewildered by these, in his opinion, wild accusations. He does not feel that engaging in an attempt to create a well-knit community of three crore human beings, is adequately described as parochialism or that calling what is one's own territory emphatically one's own is indicative of aggressive intent. During the last year he has assisted in the acquisition of Junagadh for Saurashtra and Maha-Gujerat and is at present participating in the attempt to retain Kashmir for the Kashmiris. Both these enterprises have obtained the almost unanimous backing of the leaders of the country. In consequence, the Maratha feels that he is merely performing a rightful duty when he asserts, politely but firmly, that he will not allow the State of the Marathas to be deprived of, not only what is indubitably Maratha territory but also the economic nerve centre of Maharashtra.